

## DIALECTICS, RHETORIC, AND FUNCTIONAL ISSUES IN EARLY MODERN HUNGARIAN RELIGIOUS DISPUTES. POLEMICS RESEARCH IN A LONG REFORMATION PERSPECTIVE

---

CSILLA GÁBOR\*

**Abstract** The study deals with 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian printed polemical works considering religious disputes a typical form of communication in the age of Reformation and Catholic renewal. Its conceptual framework is the paradigm or research method of the long Reformation as an efficient assistance to the discovery and appreciation of early modern theological-religious diversity. The analysis examines several kinds of communication which occurs in the (religious) dispute, and explores the rules and conventions along which the (verbal) fighting takes place. Research shows that the opponents repeatedly refer to the rules of dialectics refuting each other's standpoints accusing them of faulty argumentation, i.e., the wrong use of syllogisms. Dialectics is, namely, in this context not the *ars* with the help of which truth is found but with which evident truth is checked and justified in a way that the opponents can also be educated to follow the right direction.

**Keywords** Religious dispute, polemics, religious pluralism, Long Reformation, dialectical argumentation, syllogism, marginalia.

### Novel Propositions in Reformation Research – A Selective Review

The already obvious statement of Reformation research, that “religious disputes are a typical form of communication in the age of Reformation and Catholic renewal”<sup>1</sup> seems as a useful starting point for our chosen topic and its wider context (extending beyond an international and literary-historical approach). In order to thoroughly

---

\* Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca. gaabor.csilla@gmail.com.

DOI: 10.26424/philobib.2020.25.2.02

<sup>1</sup> János Heltai, “A 16–17. századi magyarországi hitviták adattárának tervezete” [A Project of the Database of Religious Disputes in Hungary in the 16–17<sup>th</sup> Centuries], in *Tenger az igaz hitrül való egyenetlenségek vitásának eláradott özöne: Tanulmányok XVI–XIX. századi hitvitáinkról* [The Flood of Disputing the Inequalities on True Faith: Studies on Our 16–19<sup>th</sup> Century Religious Disputes], eds. Heltai János, Tasi Réka (Miskolc: Miskolci Egyetem BTK Régi Magyar Irodalomtörténeti Tanszék, 2005), 254.

rethink its essence and characteristics, it is worth starting from further afield than what the study of polemic literature in the strict sense offers. Recent research on Reformation history highlights the emergence of pluralism in Europe in connection with the symbolic date of 1517; for example, the revealing title of the volume that publishes a selection of the lectures held at the RefoRC conference organized in Wittenberg in 2017 is *More than Luther: The Reformation and the Rise of Pluralism in Europe*.<sup>2</sup> The studies included in this volume deal, among others, with topics such as the doctrine of justification and pluralism in the post-Tridentine Catholic Church,<sup>3</sup> Reformations in the early modern period in East-Central Europe,<sup>4</sup> or the Calvinist Reformation and the rise of pluralism in Europe.<sup>5</sup> In order to emphasize diversity, the editors downright gave the title *Reformations* to one group of studies in the volume. Evidently, each study raises a distinct concept of pluralism and conceptual or methodological approach to the core of the issue; yet, one aspect connects them, namely that all of them focus on and describe in operation the real diversity of views on religious content and of formation stories (subsequently classified under the same umbrella term).

Obviously, such thematization is not entirely new, it has been present in the scientific discourse for at least a good decade. Researches on the science and history of religion already prefer to speak about the religious pluralism of the Middle Ages, not necessarily without conflict but in many situations non-violent,<sup>6</sup> and Reformation as a term referring to the age is ever more frequently utilized in the plural in order to indicate that plurality forms an inherent part of this period.<sup>7</sup> This is how the users of the term suggest that the change called Reformation took place not uniformly but in many ways over time and in different regions; furthermore, that it is insufficient to

---

<sup>2</sup> *More than Luther: The Reformation and the Rise of Pluralism in Europe*, eds. Karla Boersma, Herman J. Selderhuis (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019).

<sup>3</sup> Wim François, Antonio Gerace, "The Doctrine of Justification and the Rise of Pluralism in the Post-Tridentine Catholic Church", in *More than Luther*, 15–44.

<sup>4</sup> Edit Szegedi, "Calvinisms in Early Modern East Central Europe (1550–1650)", in *More than Luther*, 59–77.

<sup>5</sup> Herman A. Spielman, "The Calvinistic Reformation and the Rise of Pluralism in Europe", in *More than Luther*, 257–268.

<sup>6</sup> Cristoph Auffarth, mit Beiträgen von Ulrich Berner, Winfried Frey, Kocku von Stuckrad, Nocolo Zeddies, *Religiöser Pluralismus im Mittelalter? Besichtigung einer Epoche der europäischen Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2007). It is in this context that the writings included in the volume analyse the interaction between the Antiquity and Christianity and pay attention to phenomena of scientific and religious transfer such as astrology. They mark the end of mediaeval pluralism in the violent persecution of the heretics.

<sup>7</sup> Here we refer to one single volume of studies which both regards the issue as a historical and theological event and approaches it as a historiographic category and cultural myth: *Multiple Reformations? The Many Faces and Legacies of the Reformation*, eds. Jan Stievermann, Randall C. Zachman (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018).

consider the simplifying models of reception when we want to understand this complex phenomenon, but we should pay attention to the hermeneutic specificities of this reception, to the relationship between the existing and the assimilated tradition.<sup>8</sup>

A new, yet increasingly accepted discourse in the research of early modernity and the 16<sup>th</sup> century in particular is the tendency to relate the religious dissent caused by the dramatic turn around the events of 31 October 1517 leading to the Reformation and church schism not merely to the crisis of the Papacy and the tensions resulting from violently repressed reform endeavours, but also to (late) mediaeval spirituality<sup>9</sup> which defined Luther's socialisation as an Augustinian monk, in which basic issues such as the doctrine of justification, the general priesthood of the believers or the criticism of papacy were common discussion topics. In this context, the title of Volker Leppin's book speaks about foreign Reformation,<sup>10</sup> and argues that Reformation is more mediaeval than we might think. In his view, the way in which Luther connected these mediaeval(ish) issues and the way in which different interest groups used and abused of his theses can be regarded as new.

The paradigm, research method or practice of the long Reformation<sup>11</sup> can be an efficient assistance to the discovery and appreciation of early modern theological-religious diversity and the understanding of how embedded in tradition the reformers' activity is, for instance by widening the so far customary temporal limits. A pioneering work to the best of our current knowledge, the volume of studies that investigates the phenomena of the long Reformation in England, focuses on the three centuries between 1500 and 1800;<sup>12</sup> the collection of studies dealing with the long Reformation in Scotland in a similar frame examines the period approximately between 1500 and 1660.<sup>13</sup> Peter G. Wallace's monograph, rethinking the European processes in the same conceptual and/or terminological frame, operates with a slightly different time frame, indicating the period between 1350 and 1700;<sup>14</sup> the Northern European long Reformation is placed in time,

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Zsombor Tóth, „Hosszú reformáció Magyarországon és Erdélyben I.: konfesszionalizációk és irodalmi kultúrák a kora újkorban (1500–1800)” [“Long Reformation in Hungary and Transylvania I.: Confessionalizations and Literary Cultures in the Early Modern Period (1500–1800)”], *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 123 (2019): 724–726.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. the conference organized in Erfurt in 2005 for the 500<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Luther entering the Augustinian order. The conference volume: *Luther und das monastische Erbe*, hrsg. Christoph Bultmann, Volker Leppin, Andreas Lindner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

<sup>10</sup> Volker Leppin, *Die fremde Reformation: Luthers mystische Wurzeln* (München: Verlag C.H.Beck, 2016).

<sup>11</sup> Called practice by Tóth, idem, 719.

<sup>12</sup> *England's Long Reformation: 1500–1800*, ed. Nicholas Tyacke (London: UCL Press), 1998.

<sup>13</sup> *Scotland's Long Reformation: New Perspectives on Scottish Religion, c. 1500–c. 1660*, ed. John McCallum (Leiden: Brill, 2016).

<sup>14</sup> Peter G. Wallace, *The Long European Reformation: Religion, Political Conflict, and the Search for Conformity, 1350–1750* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

approximately again, between 1300 and 1700 by the editors of the volume.<sup>15</sup> It is thought-provoking, then, that Thomas A. Brady, reviewing the English-language specialist literature on German Reformation published between 1970 and 2005 by highlighting research agendas, uses the terms confessionalization and long Reformation as belonging together, almost as synonymous syntagms, while he also reflects on the fact that the attention of research (after emphasizing the rupture for a long time) has been recently directed upon the exploration of (partial) continuity that can be characterized by having late mediaeval roots.<sup>16</sup> He also mentions that as a consequence of the approach based on confessionalization and long Reformation respectively, the history of the Catholic Church can be placed on new historiographic grounds: he also discusses “Catholic Reformation” as one of the driving forces of modernization (albeit regarding it as a phenomenon similar to when a wolf gets among the sheep).<sup>17</sup>

In this context, the members of the research group hope that the examination of the processes in Hungary and Transylvania in the period between 1500 and 1800, conceived as a multidisciplinary research practice, carried out for five years with the support of the Lendület grant won in 2018, can bring new insights. The lead study of the project entitled *Hosszú reformáció Kelet-Európában (1500–1800)* [Long Reformation in Eastern Europe (1500–1800)] has been recently published by the leader of the research group, Zsombor Tóth.<sup>18</sup>

### **The Early Modern Religious Dispute: A Form of Dialogue? Preliminary Considerations**

Let us now regard our narrower topic. If we approach the early modern dispute works from the perspective of the authorial and editorial intentions, we can suppose that their authors often conceived them to be dialogical – at least in the sense that

---

<sup>15</sup> *Lived Religion and the Long Reformation in Northern Europe: c. 1300–1700*, eds. Sari Katajala-Peltomaa, Raisa Maria Toivo (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2016).

<sup>16</sup> Thomas A. Brady, “From Revolution to the Long Reformation: Writings in English on the German Reformation, 1970–2005”, *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 100 (2009): 48–64. An important statement on page 59: “The idea of the Long Reformation and the confessionalization thesis, with its core theme of discipline both as noun and verb, sparked new insights on several classic themes.”

<sup>17</sup> Brady, “From Revolution to the Long Reformation”, 60: “A far more dramatic, and in the long run probably more productive, feature of the confessionalization thesis and the Long Reformation was the inclusion of the Catholic Church. This put a new cat among old pigeons, for it utterly leveled the ranking of Protestantism and Catholicism in the old narratives of how Europe became modern.”

<sup>18</sup> Tóth, „Hosszú reformáció Magyarországon és Erdélyben” [“Long Reformation in Hungary and Transylvania”], 719–739.

they wished to elicit some sort of reaction from the adversaries. The question, then, is whether the potential of dialogicity is inherent in such polemical situations: the alternative views, insights, truths obviously come to the surface; however, is their existence legitimate from the same authorial viewpoint? This question was raised by Gábor Kecskeméti in the opening lecture of the conference entitled *Forms of Dialogue in Early Hungarian Literature*, organized in Cluj-Napoca (Kolozsvár) in 2018, albeit not primarily in connection with polemic genres, and also referring to possible research attitudes. Nevertheless, we can also extend this question to the disputes, and we can point at the potential implied in the situation: “the formal characteristics of dialogue can obviously become the media of the conceptual features of dialogicity.”<sup>19</sup>

Before proceeding any further, let us remember for a moment the religious pluralism of the Middle Ages, stemming from one root, displaying diverse local variations and, in this context, the custom of “dialogues” and disputations which are actually acts of power; and let us refer to the centralization endeavours but also to the interreligious cultural exchange (e.g. Arab borrowings).<sup>20</sup> As regards form and “purpose”, the disputes that we propose to discuss are somewhat based on these argumentative traditions. Consequently, the simple yet important question is whether such a “dialogue” leads anywhere, and if yes then why not. In other words, what kind of communication occurs in the (religious) dispute, and along what rules and conventions does the clash of views take place?

It is a widely spread view in the specialist literature of the history of rhetoric that polemics as a rhetorical term does not actually exist and there is no doctrine elaborated specifically in connection with it in the system of the speech genres either. This is the beginning of the entry “Polemik” in the *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*; the entry continues saying that polemics is, on the one hand, a specific procedure, the method of (verbal) fighting, on the other hand, it has been the literary type of public debate especially since the early modern period.<sup>21</sup> Although it is not expressly formulated, it is inferred in this statement that, accordingly, polemics does not even have a theory. We might come to a similar conclusion reading the subtitle of Jürgen Stenzel’s study on rhetorical Manichaeism, *Proposals for a [Kind of] Theory of Polemics*, whose starting point is that the rhetoric of the dispute can be traced back to the theory of the ancient praising and reprimanding

---

<sup>19</sup> The edited version of the lecture is forthcoming in the conference volume: Gábor Kecskeméti, *Dialógus a régiségben – dialógus a régiségről* [Dialogue in Antiquity – Dialogue on Antiquity], page 3 in manuscript.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. in detail: Cristoph Auffarth, “Pluralismus, Religion und Mittelalter: Das Mittelalter als Teil der europäischen religionsgeschichte,” in *Religiöser Pluralismus im Mittelalter?*, 16–19.

<sup>21</sup> “Zum einen bezeichnet P. (...) eine bestimmte Verfahrensweise, eine Methode der Auseinandersetzung; zum anderen (...) einen literarischen Typus öffentlichen Streitens insbesondere seit der Frühneuzeit” (“Polemik”, in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik VI.*, ed. Gert Ueding (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2003), 1403.

speech. Then, the German researcher promises that his study will offer heuristic guidelines to the analysis of polemic texts,<sup>22</sup> and he fulfils his promise by describing it with the characteristics of the aggressive speech, he speaks about rhetorical Manichaeism and, by adapting Roman Jakobson's model, also about dispute situation, dispute topic, transmitter and receiver, that is, attacker and attacked, who can occasionally even exchange roles.<sup>23</sup> Eventually, Kai Bremer proposes an analogous approach; in his monograph dealing with 16<sup>th</sup>-century German Orthodox and Lutheran disputes, he outlines the research situation of the topic and comes to the conclusion that both literary studies and rhetoric have dealt with the issue of polemics at the level of case studies; however, they haven't yet solved the problems of clarifying the basic terms and answering the basic questions.<sup>24</sup> Needless to say, the case studies mentioned by him and each briefly evaluated by him are of an impressive number, apply various approaches and rely on exceptionally diversified source materials.

Still, there are reflections on the dispute and the methods to be applied to them, and there also exists the term using polemics in the sense of indicating a genre: Johann Heinrich Alsted's treatise first published in 1620 (before he was invited to Transylvania) is entitled *Theologia polemica*,<sup>25</sup> even if scholarship regards it as an "essentially ironical work."<sup>26</sup> Although it does not provide detailed guidance on the methodology of the dispute, in the prolegomena it formulates a few imperatives, among them, the general aspects referring to the tone or the contender's attitude (e.g. disputes must be held decently, being aware that we are in front of God and not in the theatre,<sup>27</sup> or love is compulsory also in the heat of the debate: distinction must be made between the error and the erring person<sup>28</sup>), and

---

<sup>22</sup> Jürgen Stenzel, "Rhetorischer Manichäismus. Vorschläge zu einer Theorie der Polemik", in *Der Literaturstreit*, eds. Franz Josef Worstbroch, Helmut Koopmann (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1986), 3.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 5–6.

<sup>24</sup> Kai Bremer, *Religionsstreitigkeiten. Volkssprachige Kontroversen zwischen altgläubigen und evangelischen Theologen im 16. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2005), 7.

<sup>25</sup> I used the second edition of the work, revised by the author: Johann Heinrich Alsted, *Theologia polemica* (Hanau: Konrad Eifrid, 1627).

<sup>26</sup> Reference to his monographer, Howard Hotson in Márton Szentpéteri, Noémi Viskolcz, "Egy református–unitárius hitvita Erdélyben 1641-ben" ["A Reformed–Unitarian Religious Dispute in Transylvania in 1641"], in "*Tenger az igaz hitrül való...*" ["*The Flood of Disputing...*"], 93. On Alsted, see also: Márton Szentpéteri, *Egyetemes tudomány Erdélyben: Johann Heinrich Alsted és a herborni hagyomány [Universal Science in Transylvania: Johann Heinrich Alsted and the Herborn Tradition]* (Budapest: Universitas, 2008).

<sup>27</sup> "Debent autem tractari & Theologice, id est, sancte, non vt in hominum theatro sed vt coram Deo" (Alsted, *Theologia polemica*, 63.).

<sup>28</sup> "Iudicium charitatis adhibendum in feruore disputationis. (...) dispiciendum, qualis sit error & quales sint personae, quae errant" (Alsted, *Theologia polemica*, 64.).

ones prescribing the mode of controversy: disputes must be held not *topically* but *apodictically*,<sup>29</sup> while he advises caution in connection with syllogistics – he emphasizes the difference between speech and disputation.<sup>30</sup>

This warning leads further towards clarifying the role of dialectics. When polemically discussing religious doctrines, the application of the art/craft of dispute (*bene disputandi scientia*) is fundamental, in other words, it is the warrant of the exploration of truth. And in this context, it is possible, as partners skilled in principles measure their knowledge, force and truths against each other.

### Reflections on dialectical construction – Hungarian examples

The dedicatory letter addressed to the reader of Péter Pázmány's *Kalauz* prepares the reader that it “for the most part comprises the arguments according to the rule of the dialecticians, *in forma*, in a short and clear form, to better highlight their strength.”<sup>31</sup> The syllogism-case itself becomes a field of debate, as it goes on: “the errants do not like a struggle within such strict limits”, although “Christ himself often used this kind of argumentation. He proves with an entire *Syllogismus* that he does not drive out Satan with the power of Satan.”<sup>32</sup>

Péter Pécsváradi in the dedication to his supporter, Benedek Fodor, of his counterargument written against Pázmány anticipates the same thing, but in different words and more details: “I have never intentionally avoided any of his serious arguments (...) I used nice *summae* and evidence for my writing: (...) I have contained the arguments of the Archbishop into different types of *Syllogismus*, to make it clearer what their answer is. I have bettered and adjusted the *status of controversiae*, the essence of debates, which the Archbishop has twisted in many places.”<sup>33</sup>

<sup>29</sup> “Non topice, id est, probabiliter et in vtrumque partem, sed apodictice disputandum est in Theologicis.” (Alsted, *Theologia polemica*, 65.).

<sup>30</sup> “Syllogistica doctrina tanquam euerriculum Sophismatum adhibeatur, cogiteturque aliud esse perorare, aliud disputare.” (Alsted, *Theologia polemica*, 65.).

<sup>31</sup> *bizonyoságit* “nagy részre a dialecticusok törvénye szerint, *in forma*, rövid kötésbe és bizonyos formába foglal[ja], hogy nyilvánbban kitéssék erősségök.” Pázmány Péter, “Hodoegus. Igazságra vezérlő kalauz” [Hodoegus. Guide to Truth], ed. Ignác Kiss (Budapest: M. Kir. Tud.-egyetemi Nyomda, 1987), 10. (Pázmány Péter Összes Munkái III.)

<sup>32</sup> “nem szeretik az ilyen szoros korlátban-valo harcolást”, pedig „ö-maga Christus, sokszor követte az ilyen bizonyítás formáját. Együtt, egész *Syllogismus*-sal bizonyította, hogy ő nem üz Ördögöt, ördög hatalmával” Ibid. The biblical locus referenced: Mt 12,25-26.

<sup>33</sup> “Egy *argumentum*at, avagy okoskodását, az mely valamire való volt, szan szandekkel el nem kerültem (...) szép függő *summákkal* es tanusagokkal irasomat hasznosítottam: (...) Az Ersek bizonyoságit *Syllogismusok*ban es azoknak bizonyos nemeiben foglaltam, hogy nyilvánbban való lenne mire felelnek es mit felelnek. Az *controversiak statusat*, vetekedések sarkat, melyeket az Ersek sok helyen el fordított volt, meg igazítottam, es megh jobbitottam.” Pécsváradi Péter,

Based on the two short quotes above, although the texts do not directly respond to each other, it can be suspected that the very same things that should dissolve the conflict actually just deepen the differences in the thoughts of the debating parties. An adequate illustration of this process is an instance in the debate of András Monoszlói, Miklós Gyarmathi and Péter Pázmány regarding the cult of saints. In his dedication to the reader, Monoszlói refers to the argument of the “opponents” that the Bible does not say anything about the saints mediating for us, so it is useless to trust their mediation. His answer is that the conclusion is faulty, because “the conclusion is not that it does not exist if it is not written, because if we use this negative way, we can deny many things, and a negative argument is worthless and mean, as the dialecticians say.”<sup>34</sup> In his answer, Gyarmathi also refers to the rules of dialectics when he refutes the Catholic standpoint, which claims that the mediating power of saints derives from our asking help from the living: “The Argument of the living for the dead is not fitting and is not right”.<sup>35</sup> Or even more explicitly, referring to the “common and certain” rule of dialectics: “*Conditionalis nihil probat, nisi conditio impleatur*: a conditional talk proves nothing unless the condition is met. It is also certain: *Conditio impossibilis nihil inducit*, if the condition is impossible, nothing derives from there.”<sup>36</sup>

In the next round Pázmány again reproaches Gyarmathi for using faulty argumentation: “among those almost thirty arguments that he presents starting from page 17 of his book, many are so faulty that even young students would realise they are worthless, and as they say *non sunt in forma*, not put in a good form; therefore permitting the first and second part, they would deny the *consequentia*, namely that the consequence of all these is what Gyarmathi wants to get out of

---

*Feleleti, Pazmany Peternek (...) Ket könyvetskeire* [Answer to Two Booklets by Péter Pázmány] (Debrecen: Rheda Peter, 1629), b2. (RMNY 1427)

<sup>34</sup> “nem következne semmikeppen az, hogy ninc meg irva, taht ninc ugy, mert igy *negatiue* ha probalunc, sok dolgot el tagadhatunc, *negatiue* penig, valamit probalni az Dialecticusoknal, igen ala valo hituan bizonyetas” Monoszlói András, *De invocatione et veneratione sanctorum* (Nagyszombat, 1589), e3. (RMNY 633.)

<sup>35</sup> “Nem illik es nem esik jól az elevenekrül az meg holtakra az Argumentum”. Gyarmathi Miklós, *Keresztyeni felelet Monozloi Andras vesperini püspök es posoni praepest könyve ellen, az melyet irt De invocatione et veneratione sanctorum* [Christian Response Against the Book of András Monoszlói, bishop pf Veszprém and Provost of Pozsony, Written De invocatione et veneratione sanctorum] (Debrecen: Lipsiai Pal, 1598), 137v. (RMNY 830.)

<sup>36</sup> “*Conditionalis nihil probat, nisi conditio impleatur*: Haval valo beszed semmit nem bizonit, hanem ha az mirül az conditio, az ha vagyon, be tellyesedik. Az-is bizonyos: *Conditio impossibilis nihil inducit*, ha lehetetlen dolgot vet ember haul valamiben, abbul semmi nem következik”. Gyarmathi, *Keresztyeni felelet Monozloi Andras vesperini püspök es posoni praepest könyve ellen*, 158 r–v.



them.”<sup>37</sup> To make his point clearer, he gives an example as well: “Gyarmathi reasons as follows: »We must get assistance from those who we believe in, to whom the Holy Spirit guides us, who is above all else, who has all power, who has true love for us, cares for us, who is our hope, who is omniscient, etc; but only God is who has all this: therefore we must only ask Him for help.« Gyarmathi might almost just as well say this too: One has to love and honour he who saved us by his holy blood, and reconciled us with the Lord God; and this is no one but Christ: so we must only love him. And for this reason, I do not have to love the Lord God, nor my neighbour.”<sup>38</sup>

In fact, all three authors object because of the same thing, that the opponent used a faulty syllogism: the major and the minor propositions are not related in such a way that their connection may necessarily lead to the conclusion drawn.<sup>39</sup> Because when dialectics, the science of definitions and analyses, is the organising principle, it comes as obvious for the debating partners introduce their own doctrines as syllogisms, and prove that the other partner used faulty syllogisms or other faulty dialectical principles.

### A dialectical construction in practice

The interdependence of dialectics and rhetoric is formulated without too many details in Quintilian’s *Institutio Oratoria*. Part II.20 mentions two kinds of discourses: “since there are two kinds of speech, the continuous which is called rhetoric, and the concise which is called dialectic (the relation between which was regarded by Zeno as being so intimate that he compared the latter to the closed fist, the former to the

---

<sup>37</sup> “azok közül az egy heán harminc erősség közül, melyeket előhoz az ő könyvének 17. levelén elkezdvén, sok oly férges vagyon, hogy még a tanuló ifjak is eszekbe vennék, hogy semmirekellők, és amint ők szokták mondani *non sunt in forma*, nem öntötték jó formába; annak okáért megengedvén az első és második részét, tagadnák a *consequentiát*, azaz tagadnák, hogy ezekből az következik, amit Gyarmathi ki akar satolni belőlök.” Pázmány Péter, *Keresztyéni felelet a megdűcsöült szentek tiszteletéről (1607)* [Christian Response about the Veneration of the Glorified Saints], ed. Ajkay Alinka (Budapest: Universitas, 2016), 59.

<sup>38</sup> “így okoskodik Gyarmathi: »Azt kell segítségül hínunk, akibe hiszünk, akihez a Szentlélek igazít, aki mindenek fölött vagyon, akinek minden hatalma vagyon, aki igazán szeret minket, őriz, ótalmaz bennünket, aki mi reménységünk, aki mindennel bíró etc; ilyen pedig csak az Isten: tehát csak őtet kell segítségül hínunk.« Szinte ezen formán így is okoskodhatnék Gyarmathi: Azt kell embernek szeretni, tisztelni, aki minket megváltott szent vérével, megbékéltetett az Atyaistennel; ilyen pedig egyedül csak a Krisztus: tehát csak őtet kell szeretnünk. És annak okáért sem az Atya Istent, sem felebarátomat nem kell szeretnem.” Ibid.

<sup>39</sup> On the relationship of polemics and dialectics, see Barbara Bauer, “Die Rhetorik des Streitens”, *Rhetorica* 14 (1996), 41.

open hand), even the art of disputation will be a virtue.”<sup>40</sup> The two attributes pointing to the two kinds of discourses in the original text are *perpetua* and *conclisa*:<sup>41</sup> the effect of the latter is to group the arguments into points and new paragraphs, according to a set order, *ordo*. Whatever the subject of the debate, the comfortable and flexible, frequently used structure is the justification or refutation of the proposition based on the Bible, the Holy Fathers (the patristic inheritance), and, in certain cases, the synodal decisions (*concilium*), followed by the detailing of the opponent’s errors as the conclusion, and further subject-specific arguments, if needed. For example, the first article of Miklós Telegdi’s *Egy nehany jeles okai* (*Some significant reasons*) equally calls the communities of Luther, Calvin, Zwingli and the anti-Trinitarians errants, proves their heresy with the help of biblical places and quotes from the Church Fathers, to draw the conclusion leading on to the next chapter: “Everyone can realise from what I will write in the followings that Martin Luther and his heirs are the inventors and creators of erroneous teachings.”<sup>42</sup>

András Monoszlói’s *De invocatione et veneratione sanctorum* has a similar structure: it alternates chapters which prove the legitimacy of the veneration of saints and the mediating power of the saints with chapters which refute and explain the “errors” connected to this subject. His special arguments for proving the mediation of saints: “That saints pray for us is obvious because of their miracles”<sup>43</sup> – proved by a catalogue of miracles performed by the saints of Christian antiquity, based on the writings of Saint Augustine and other Church Fathers. The eight chapters of *De cultu imaginum*<sup>44</sup> comprise the dogmatic aspects and theoretical issues of the veneration of images depicting Christ, Virgin Mary and the saints, while taking into account “the old heresies against images”, clarifying the Catholic teaching using biblical and Patristic arguments, and refuting the counter-arguments of the

---

<sup>40</sup> Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, Loeb Classical Library edition, 1920, vol. I, online: [https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Quintilian/Institutio\\_Oratoria/2C\\*.html#20](https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Quintilian/Institutio_Oratoria/2C*.html#20) (Accessed in October 2020).

<sup>41</sup> The Latin edition used: M. Fabii QUINTILIANI *Institutionis oratoriae libri duodecim*, recensuit Car. Timoth. Zumptius (Lipsiae, 1831), 101: “Itaque cum due sint genera orationis, altera perpetua, quae rhetorice dicitur, altera concisa, quae dialectice”.

<sup>42</sup> “Luter Marton es az ő maradeki hamis tudomannac talaloi es alkotoi legyenec, azokbol mellyeket en nec utanna iroc, akar kies eszebe veheti.” Telegdi Miklós, *Egy nehany jeles okai mellyekert Telegdi Miklos pechi püspöc nem ueheti es nem akaria uenni Luter Martonnac es az ő maradekinac tudomanyat* [Some Significant Reasons why Miklós Telegdi, bishop of Pécs cannot and does not Take the Learnings of Luther and his Followers] (Nagyszombat, 1581), 6v. (RMNY 496).

<sup>43</sup> “Az szentec érettünc valo esedezesek nec, niluan valo volta, chodakbol bizonyul” Monoszlói, *De invocatione...*, 479–541.

<sup>44</sup> Monoszlói András, *De cultu imaginum. Az idvössegre intö kepek nec tisztetiröl valo, igaz tvdomany* [De cultu imaginum. True Learning about the Veneration of Pictures Warning of Salvation] (Nagyszombat, 1589). (RMNY 632.)

“errants”. Chapters that demonstrate and chapters that refute alternate here as well, the source of the argument is again the Bible and Christian Antiquity, but in this new context of the age of the Reformation. As István Bitskey rightly notes in this respect: “This was a re-reading of the icon debate in the Hungarian literature of the turn of the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century.”<sup>45</sup>

Péter Pécsváradi’s thoughts on dialectical argumentation and his own working method have already been presented, but it is worth taking a closer look at how he constructs his refutations. Pécsváradi seems to lead the reader by the hand as he presents the steps he takes in the thinking process.<sup>46</sup> However, more importantly, the questions that guide him can all be traced back to the most frequent interrogative words: what [is the ecclesia], what [is the universal ecclesia], whether Pázmány, the archbishop believes the invisible state of the church on earth,<sup>47</sup> and if he does, “How does he say (...) that the *Ecclesia* can be seen and known in all times?”<sup>48</sup> As we can see, he divides Pázmány’s arguments in the relevant parts of *Két rövid könyvecskék* and the *Kalauz* to simple and compound questions, and his conclusion after listing and answering them is that “the Archbishop contradicts himself and other Papists.”<sup>49</sup> If we read through this reasoning, divided into sections and subsections, we can also see that these texts are not merely *concise*, as required by the discipline, but also *perpetua*, with carefully joined parts.

### The (at times unworded) rhetoric of inequality

The examples above suggest or imitate polemical situations in which the debating partners have equal chances in the fight, and carry their own knowledge and beliefs. The fact that I quoted printed sources, implied a kind of power position as well: the author or his supporter possessed the financial or technical possibility of printing. (In this case, I think that the evidence of the existence of a manuscript culture is not relevant). To suggest how privileged it is who has access to it, and how unprivileged who hasn’t, I will refer to two “struggles” (one now, and one later), where one of the parties had most probably not had the opportunity to publish their contribution in a printed form. We know of a certain János Dávid who replied to the work of Miklós

---

<sup>45</sup> Bitskey István, “Képtisztelet vagy bálványozás? (Pázmány hitvitái a szentek ábrázolásáról) [Veneration of pictures or idolatry? The polemics of Pázmány regarding the depiction of saints],” in *Tenger az igaz hitről való...*, 68.

<sup>46</sup> “Ez meg hallott kérdéseknek utanna, mennyünk immar az Ersek irasara (...) Hogy vilagosb legyen mit akarjon; nyomozzuk irasat ilyen kerdések szerint”... (Pécsváradi, *Feleleti, Pazmany Peternek*, 354.)

<sup>47</sup> Pécsváradi, *Feleleti, Pazmany Peternek*, 355.

<sup>48</sup> Pécsváradi, *Feleleti, Pazmany Peternek*, 356.

<sup>49</sup> Pécsváradi, *Feleleti, Pazmany Peternek*, 356.

Telegdi, Catholic Bishop of Pécs, but we do not know the text of the response. We know little about the author as well, Jenő Zoványi mentioned him as one of the signatories of the Synod of Galánta in 1592, which stipulated the separation of the Helvetic direction from the Lutheran-type diocese.<sup>50</sup> Later he wrote about him that he was, “so it seems,” of a Helvetic direction, and in this respect he added that “he did not let Telegdi’s work pass without a word”.<sup>51</sup> We know about this response and its partial content from another print, András Monoszlói’s *Apologia* from 1588.<sup>52</sup> According to the full title, the work is a response written instead of Telegdi to the Protestant side’s counterarguments and in defence of the first writing, three years after the death of the Bishop of Pécs. Monoszlói also reproaches him for hesitating between the branches of the Reformation: “You are a Calvinist, but you follow Luther”.<sup>53</sup>

At the same time, he says that János Dávid claims that he is independent from the various trends: “you usually say (...) that you did not follow any of them.”<sup>54</sup> Aware of his obvious superiority, Monoszlói can very easily dispute János Dávid’s position as priest in a cultural and religious centre such as Trnava (Nagyszombat) (“I can’t call him a priest for he would not like it and I would offend my God with it too”<sup>55</sup>), “magnanimously” calling him a “*deák*” (a scribe or student). He goes on about the writing: “not a book, because a book has meaning, but that writing (...) has no head nor feet, and it confuses the branches of faith, as I will prove in due order”.<sup>56</sup> Monoszlói’s usually very careful citing method also betrays that it is most probably a manuscript text: the *Apologia* contains no references to any page- or chapter numbers, not even in case of word-by-word, italicised quotations.<sup>57</sup>

### Marginalia in the Printed Book: A Mode of Reading

If we look at dispute works (since it is not only the polemical readers who comment on what they have read; notes of approval are also added), “polemising on the side

---

<sup>50</sup> Jenő Zoványi, *A magyarországi protestantizmus 1565-től 1600-ig* [The Protestantism in Hungary from 1565 to 1600] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1977), 163.

<sup>51</sup> Uo., 300.

<sup>52</sup> András Monoszlói, *Apologia a közönseges keresztény hit agazatinac es az Anyaszentegyhaz bizonyos fő vallasinac oltalma, DAVID IANOS felelete ellen, ki ellenzette Telegdi Miklos, Peechi Pispoc irasat, melyben nem akarta Luthernecc vallasat venni* [Apologia of the Universal Christian Beliefs and Special Main Creeds, against the Answer of János Dávid, who Opposed Miklós Telegdi, Bishop of Pécs’s Book of not Accepting Luther’s Belief] (Nagyszombat, 1588). (RMNY 620).

<sup>53</sup> Monoszlói, *Apologia*, 169.

<sup>54</sup> Monoszlói, *Apologia*, 210.

<sup>55</sup> Monoszlói, *Apologia*, B1r–v.

<sup>56</sup> Monoszlói, *Apologia*, B1v.

<sup>57</sup> Monoszlói, *Apologia*, B1v.

of the page” is, as is well known, a sign of reader activity, a particular way of engaging in polemics,<sup>58</sup> the possibility of expressing refusal. This can be particularly exciting when somebody adds glosses to a piece of writing personally related to him. A Transylvanian polemics, starting as a discussion at the table and continuing in writing, is a variation to the situation outlined above, in a different denominational context and with another function. The initiator, later patron of the dispute is the Princess Consort Zsuzsanna Lorántffy: the oral polemics between the court pastor Pál Medgyesi and the old pater of the local Jesuit mission, Dániel Vásárhelyi, took place in her house in Kolozsmonostor, not devoid of any representational and propagandistic character, with the aim of entertaining and educating those present rather than with a serious theological stance. After the dispute, Dániel Vásárhelyi handed in to the princess consort a short piece of writing about his tenets, which were “shaken”, then briefly answered by Medgyesi; this was followed by Vásárhelyi’s longer counterreply, to which later Pál Medgyesi responded in his surviving work also published in print, entitled *Szent atyák öröme [Holy Fathers’ Joy]*.<sup>59</sup> Dániel Vásárhelyi’s texts also addressed to the princess consort did not appear in print, so far we have no knowledge of the existence of the manuscript either, thus his writings can only be reconstructed to some extent based on the allusions and

---

<sup>58</sup> Cf. István Bitskey, “»Nem úgy bátya!« Marginálisok Pázmány *Kalauzában*” [“»Not so, brother!« Marginalia in Pázmány’s *Guide*”], in “*Nem súlyed az emberiség!*” *Album amicorum Szörényi László LX. Születésnapjára [“Humanity Doesn’t Decline!” Album amicorum on László Szörényi’s 60<sup>th</sup> Birthday]*, editor-in-chief József Jankovics, eds. István Csörsz Rumen, Zoltán Szabó G. (Budapest: MTA Irodalomtudományi Intézet, 2007), 476. On the research possibilities of the topic, see Zsombor Tóth, “Hitvita és marginália: Megjegyzések a „(hit)vita” antropológiájához (Esettanulmány)” [“Religious Dispute and Marginalia: Notes on the Anthropology of “(Religious) Dispute” (A Case Study)], in “*Tenger az igaz hitrül való...*” [“*The Flood of Disputing...*”], 175–197.

<sup>59</sup> It is worth reading the entire long title, because it contains the basic question of the book and the way it connects to the biblical-patristic tradition, as well as the recurrent theological stigmatization of the opponent: Pál Medgyesi, *Szent atyák öröme. Az Messias Jesus Christusnak Maria előtt személy szerént létének, s-örök Istenségének az O Törvénybéli Jelenésekből, Sz. Írás, jó okok, és a jozanb régi Doctoroknak értelmei szerént-való világos megmutatása; sok egyéb tudásra idvességes és gyönyörűséges dolgokkal egyetemben: Daniel Vasarhelyi Jesuita Professus Paternek, amaz nagyságos angyal Gen. 32. v. 24. etc. és Exod. 3. v. 2. etc. s az Jehovah nev, és az közölhetetlen isteni tulajdonságok s-munkák felől samosatenizalo, és abban fülüg merült tsekely tzikkelyinek meg tzikkelyezesekre, Irattatott [Holy Fathers’ Joy. That is the Clear Exploration of Messiah Jesus Christ’s Personal Existence before the Virgin Mary, His Eternal Deity Shown from the Epiphanies of the Old Testament, the Holy Bible, Good Reasons and Sound Doctors; Together with Many Salutary and Delightful Things: Written against the Slight, Samosatenizing Articles of the Jesuit Professed Father Dániel Vásárhelyi about the Great Angel in Gen 32,24 and Exod 3,2 etc. and the Name Jehovah and the Ineffable Divine Attributes] (Gyulafehérvár: Typis Cels. Principis, 1640) (RMNY 1826).*

quotations of the *Holy Fathers' Joy*. The written material was analysed by János Heltai, paying attention to the theological issue raised, to the textual context of the polemics and, in connection with this, to the unavoidable power aspects.<sup>60</sup> A copy of the *Holy Fathers' Joy* is preserved in the department of the Early Modern Hungarian Library collection in the Library of the Romanian Academy in Cluj-Napoca, which contains the collection of the Roman Catholic School,<sup>61</sup> in which the entries and marginalia defying, refusing, refuting Medgyesi's accusations derive from Vásárhelyi's hand.<sup>62</sup> I presented the marginalia myself;<sup>63</sup> in summary, it can be said that they are defensive rather than attacking or derisive remarks, providing a reading of the first oral, then written polemics completely different from that of Medgyesi: there are differences in how the details of the "contests" are remembered, in the evaluation of particular episodes and also in the interpretation of the real meaning of the spoken words. Further comments made in the book are keywords, probably reminders, mostly referring to the content of the printed material, corrections concerning typographical errors or other types of misspelling, sometimes qualifying attributes, rarely subtle offenses. The remarks refusing the statements from the main text are recurrent phrases; the old pater reacts to Medgyesi's statement with the expressions *calumnia*, *ridiculum*, *gugolás* [squat], *nem igaz* [not true], *gyarló* [frail], *kabaság* [befuddlement] or *delirium*, noted at the side of the page.

Based on the marginalia, it would be hard to give a reassuring answer to the question whether the Jesuit father read Medgyesi's printed book with the intent of responding to it or out of curiosity due to personal involvement. The resigned voice and surprising mildness of his annotations may be the sign of tiredness: a year after the book was printed and he received it, Dániel Vásárhelyi died; it is unlikely that the most important goal of the last months of the Jesuit priest's life was the school analysis-type subject of the identity of the angel who led the Jews out of Egypt and fought with Jacob. And perhaps it is not an exaggerated assumption either that he

---

<sup>60</sup> János Heltai, „»Szent Atyák öröme«. Medgyesi Pál és Vásárhelyi Dániel hitvitája” [“»Holy Fathers' Joy«. The Religious Dispute between Pál Medgyesi and Dániel Vásárhelyi”], in *Europa Balcanica-Danubiana-Carpathica 2/a. Annales, Cultura – historia – philologia*, ed. Ambrus Miskolczi (Budapest: ELTE BTK Román Filológiai Tanszék, 1995), 224–235.

<sup>61</sup> Shelf Reference: BVM I. 58.

<sup>62</sup> Lajos György, *A kolozsvári Római Katolikus Lyceum-könyvtár története 1579–1948* [The History of the Library of the Roman Catholic Lyceum from Cluj-Napoca 1579–1948] (Budapest: Argumentum, 1994), 47.

<sup>63</sup> Csilla Gábor, “A széljegyzet dicsérete – Medgyesi Pál és Vásárhelyi Dániel vitája” [“The Praise of the Marginalia – The Dispute between Pál Medgyesi and Dániel Vásárhelyi”], in Csilla Gábor, *Laus et polemia: Magasztalás és vetekedés közé- és kora újkori szövegtípusokban* [Laus et polemia: Glorification and Contest in Mediaeval and Early Modern Text Types] (Debrecen–Kolozsvár: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó– Bolyai Társaság Egyetemi Műhely Kiadó, 2015), 291–205.

did not (would not) see much point in continuing the debate under the given unequal conditions.

### Language Shifts, Translations and the Functions of the Religious Dispute

A classic example of a religious dispute started in one language and continued in another is related to Pázmány's *Kalauz*, more precisely, to its first, 1613 edition. A systematic and comprehensive response to the Hungarian-language apologetic and polemical work, following some Hungarian-language clatters and twitters (*sibogások and csiripelések*, these are Pázmány's words),<sup>64</sup> came thirteen years later from Wittenberg, written in Latin, with the title *The Morning Star of True Catholicism*. It was authored by the prestigious professor with an extensive scientific life work, Friedrich Balduinus.<sup>65</sup> Pázmány responded to this again in Hungarian, in his work *A' setét hajnal-csillag után bujdosó luteristák vezetője* [Guide of the Lutherans Seeking the Dark Morning Star], whose title ironically refers to the work of the Lutheran professor.<sup>66</sup> Emil Hargittay interprets this choice in the light of Pázmány's engagement in the arena of international controversy, reminding that much earlier, in 1605, he published in Graz, in Latin, the *Diatriba theologica* in which he defended Robert Bellarmine's polemical writing. Agreeing with János Heltai, Hargittay formulates the conclusion that "with his superior knowledge of materials and excellent command of Latin, Pázmány deliberately directed (...) the answer against Balduinus into the Hungarian language environment".<sup>67</sup> Directed back, we can add to this statement, since his aim, in this case, was not to internationalise the polemics but to promote the recatholicization of Hungarians.<sup>68</sup> He could afford not to engage

---

<sup>64</sup> After the publication of the *Guide* in 1613, on the Lutheran and Calvinist side Imre Zvonarits, Benedek Nagy, István Milotai Nyilas and János Kecskeméti C. gave partial responses to some questions raised by Pázmány.

<sup>65</sup> Friedrich Balduinus, *Phosphorus Veri Catholicismi: De via Papatus, & viam regiam ad Ecclesiam vere Catholicam & Apostolicam fideliter monstrans, facemque praelucens legentibus Hodegum Petri Pazmanni olim Jesuitae, nunc Cardinalis Ecclesiae Romano-Papisticae* (Wittenberg: Caspar Heyden, 1626).

<sup>66</sup> Péter Pázmány, *A setét hajnal-csillag-után bujdosó luteristák vezetője* [Guide of the Lutherans Seeking the Dark Morning Star], prepared for publication by János Kiss (Budapest: M. Kir. Tud.-egyetem, 1901), 477–819. (Pázmány Péter Összes Munkái, V.)

<sup>67</sup> Emil Hargittay, "A *Kalauz* védelmében: A setét hajnalcsillag után bujdosó luteristák vezetője" ["In Defence of the *Guide*: Guide of the Lutherans Seeking the Dark Morning Star"], in *Útmutató. Tanulmányok Pázmány Péter Kalauzáról* [Guide. Studies on Péter Pázmány's Guide], ed. Ibolya Maczák (Budapest: MTA–PPKE Barokk Irodalom és Lelkiség Kutatócsoport, 2016), 47.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. János Heltai, *Műfajok és művek a XVII. század magyarországi könyvkiadásában (1601–1655)* [Genres and Works in the Publication of Books in Hungary in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century (1601–1655)] (Budapest: Universitas Kiadó – Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, 2008), 110.

in the language shift – as he said, for the *spiritual cure of his nation* [*nemzetének lelki orvosságáért*]<sup>69</sup> – since it was, after all, the professor from Wittenberg who “broke the rule” somehow.

Furthermore, similar cases of polemics interrupted because of the language shift occurred at other times and places as well. After his catholicisation, Mihály Veresmarti (formerly a Calvinist preacher), who after his conversion made a serious career in the “papist” clergy, contributed in Hungarian to a dispute started in Latin: he responded to the – Latin – response of Balthasar Meisner<sup>70</sup> Lutheran theologian from Dresden to the writing of the Belgian Jesuit Leonardus Lessius.<sup>71</sup> (Veresmarti himself previously translated Lessius’ work into Hungarian<sup>72</sup>) In a following work of his, Meisner vehemently called him to account for the use of the *peregrinum idioma*<sup>73</sup> and, at the same time, for not respecting the rules of the dispute regarding language use, for example, why his work was not translated into Hungarian if its refutation was written in Hungarian. In his proposition, he reflects on the unequal debate situation arising from the language shift: the one who cannot get familiarized with both parties’ arguments cannot compare them and judge their truth value.<sup>74</sup> Veresmarti, however, although he was the one who broke the rule, no longer reacted to this.<sup>75</sup> It is evident here as well, just like in the above case of the counter-response given by Pázmány to Balduinus, that the aim is the “spiritual” service, that is, education of the vernacular community.

---

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Pázmány, *A setét hajnal-csillag...* [*Guide of the Lutherans...*], 480.

<sup>70</sup> Balthasar Meisner, *Consultatio catholica de fide Lutherana capessenda, et Romana-Papistica deserenda. Opposita hereticae Consultationi Leonardi Lessii* (Wittenberg: Johannes Richter, 1611).

<sup>71</sup> Leonardus Lessius, *Quae fides et religio sit capessenda consultatio* (Antwerpen: Jan Moretus, 1609).

<sup>72</sup> Mihály Veresmarti, *Tanáchkozás, melyiket kellyen a különböző vallások közül választani* [*Consultation on Which of the Different Religions to Choose*] (Pozsony, 1611). (RMNY 1025)

<sup>73</sup> Balthasar Meisner, “Responsio ad Praemissam censuram puerilem Michaelis Vörösmarti, Plebani Selliensis in Hungaria”, in = Balthasar Meisner, *Consultatio Catholica de fide Lutherana capessenda, et Romana-Papistica deserenda* (Wittenberg, 1615), 626: “Prima est peregrinum idioma. Nam Consultatio mea Scripta est Latine, ut & Lessii: sed Plebanus noster respondit Hungarice. Sed cur non lingua Turcica vel Indica? Haec enim idioma magis ignota sunt.”

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.: “Si Hungaris Latinae linguae ignaris gratificari voluit, cur non & meam Consultationem in eandem linguam verti curavit? Nec enim potest institui collatio utriusque dissertationis, si utraque non intelligatur.”

<sup>75</sup> Explanation and interpretation: Ágnes Baricz, “Tanácskozás és környéke: Veresmarti Mihály fordításairól és vitáiról” [“Consultation and Its Environment: On Mihály Veresmarti’s Translations and Disputes”], in *Devóciók, történelmek, identitások* [*Devotions, Histories, Identities*], ed. Csilla Gábor (Kolozsvár: Scientia, 2004), 137–161; Ágnes Baricz, “Veresmarti Mihály és hitvitái” [“Mihály Veresmarti and His Religious Disputes”], in *“Tenger az igaz hitrül való...”* [“The Flood of Disputing...”], 85–92.



Matthias Hafenreffer's (1561–1619) *Loci theologici*<sup>76</sup> is a strange and interesting case of the “internationalisation” of a dispute basically conducted in Hungarian. The work of the Tübingen representative of early Lutheran orthodoxy was first published in 1600, that is, almost one and a half decade before Pázmány's *Guide* appeared. The first book of the three-part work is about God, Genesis and the Holy Scripture, the second one summarizes the doctrine of angels, while the topic of the third book, of central role, is man, and among these coordinates, pivotal themes such as the free will, predestination, sin, faith, justification, etc., are discussed.<sup>77</sup> Pázmány himself makes reference to this work, this provides the ground for the fact that the Hungarian translation made by Imre Zvonarits situates Hafenreffer's work in relation to the *Guide*. The *Praefatio* of *Szentírásbeli hitünk*<sup>78</sup> attacking Pázmány – its author is Benedek Sármelléki Nagy, schoolmaster from Kőszeg – recommends to the readers the Hungarian version of the book written earlier as a response to the *Kalauz*, as a work with the support of which “Pázmány's *Guide* is being taken binded to Hafenreffer's house” [Hafenreffer hazához kötve viszik Pazman Kalauzzat].<sup>79</sup> In this way, the translation becomes a sort of Lutheran *Kalauz*, to refer to the title of a study by Dávid Csorba.<sup>80</sup> Its function will be to appear as the worthy refutation of Pázmány's apologetic treatise (in spite of the fact that it was written earlier), in this way its original character is also modified in the new cultural, linguistic context.

### Closing Remarks

In this essay, we did not have the opportunity to look at entire texts of disputes or multi-round disputes as conceptual constructs, however, our examples showing the mode of argumentation perhaps provide a glimpse into the fact that these are coherent constructs within their own system. In this way, it is indispensable to raise the question: if each disputing party is right (within his own system), in other words, if each contrasting standpoint is somehow valid at the same time, then how can the

---

<sup>76</sup> I used a later edition of the work: Matthias Hafenreffer, *Loci theologici, certa Methodo ac Ratione, in Tres Libros tributi* (Tübingen: Georg Gruppenbach), 1603.

<sup>77</sup> The analysis placing in focus the significance of the work from the perspective of the history of theology: Friederike Nüssel, *Allein aus Glauben: Zur Entwicklung der Rechtfertigungslehre in der konkordistischen und frühen nachkonkordistischen Theologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 185–198.

<sup>78</sup> Its full title: Imre Zvonarits, *Az szent Irásbeli hitünk agának bizonyos moddal es rendel, három könyvekre valo osztasa* [The Division into Three Books of Our Faith based on the Holy Scripture] (Keresztúr: Farkas Imre, 1614). (RMNY 1072)

<sup>79</sup> Zvonarits, *Az szent Irásbeli hitünk* [Our Faith Based on the Holy Scripture], B2r.

<sup>80</sup> Dávid Csorba, “Kálvinista Kalauzok” [“Calvinist Guides”], in *Pázmány nyomában: Tanulmányok Hargittay Emil tiszteletére* [In the Wake of Pázmány: Studies in Honor of Emil Hargittay], eds. Alinka Ajkay and Rita Bajáki (Vác: Mondat Kft, 2013), 103–111.

contradiction created by the mutual refutations be understood? A possible, but evidently not final answer to this is the attitude of the age to dialectics: dialectics, in this context, is not the *ars* with the help of which truth is found but with which evident truth is checked and justified in a way that the opponents can also be educated to follow the right direction; what is more, through it, the disputing opponent can better understand the standpoint that he defends.<sup>81</sup> And what makes it impossible for those belonging to different confessional communities to allow for views differing from theirs is the longing for the security of divine approval; this search for security hides the values also existing on the other side,<sup>82</sup> making the parties mistrustful towards the undoubtedly existing surfaces of communication.

The survey of entire series of disputes is good for something, after all, albeit somewhat creating the impression of the senselessness of the polemics (it is not characteristic that the parties would convince or understand each other, or would move towards each other from their own position): the actual existence of religious pluralism manifests in operation before the researcher, together with the chances and boundaries of this operation. It also becomes clear that the skilled preachers of both the Catholic and various Protestant communities systematise and summarise the pivotal topics of their own conviction in relation to that particular *other*, and even if they ignore the common surfaces for the most part, they create authorial and conceptual achievements worthy of each other. Furthermore, it is also revealed that the religious dispute has not only passions but also (even unwritten) rules of the game and etiquette: non-compliance with these can also group on the same side those who are otherwise conceptually very far apart.

**Acknowledgement:** This article has been written with the support of the MTA BTK Lendület Long Reformation in Eastern Europe (1500-1800) Research Project.

---

<sup>81</sup> Bauer, "Die Rhetorik des Streitens", 44–45.

<sup>82</sup> Wallace, *The Long European Reformation*, 5.