

MODUL II – ISTORIA APOLOGETICII

Lectia 4 - PERIOADA MODERNA TIMPURIE : Doua secole aglomerate, 1600-1800: Reforma, Contra-Reforma, Post-reforma, Ortodoxia Răsăriteană

Sumar

Lectia 4 - PERIOADA MODERNA TIMPURIE : Doua secole aglomerate, 1600-1800: Reforma, Contra-Reforma, Post-reforma, Ortodoxia Răsăriteană.....	1
<i>Apologetica în Reformă: Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Reforma și apologetica Islamică: Luther</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Apologia contra-reformată și contra-Islam</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Apologetică continentală post-Reformă: Montaigne, Mornay, Pascal, Bossuet, Fenelon, Huet, Abbadie.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Franța, sec. 17-18: apologeți catolici împotriva ateismului, Lamy, Houtteville, Bergier.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Anglia, sec. 17-18, și apologetica post-Reformă: Cherbury, Boyle, Newton, Locke, Palley</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Ortodoxia răsăriteană în sec. 16-17: M. Pegas, C. Lukaris, P. Moghilă.....</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>Concluzii.....</i>	<i>52</i>

In the Middle Ages apologetics had been handicapped by the fact that the Catholic faith was taken too much for granted by most of the European populations. It was simply a part of the air they breathed. To find genuine objections to Christian faith the apologists were forced to seek out Jews and Saracens. This happy situation of religious unity was not destined to perdure. From the sixteenth century onward Europe was divided into hostile religious camps, and controversy became the dominant form of religious literature.

In the sixteenth century, religious controversy was primarily an inter-Christian affair. Most of it centered upon particular doctrines debated between Protestants and Catholics; for example, the Mass, indulgences, the invocation of saints, purgatory, the sufficiency of the Scriptures, and the authority of the pope. These domestic disputes among Christians were generally conducted on the presupposition that all parties to the discussion were convinced Christians. Hence the primary apologetical problem—the credibility of the Christian religion—scarcely arose in this literature. For this reason the inter-Christian polemics of the sixteenth century will be dealt with here only very briefly and, as it were, in passing.

In the seventeenth century one finds increasing evidences of skepticism and religious indifferentism, engendered in part by the hostility (including even religious warfare) among rival Christian groups. Under this external opposition Protestants and Catholics were to some extent brought together in a

common effort to show the importance of religious convictions and the preeminent value of the Christian religion.

In the eighteenth century the forces of the Enlightenment staged a more blatant attack on the claims of Christianity, appealing to the positive sciences, especially history, to prove their case. Christian apologetics, seeking to answer in kind, concentrated increasingly on scientific historical evidences and relied rather less upon lofty metaphysical considerations.

Apologetica în Reformă: Luther, Melancthon, Calvin

The great new fact that conditions the development of apologetics from the sixteenth century onward is, of course, the Protestant Reformation. As the name indicates, this movement was directed toward an inner purification of the Church rather than toward an outward expansion of Christianity. None of the great reformers was deeply involved in the immediate problems of winning over non-Christians to the faith; hence they had little to say about apologetics in the strict sense of the term. Nevertheless, some of the great reformers, such as Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin, through their discussions of the relations between faith and reason made notable contributions to the future of apologetics.

Martin Luther (1483—1546): rațiune, credință, revelație – de la prostituată, la asistentă

Martin Luther (1483—1546), while he occasionally polemicized **against the Jews**, constructed **no formal system of apologetics**. Not only would this have been foreign to his *main purpose—the inner reform of the Church*—but it ran counter to his idea of the relations between **faith and reason**.¹ Partly because of his background in the Ockhamist tradition, he distinguished sharply between two spheres:

- a. the sphere of the natural, temporal, earthly
- b. the sphere of the spiritual, the eternal, the heavenly.

In the first sphere, he held, reason was the proper guide; properly used, it could sharpen man's natural prudence and could even lead to a certain civil righteousness.

Reason, revelation and faith

In the second sphere, however, **reason was simply incompetent. When it strove to occupy itself with the heavenly and the divine it became insufferably arrogant—in Luther's vigorous language, the "devil's whore"**. Reason prior to faith, he held, could only raise objections and engender doubts. But if, on the other hand, **reason was willing to submit to revelation, it could become a useful handmaid of faith**. It could help one to interpret the Scriptures and to attain theological wisdom.

In Luther's eyes, the problem of faith and reason was not so much a matter of epistemology as of soteriology. To try to draw up a set of preambles of faith that would demonstrate the antecedent possibility or probability of revelation was for Luther an act of works—righteousness, smacking of Semi-Pelagianism. **Thus apologetics, conceived as a natural preparation for faith, stood condemned by his doctrine of the sole efficacy of grace (sola fide, sola gratia).**

While **he rejected any naturalistic apologetics, conducted from a position outside of faith**, his system did perhaps make room for **a type of apologetics constructed from within faith**. The development of such an apologetics—which would show the inner power of faith from the standpoint of the believer—

would have to wait for authors such as Kierkegaard and Barth, both of whom were strongly influenced by Luther's dynamic and existential concept of reason.

Luther paved the way for Kierkegaard and Barth.

Philipp Melanchthon(1497—1560): rațiunea credinței în dialog cu natura și Aristotel

Luther's close associate and systematizer Philipp Melanchthon (1497—1560) in his early years as a theologian was totally won over by Luther's views on the relationship between faith and reason. **In the first edition of his Loci communes (1521) he adopted a negative stance toward autonomous reason and philosophy.** But several years later he regained his youthful devotion to classical philosophy and to Aristotle in particular. **By the 1536 edition of the Loci communes Melanchthon was ready to declare that philosophy was not only useful within faith, as the servant of theology, but was also a propaedeutic device for leading men to the gospel.** He came to hold that reason could establish without the aid of revelation that God exists; that He is eternal, wise, truthful, just, pure, and beneficent; that He created the world, conserved all things in existence, and punished the wicked.² **More and more Melanchthon relied upon the natural evidences in favor of Christianity:**

Accordingly the later editions of the Loci contain a formal apologetic for Christianity as a divinely revealed philosophy. The antiquity of the Christian revelation, which includes the Old Testament, the excellence of its doctrine, the continued existence of the Church, in spite of the hostility of the world, the flesh, and the devil, the attestation by miracles—all these are cited in support of the gospel in good traditional fashion.³

Although many of Melanchthon's theological positions were repudiated by the normative Lutheranism that established itself in Germany in the latter part of the sixteenth century, his Aristotelian Scholasticism won acceptance. As a result Lutherans of the "age of orthodoxy", such as Johann Gerhard (1583—1637) and particularly Abraham Calov (1612—88), took over many of the medieval Thomistic theses to justify the **assent of faith before the bar of natural reason.**

John Calvin (1509—1564): Rațiune, Scriptură și Revelație, și mărturia Spiritului

John Calvin (1509—1564), **the most systematic of the sixteenth-century reformers,** sets forth an integral fundamental theology in the first book of his Institutes of the Christian Religion (definitive edition, 1559).⁶ He admits in theory that man can by the contemplation of creation arrive at a knowledge of God's existence, life, wisdom, power, goodness, mercy, and other attributes (1.1-5) - **The Logic of Epistle to Romans.** But he goes on to say that man's inherited depravity is such that he inevitably falls into idolatry unless God assists him by positive revelation. **In order to correct man's faulty vision, God must, so to speak, equip man with a pair of spectacles. The special revelation of God is contained, for all practical purposes, in Scripture alone (1.6).** Thus for Calvin the reasons for accepting Scripture as divine coincide with the reasons for accepting the Christian faith.

As the primary and sufficient reason for admitting the divine origin of Scripture, Calvin alleged the **inward testimony of the Holy Spirit** (1.7), but then he adds **auxiliary proofs from reason that serve to confirm** what one already knows by inspiration. In Calvin's view these rational arguments suffice, so far as human reason goes, to render the Scriptures (and hence Christian revelation) fully credible. The indicia that he lists at this point are not very different from the traditional apologetical arguments for Christianity.

Scripture and its arguments

For the Old Testament Calvin lists the following signs of credibility:
the sublimity of the matter (its heavenly doctrine, savoring of nothing earthly);
the majesty of style (at once humble and eloquent);
the antiquity of the books (which in his estimation “far outstrip all other writings in antiquity”);
the honesty of the writers (e.g., in reporting the disgraces of the Patriarchs);
the miracles, publicly attested; predictive prophecies, later fulfilled; and finally
the wonderful preservation of the original text throughout all the vagaries of history (1.8.1-10).

Turning to the New Testament, Calvin gives still other arguments more specially adapted to this part of the Bible, such as

its authorship by untutored men,
the universal consent of the Church as to its authority, and
the blood of so many martyrs who died as witnesses to its veracity (1.8.11-13).

Arguments such as these, Calvin maintains, are available in case anyone should wish to establish the validity of the Scriptures on rational grounds; but Calvin admits that the **arguments do not give full conviction unless confirmed by the inner testimony of the Spirit**. On the other hand, **he who has the Spirit’s own witness does not need to rely on any rational arguments**.

Calvin’s apologetical arguments do not appear very impressive today. Like other apologists since Justin, **he vastly overestimates the antiquity of the Old Testament as compared with the writings of other civilizations, e.g., Egypt**. His appeal to the miracles and much of his argument from prophecy move in a vicious circle; for the reliability of the biblical reports of miracles and fulfilled prophecies is the very thing in question.

Some of Calvin’s arguments, no doubt, give valid grounds for a high esteem of the Christian Scriptures, but they do not lead necessarily to the conclusion that they are divinely inspired and completely free from error. Still less do they provide, as many Calvinists wished them to, a practical norm for determining the limits of the canon.

Reforma și apologetica Islamică: Luther

Luther și Islamul, și Coranul

How should we present our case, if a Turk were to ask us to give reasons for our faith? He doesn’t care how long we have believed a certain way or how many or how eminent the people are who have believed this or that. We would have to be silent about all these things and direct him to the holy Scriptures as the basis for our faith.

Die Dreiständelehre: Cele trei stări – gândirea teologică a analizei islamice a lui Luther

Because **Luther was convinced that the Devil was always at work in the world he inferred that the Quran was the product of Muhammad being possessed by Satan**, and the Turks, by following the

prophet and his 'blasphemous book', were servants in the army of the Devil.¹ A summary drawn from the end of his analysis of Islam illustrates the premises from which he drew this rather striking conclusion.

Trei stari: Spiritual, temporal si marital ('nuptial' : familie, casatorie, intimitate)

What good can be in the government and whole Turkish way of life since according to their Quran these three things reign freely among them: namely lies, murder, and disregard for marriage? ... Lies destroy the spiritual estate, murder destroys the temporal estate, and disregard for marriage destroys the estate of marriage. Now, if you take true religion, true political rule, and true economy out of the composition of the world (that is, true spiritual life, true temporal authority, true home life) what remains in the world except vain flesh, world and Devil?

It might be tempting to dismiss Luther's allegations as hyperbole or Islamophobia, but despite his harsh caricaturisation of the Turks as destroyers of religious truth, benevolent political rule, and virtuous domestic relationships between men and women in holy matrimony, there is a deep rationale behind his initial critique of Islam.

By dividing his analysis into the categories of **spiritual, temporal, and nuptial 'estates'** Luther was working from what is commonly referred to as his doctrine of the **three estates (Dreiständelehre)**. While it is typically viewed from the perspective of the Reformer's theological ethics, this doctrine was the lens through which he viewed the natural social order of humankind. It is thus necessary to obtain a basic understanding of the three estates and how they informed his perception of the world before turning to the Reformer's employment of this doctrine in his evaluation of the Turks and their religion.³

Bernd Wannewetsch explains it as 'the elementary and paradigmatic forms of social life that are appropriate to creaturely existence from the beginning [They] are created together with man in order to provide the social spheres that are necessary for a flourishing and obedient life.'⁴

These fundamental estates of human life were threefold, according to Luther, and were called, as in Vom kriege, the 'spiritual', 'worldly' or 'temporal', and 'marital' estates or the estates of 'religion', 'politics', and 'economy' or 'home life.'⁸ A host of other terms, from his vast literary corpus, could be listed as well. Whatever one he applied, though, they were conceived to be the fundamental spheres of human activity, preordained (vororten) by God and created with humankind (as concreateae) in primordial history

('The "three orders" scheme is an adumbration of the traditional Lutheran distinction of the inter-relation of "economic, political and ecclesiastical man" within the bosom of Christendom' (John Stephenson, **'Drei Stände, Zwei Regimente und Zwei Reiche—Three Orders, Two Governments and Two Kingdoms'**, Evangelium: Zweimonatschrift für Lutherische Theologia und Kirche [1985], 48–60 [emphasis added]).

Luther's earliest statements regarding the origin and shape of the three estates were made even before his break with Rome. In 1519, for example, in what Werner Elert claims was his first remark concerning their establishment, Luther identified **the marital (eelichen [sic]), spiritual (geystlichen), and governing (regirenden) estates** as having been ordained by God at creation.

The spiritual estate was, for Luther, synonymous with the church. While his understanding of the structures within the visible church went through considerable development, the spiritual aspect of the church or spiritual estate remained virtually unchanged. At its most fundamental robbery; and the ecclesiastical order to withstand heresies and doctrinal corruptions' (quoted in Stephenson, 'Drei Stände', 54).

The boundaries of the religious estate were consequently established and could be identified by people

and institutions that adhered to the Scriptures and the preaching of Christ.

Luther contra Coran

Confutatio Alcorani : (1300). Verlegung des Alcoran : (1542) / Martin Luther.

Beigefügtes Werk: Verlegung des Alcoran : (1542), Kommentierte lateinisch-deutsche Textausgabe. von Johannes Ehmann / Martin Luther

Beteiligte: Ricoldus de Monte Crucis [VerfasserIn]; Luther, Martin [VerfasserIn]; Ehmann, Johannes [Hrsg.] Umfang: 339 S. Sprache: Latein; Deutsch, BN 2884 : Ricoldo (Pennini) de Monte Croce OP (1243-1320)

There are several interesting aspects to Luther's Verlegung that have already received the attention of scholars. For example, the nature of the translation itself is the subject of a few older, cursory studies which address the Reformer's interest in Islam.²⁰

More recently, Hartmut Bobzin has contributed several indispensable investigations ranging from a study of the transmission of its Quranic citations from Latin into German to its place in the history of European polemics against Islam.²¹ And, most recently, in volume 6 of the Corpus Islamo-Christianum, as well as providing the original Latin alongside Luther's German, Johannes Ehmann has supplied an informative paragraph by- paragraph commentary on the text.²² What has not been sufficiently addressed, however, is Luther's adaptation of the presuppositions, methodology, and arguments of this medieval scholastic polemic into his own apologetic repertoire.

The question of whether or not the Verlegung, a translated text, constitutes a proper source for gaining insight into Luther's response to Islam is perhaps raised here.

Apart from the fact that it is an 'extremely free translation',²³ a comparison of the German text with the manuscript from which he worked shows that 'his use of the Latin text is rather arbitrary; he shortened some passages which seemed to him too much inspired by scholastical theology and added other passages to stress some important matters.'²⁴

Moreover, not only are there traces of Luther's own theological impulses, but also his additions to and subtractions from the original text make it apparent that he assimilated the method and argumentation of the Confutatio into his own approach towards Islam while, at the same time, modifying it in order to form an apologetic suitable for his German readers. In order to elucidate his response to Islam a description of the overall contour and strands of the arguments put forward in the Verlegung is therefore warranted and necessary.

The first chapter of the Verlegung purports to summarise the main points of Quranic doctrine in order to give its readers an overview of what the Quran teaches. Not surprisingly, it begins with the rejection of the Trinity and then moves into Quranic Christology, noting every aspect in detail from Christ's denial that he ever ascribed a divine nature to himself to the highly contentious passage in sura 4:157, from a Christian point of view, that he was never crucified, but instead taken up into heaven. Then, following on, other miscellaneous Quranic teachings are briefly recounted, from stories of the jinn being converted after hearing the recitation of the Quran to Quranic descriptions of paradise. From the points that are summarised, though, it is clear that this was not really a summary of the 'main points' of the Quran but rather it was intended to be a summary of the main points of contention between Christian and Islamic doctrine. This then raised the question of how Christians ought to respond.

The particular methodology used to approach Islam in the Verlegung is rooted in the Dominican scholastic apologetic tradition. Thomas Aquinas (c. 1225–1274), the greatest of the Dominican theologians, established the skeleton of this ‘system’ of apologetics in his *De rationibus fidei contra Saracenos*, which he composed shortly after his great *Summa contra gentiles* in 1264.

Luther was, by comparison, not so confident in reason’s ability to demonstrate a logical coherence to doctrines such as the two natures in Christ and the tri-unity of God. The high articles of the Christian creed were not irrational, according to Luther, but instead were outside the bounds of human rationality.²⁹

The translation of Riccoldo was not integral, it did omit many passages

While his translation of Riccoldo omitted passages that would have been conceived by him as a misuse of reason,³⁰ Luther still followed the basic Dominican method of exposing and destroying error first before expounding truth.³¹ He thus put forward that, because Muslims firmly believe the Quran is God’s word, one should begin by attacking it. ‘One must not deal with them at first by [asserting and defending] the high articles of our faith ... but take this way and manner, namely, take and diligently work with their Quran, demonstrating their law to be false and useless.’³²

After this is accomplished, then one could begin to expound the Christian faith and in effect replace error with truth. Oddly enough, as will be shown below, the Verlegung based its exposition of Christian dogma primarily on the Quran itself. In any case, the proper starting point in Christian-Muslim theological dialogue, according to Luther, was to first destroy the foundation of the Muslim faith by exposing its errors. This would clear away any obstacles to the Christian faith and thereby make way for the comprehension of the gospel.

Following the prescribed methodology, the Verlegung attempted to prove that the Quran ‘cannot be God’s law’ for the following reasons: ‘neither the Old or New Testament bear witness to it, it does not [agree] in speech or doctrine with any other [authority], it contradicts itself, it is not confirmed by miraculous signs, it is contrary to reason, there are manifest lies within it, it promotes murder, it is disorderly, it is shameful, [and] it is untrustworthy.’³³

Each of these allegations are put forward and supported by evidence from the Quran and other Islamic sources in **ten successive arguments**.

The first argument alleged that there was no evidence vindicating Muhammad’s prophethood. It began by asserting that ‘concerning Muhammad there is no evidence either in the Old or New Testament, but he himself and only he testifies on behalf of himself.’ Based on the assumption that God’s revelation in history was like a chain whereby the prophets formed a continuous linkage by foretelling the ministry of future prophets all culminating in the incarnation, Luther drew the immediate conclusion that since the Scriptures did not foretell Muhammad’s arrival and he did not perform any miracles to support his claims, ‘He cannot be from God’ and his claim to be a prophet—

‘the prophet of the world’—was therefore a lie.³⁴

Anticipating that a Muslim’s response to this would be that he actually was foretold in both the Testaments but Jews and Christians had excised these prophecies from the text such that only what is contained in the Quran is now reliable,³⁵ the Verlegung shifted into a defence of the veracity of the Bible against the charge of textual corruption (*tahrīf al-laf.z*).³⁶

After citing Quran 10:94, where Muhammad related, ‘if you doubt that which we revealed to you, ask those who have read the book

(the Bible) before you',³⁷ it then asked, 'Now if the books of the Bible are corrupted why does he point his Saracens to false books?'³⁸ This demonstrated, along with other passages such as s̄ura 15:9 and 5:43, that Muslims were unjustified in their belief that the Bible was corrupt, for according to Luther the Quran clearly maintained the authority of the Gospel (Inj̄il) and Torah (Tawr̄a). In addition, further questions could be raised against the charge of ta.hr̄if.

Why would the Christians have removed the name of Muhammad, who praises Christ and his mother, even the gospel, from the Gospel? For he says in the Quran [5:46]: 'in the Gospel of Christ is the truth and perfection.' They [the Christians] would have rather removed the names: Pilate, Herod, Judas, Caiphas, etc.³⁹

Also, How is it that the Christians patched into the Gospel how Christ was crucified and died (as Muhammad lies)? It would have been much better and easier for the world to believe had they preached that Christ was not crucified or died (as Muhammad did), particularly because it is foolish and impossible according to all reason to believe that the one true God should have died.⁴⁰

Such questions all pointed to the reliability of the biblical text, and thus, after citing Quran 5:68, 'hold the Gospel and Law of Moses, alongside the Quran',⁴¹ the argument concluded asking why Muslims would be admonished by Muhammad to hold allegedly corrupt books to be authoritative if they actually were not. The onus of proof was therefore shifted to the accuser: because the Quran regards the Bible as authoritative but Muslims claim that it has been corrupted (based on passages from the Quran), to vindicate their claim, they needed to produce at least one copy of the original uncorrupted text and compare it to a corrupted text from or shortly after the time of Muhammad.

This should be very easy to do since it was unconceivable for every single uncorrupted copy of the Bible to have been lost such that only corrupted versions existed.

With the Bible vindicated, *the second charge* raised to undermine the Quran was that it contradicted the manner in which God had previously revealed himself. The argument began by drawing attention to the rhythmic nature of the Arabic text. Although Luther had no knowledge of Arabic, he trusted Riccoldo and argued that such a manner of expression not only militates against the holy Scriptures but also all philosophical and legal texts. Rhymes were only fitting for entertainers or jesters but certainly not for preaching, teaching, or explicating legal matters. Luther even confidently added, 'never has auch das Euangelium lobet. Denn so spricht er im Alcoran: "im Euangelio Christi ist die warheit und volkommenheit." Viel mehr hetten sie moegen austilgen die namen: Pilati, Herodis, Jude, Caiphe etc.'

A second charge that the Quran's mode of expression contradicted God's former revelation was, ironically enough, based on its 'excessive' praise of God. The argument began with the claim that hardly a chapter passed where one does not read that God was great, high, wise, good, and just; that he was the only one who was worthy to be praised; and that there was no one like him. Although all these things were true, Luther responded, adding to the text, that this was not the way God spoke of himself in the past. Instead, when he spoke through the prophets he did so in the following manner: 'I am your God, I have made everything, everything is mine, I am gracious, etc.' This addition was prompted by Luther's conviction that God was more than an abstract distant reality, which was, he thought, how the Quran depicted him.⁴³ Instead God was, for Luther, a very personal God. Thus he closed this brief argument, again adding to the text, asserting that in the Quran God does not speak as if he is 'your God', but instead it is as if he does not even exist.⁴⁴

The third problem with the Quran's mode of expression vis-à-vis previous revelations was its undignified description of sexual intercourse.

With characteristic verbosity, Luther began by claiming that concerning the matter of sex the Quran expressed itself similar to the way ‘whores and scamps’ speak ‘in whorehouses The Holy Spirit, however, speaks very chastely concerning this in the Scriptures. For example, Adam knew his wife Eve, David went into Bathsheba, Elizabeth was with child, etc.’⁴⁵ Even the philosophers spoke about such things decently, he added. ‘But Muhammad was so deeply immersed in shameful behaviour that he very openly [and] gladly spoke of such wretched desires.’⁴⁶ Luther seems to have forgotten about instances in the Bible where shameful sexual acts did take place such as Lot’s incest in Genesis 19:30–38, but what is especially imbalanced about this argument is that it does not refer to a single passage of the Quran to justify its allegations.

Nevertheless, the argument that the Quran contradicted divine revelation continued by purporting that it was filled with obvious fables and fairy tales. Abridged translations of Quran 27:17–24 (the story of Solomon and the ants),⁴⁷ 54:1 and its accompanying tradition (the splitting of the moon),⁴⁸ 34:14 (the worm gnawing at Solomon’s staff), and a tradition from a work known as *Doctrina Machumet* (on the origin of the prohibition of wine),⁴⁹ are all used to demonstrate that ‘such a law cannot be divine for even nature teaches that if there was no Bible the true God would not speak to men through such fables.’⁵⁰

Shifting from a comparison of the Quran’s mode of expression to the Bible, the next argument asserted that the Quran not only contradicted the Bible, but also itself. Beginning with a paraphrase of sura 4:82, ‘If the Quran was not from God, many contradictions would be found within it’,⁵¹ the *Verlegung* simply pitted excerpts of the Quran against each other. For example, s̄ura 2:62, ‘Jews, Christians, and Sabians will be saved’,⁵² was juxtaposed with s̄ura 3:19, ‘Nobody can be saved except those who live according to the law of the aracens.’⁵³ Furthermore, when the Quran instructs Muslims to treat those from other sects gently and kindly it is contradicted by passages where Muhammad

commands Muslims to rob and kill unbelievers until they believe or pay tribute.⁵⁴

These two examples, however, did not compare to the striking nature of the following one: ‘in the chapter of the cow, that is, the bull, he allows that it is not against nature to mingle with boys or women

[Then] he says in the same chapter that the sodomites at the time of Lot committed abominable sins.’⁵⁵ While this certainly would have shocked Luther, what should have surprised him more, if he had verified this with his manuscript of the Quran, was that the former passage was a ‘complete fabrication.’⁵⁶ Nevertheless, these inconsistencies were more than enough to Luther’s mind and, more importantly, his less informed readers to prove that the Quran was riddled with internal inconsistencies, and was, therefore, in accordance to its own standards, not from God.

Shifting slightly from the premise of the former arguments, *the fourth attack on the divine nature of the Quranic* message questioned the legitimacy of the message bearer by taking issue with the prophethood of Muhammad on the grounds that he failed to perform miracles to verify his status as a prophet of God. ‘Just as Moses was sent to Pharaoh he performed great wonders, and all the prophets, Elijah, Elisha, and others. So too a new [prophet] should perform them. Indeed Christ came with great signs, as Muhammad himself acknowledges everywhere in the Qur"ān. However, [Muhammad] performed no signs at anytime therefore his law cannot be from God neither can he be a messenger of God.’⁵⁷ The basic presupposition here, which Luther expressed elsewhere when dealing with claims of extra-biblical revelation, was that revelation is most aptly verified true when accompanied by signs and wonders. Anticipating a rebuttal, the argument continued, claiming that Muslims would dispute this by saying that Muhammad did, in fact, perform many miracles. For example, they said that he brought together a divided moon and produced water from his fingertips. Such examples, however, were ‘fables and even contrary to the Quran itself.’⁵⁸

Muhammad often says in the Quran how the people had said to him: 'show us a sign as Moses came with signs and as Christ and other prophets have performed.' Thereupon he responded: 'Moses and the prophets were sent by God, particularly Christ, coming with great signs. The world did not believe them, but called them magicians and practitioners of black arts. Therefore God has not permitted me to perform any signs, because they did not believe, but [instead] I have come with force of arms.'⁵⁹

Next to conformity with previous revelations, miracles were the surest way to confirm the claims of a prophet. Muhammad self-admittedly failed to offer any.

Christianity, on the other hand, was firmly supported and confirmed by miracles.

Our Christian faith, which requires one to believe and perform difficult things is established with verifiable and useful miraculous signs, which not only Christ but also the apostles and thereafter the fathers performed. And still it happens today that demons are exorcised, the sick are healed, [and] dead are raised. Such wonders Christians perform, who believe and confess that Jesus Christ the crucified one is the true and only God.⁶⁰

Noting that Saracens would certainly deny such phenomena, the Verlegung argued that Christianity's successful growth in a hostile environment under the pagan Roman Empire demonstrated that such supernatural events did, in fact, occur. It would have been a miracle unto itself if Christianity survived without miracles and only through the preaching of a few simple, uneducated people. Also, that Christians under the persecution of the Romans remained firm in their faith was further evidence that such miracles did happen, for those persecuted would have certainly abandoned their faith had they not been compelled to believe on the basis of the overwhelming evidence of miracles. In conclusion, Luther asserted that 'the Muhammadan faith is without one miracle' and therefore without adequate evidential grounds for its

claims.⁶¹

The fifth argument against the Quran began with the supposition that, in addition to confirmation by miracles, a religion might prove to be legitimate if it was rational. 'It certainly could have happened that Muhammad's law was accepted by the world even without miracles if it conformed to reason.'⁶² Even this was not the case, though, argued Luther, for it is entirely irrational. He thus altered Riccoldo's plain, sober title—'How the law of Muhammad is irrational'—to 'How the Quran of Muhammad is beastly and swinish.'⁶³ This lengthy chapter henceforth portrayed Muhammad and the teachings of the Quran in the worst possible light.

Muhammad's character was the first target. 'It does not conform with reason that such a bad man, a murderer, robber, adulterer, and one who was subject to other wickedness should establish such a holy (as they call it) law.'⁶⁴ While examples of vices from other prophets could be cited, such as the adultery of David and murder committed by Moses, the difference between them and Muhammad was clear. David and Moses repented of their sin whereas Muhammad never even confessed them. Rather, he justified his sin 'through his wicked, shameful law.'⁶⁵

Two examples of this were offered in the Verlegung.⁶⁶ The first is the story of a Coptic slave girl named Ma^{riya} who was given to Muhammad by the Egyptian king Al-Muqawqis and with whom Muhammad was caught having intercourse. When his two wives, Hafsa and #^Aisha, confronted him he promised not to do it again, but then, not able to resist temptation, he slept with her a second time and justified it by placing a statement in the Quran, claiming it was revealed by God that he could break his oath.⁶⁷ The second example concerned Muhammad's 'incest' with his adopted son Zayd's ex-wife (Zaynab bint Jah. sh). Similarly, Muhammad again claimed that God had given him permission to engage in the illicit affair.⁶⁸ When he was confronted by Zayd, Muhammad simply responded, 'Be quiet, God has given

her to me.’⁶⁹ With the above mentioned, the first part of the chapter concluded, citing Jerome and Aristotle for support, that it was against all common sense for a messenger of the divine law to be such an ‘impure, gross, uncouth, and carnal man.’⁷⁰

The second major argument alleging that the Quran was irrational concerned its physical description of paradise.

[Muhammad] sets man’s highest and final good (eternal blessedness) in fleshly desire. For throughout the Quran he promises his Saracens this blessedness: that they will recline in well-watered gardens, with young, beautiful, modest women and mistresses dressed in purple. Gold and silver goblets will be on the tables along with all sorts of costly spices. All these things he recounts particularly in chapter al-Ra.hm̄an.⁷¹

Admittedly, the Verlegung continued on, the Bible speaks of paradise in terms of a lavish, heavenly banquet, but Luther explained that such physical images pointed to a deeper spiritual truth, which was that salvation consisted mainly in knowing God. Even Aristotle, in his Ethics and Metaphysics, knew that the highest goal, the end of life, was a life of understanding and knowledge. To the characterisation of paradise as a physical as opposed to a spiritual existence, Luther added his own rhetorical questioning: if eternal life meant that there will no longer be sickness, hunger, thirst, dying, or any other human deficiency, of what use would there be in eating and drinking? If eating and drinking were present in heaven, then other normal bodily necessities and functions must also be present, such as sweating and farting? What sort of salvation is this? If sexual intercourse continues in paradise, will there still be childbirth? If so, what sort of paradise is it for a woman to go through the pangs of childbirth? If not, what is the purpose of sexual desire in paradise? This redundant argument coupled with the evidence from Muhammad’s life and several other references to the Quran was enough, Luther thought, to prove the original assertion that Muhammad’s law was irrational.

The sixth charge levied against the Quran was that it was full of lies and therefore one must consider it to be ‘untrustworthy and false and that the one who wrote it was a liar and a father of lies.’⁷² To demonstrate this, several passages were either referenced or cited and rebutted to show that the Quran contains factual and theological errors.

For example, the Verlegung claimed that the Quran charged Christians with deifying their clergy,⁷³ which Luther described as an obvious error. Another factual error that he thought was very significant concerned the identity of Mary as Aaron’s sister.⁷⁴

In the chapter Maryam, that is, Mary, it says that Mary the mother of Christ was the sister of Aaron. It is true that Moses and Aaron had a sister named Mary and all three were children of one father, #Imr̄an, as Exodus 2 says. But between that Mary and this Mary, the mother of Jesus Christ, are over 5,000 years, and that Mary died in the desert where Moses led the children of Israel out of Egypt.⁷⁵ The significance of this error was not just that it was so obviously untrue, but Luther was convinced that it had to have been placed there through divine intervention so that it would stand out to anyone reading the Quran. And upon detecting it, they would know that the Quran could not be from a prophet of God.⁷⁶

There were also manifest theological errors in the Quran, charged the Verlegung. The one that warranted the most attention from Luther was s̄ura 6:101, that God cannot have a son since he does not have a partner. Not only is this contrary to what the Gospel teaches, Luther responded,

But such wisdom is just as if I said: ‘God cannot live for he does not eat or drink, does not shit or piss, does not sneeze or cough.’ Christians certainly know how God can have a son, and it is not necessary that Muhammad instruct us how God must first be a man and obtain a wife to produce a son.⁷⁷

Rather than explaining how Christians might know (wissen) how it is possible for God to have a son, though, Luther resorted to an ad hominem attack. In addition to his marginal note, 'Women are Muhammad's god, heart, and eternal life',⁷⁸ he continued by charging the prophet with being infatuated by the flesh of women so much so that his thoughts, speech, and actions concentrated on the conquest of the opposite sex. For Muhammad, he claimed, 'it must always be flesh, flesh, flesh.'⁷⁹

The list of the lies of Islam was complemented further by several examples of even more absurd anecdotes or 'preposterous tomfoolery' (ungereimpter narrenteiding) from Muslim tradition. Apparently Luther thought that the more absurd and condemning the evidence the better, for he rendered all of the Confutatio's Latin in German at this point.

One 'tradition' that he thought was especially damning was the following: Muhammad has written a book of 12,000 marvellous words. Now several among them [his companions] wondered and asked if they were all reliable and true. [Muhammad] replied, 'there are only 3,000 reliable [words]. The others, however, are all lies.' And when one now finds something false in this book, the Saracens say, 'O Muhammad said himself [that] they are not all true. This part belongs to one of these parts. The others, nevertheless, remain true.'⁸⁰

Still following the Latin, he continued, 'it seems to me that they also do this with the Quran, for although they can find many lies within even still, because several truthful words are also found within, they still regard it as God's word.'⁸¹ Luther was sure that they did this with the Quran, for he wrote in the margin that here Muhammad called his own bluff (Kuckuc seinen namen) and he thus reasoned: 'The Quran lies and yet is still regarded as God's word, thus the God of Muhammad must be a liar.'⁸²

The Verlegung rounded out the accusation of lying against Muhammad and the Quran by suggesting that Muslims themselves knew all of the above (and more) to be lies. The fact that Islamic scholars would

not openly debate the veracity of the Quran, as Riccoldo allegedly experienced, nor would allow it to be translated was also indicative of its obvious falsehoods.

The next accusation – the seventh accusation, against the 'law of the Saracens' was that it condoned compulsory conversion and murder. Rather than proving this from the Quran,⁸³ though, the Verlegung cited three anecdotes from the biography of Muhammad.

One reads that Muhammad's Uncle was brought to him saying, 'Dear nephew, son of my brother, what happens if I do not do this [i.e., follow you]?' Muhammad responded, 'Oh Uncle, I will kill you.' He [Muhammad's Uncle] then said, 'Can it be no other way?' 'No other [way]', said Muhammad. 'Well then, I will follow you, only with the tongue, not with the heart, out of fear of the sword.' And #Umar ibn al-Khattāb [d. 644], being forced, said, 'Lord, you know that I only became a Saracen out of fear of death.' Similarly, the son of Empiasca also became a Saracen out of fear of the sword. He [even] sent letters to Mecca ... wherein he warned those in the city of the arrival of Muhammad, that they should guard themselves from the power of the teachings of Muhammad.⁸⁴

In addition to forced conversion, the argument continued, Islam also encouraged tyranny by enforcing its law at pain of death. As an example Luther told his readers that when Muslims gather together to hear a sermon their preachers brandished a sword, and held it out before the people in order to frighten them into submission. And from this he concluded, 'Therefore it is certain that the Saracen's [law] is a murderous, ruthless law; it is not God's but the Devil's.'⁸⁵

Returning to allegations based on a comparison between the Quran and the Bible, *the eighth argument* began with the following assertion: 'what is from God is well ordered One sees this both in nature and holy Scripture.'⁸⁶ Regardless of whether one was a Christian or a Muslim, upon reading the Torah, Prophets, and Gospels they would know for certain that they were from God. Not only did each book progress

in an orderly, chronological manner. They were also clearly anchored in history, referring to historical figures throughout. The Quran, on the other hand, was devoid of order. It did not refer to the time in which the events recorded took place. Both the affairs and speeches that it recounted were completely unorganised and, while the first four chapters maintained some semblance of order and even mention some historical figures, the remaining chapters were in complete disarray thereby proving the original thesis ‘that the Quran is not God’s law for it is disorderly.’⁸⁷

The ninth charge raised against the Quran, perhaps the most pedantic of them all, is that on account of its unjust and undignified teachings it was shameful. In addition to instances already referred to above (such as when he broke his vow to his wives, his marriage to his adopted son’s ex-wife, etc.), the Verlegung provided two further examples to support this allegation. Citing Quran 8:41, where a fifth of the spoils of war were allotted for ‘God and the messenger’ to be distributed to the community, Luther commented, ‘Tell me, has God become such a rascal that he permits robbery out of which he takes a fifth? Or is he so insufficiently poor that he is not able to take care of his needy and widows, orphans and strangers ... and he then permits robbery?’⁸⁸ Attributing such injustices to God was enough to prove the Quran’s indignity, but there was still another example, Luther continued. In *s̄-ura*

Whatever the case, the above evidence was compelling enough for Luther to note in the margin that ‘the Turks did not know where the Quran came from.’⁹⁴

Luther thus concluded that the only reason the present text ‘must be regarded as the true Quran was the result of arbitrary [decisions] and force.’¹⁰⁸ While this is not quite as absurd as the previous anecdote¹⁰⁹—that Muhammad confessed to lying—it demonstrates that Luther preferred the most damning evidence, sometimes without questioning its origin, in waging his attacks on Islam.

Luther’s Demonstration of Christian Truth from the Quran Following what was regarded as a damning exposé of Muhammad and the Quran the final chapters of the Verlegung shifted from offence to defence. Ironically, while **Luther identified the Quran as the Gesetz Teuffels** he confidently followed the Confutatio in its attempt to demonstrate fundamental Christian doctrines from it, even adding several full paragraphs of his own to the text.

The Verlegung first attempted to demonstrate Christian dogma by formulating questions arising from a Christian exegesis or what Nicholas of Cusa called a *pia interpretatio* of the Quran.¹¹⁰ It began with the

4:110 one could read, ‘you should not do evil for it does not please God.

If you do evil, however, he is merciful and gracious and will gladly forgive you.’⁸⁹ From this passage, the Verlegung charged that, while it certainly seemed to forbid sin, in reality this and other passages from the Quran gave license to sin, for regardless of what one did they were assured they would be forgiven by God. There was no reason for anyone to exercise restraint when no punishment is proffered for wrong doing. What was worse, though, is that all this and more was attributed

The tenth and final allegation against the Quran is that its text is untrustworthy. Anecdotes describing its composition during the years following Muhammad’s death were thrown together in order to show that it was the product of highly dubious circumstances. Luther recounted that there were many different versions of the Quran, and those who were known to have understood it, that is, those who knew most if not all of it by heart, could not come to any agreement regarding the proper reading. This confusion lasted until the time of Marwān ibn al-Hakam (623–685), who established the text now in existence and burned all the rest.⁹¹ There was another earlier tradition, Luther explained, that was nevertheless just as revealing.

following challenge: ‘we want to present six questions to the Saracens, from which, if they are not able to respond, they should, rationally speaking, recognise and convert to the truth.’¹¹¹ With the underlying assumption that the Holy Spirit somehow caused Muhammad to express, albeit subtly, fundamental Christian doctrine,¹¹² the first three questions all tried to demonstrate that the Quran expressed the doctrine of the Trinity.

The initial question was grammatical. ‘What does the Quran mean when it frequently introduces God speaking in many persons?’¹¹³ After citing passages where God spoke in the third person plural,¹¹⁴ Luther suggested, adding his own interpretation, that ‘Muhammad should have been able to recognise from his own words’ that when ‘God refers to himself as “We” or “Us”, he is saying that there is one God and three persons.’¹¹⁵ This should have been especially clear when he said, O people of the book, Do not become lax in your law and say nothing about God except the truth, that Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, is a messenger of God, and is God’s word, which [God] impressed upon her through the Holy Spirit.¹¹⁶

This was *prima facie* evidence for a trinitarian interpretation of passages that have God speaking in the plural, Luther continued, for here Muhammad specifically mentioned **God, the incarnate word, and the Holy Spirit**. The blame for failing to recognise the Trinity in the Quran, however, was all Muhammad’s for he could not comprehend the difference between the assertion of three persons in one divine essence and three separate Gods.

The next two questions employed to uncover the triune nature of God in the Quran concerned the above referenced passage as well as other Quranic citations and their mention of the Holy Spirit and equating of Jesus to a word of God. Regarding references to the Holy Spirit, particularly Quran 2:87 (where Jesus is strengthened by the Spirit), 21:91 (where the Spirit is breathed into Mary), and 4:171 (where God gives his Spirit), the Verlegung argued that the Holy Spirit must be a divine personage.

To interpret the Spirit as an angel such as Gabriel (or refer to the universal activity of the Spirit whereby the ‘Spirit is present and at work in all creation as well as in every human deed, even in every natural occurrence’ (Lohse, Luther’s Theology, 235, 237; cf. WA 39/2.29–31, WA 39/1:103.16–21 [LW 34:173]).

204 chapter seven

dubious history behind the collection of the Quranic text, the Verlegung suggested that the real reason why Muslims did not read the Bible was conspiratorial.

Muslim attitude against Christians

Muslim leaders knew that if the general population read the Judeo-Christian Scriptures they would discover the manifest lies in the Quran. And so they instructed the people to follow what the Quran suggested with regard to non-Islamic religions: first, kill anyone who speaks against the Quran; second, do not dispute with people holding opposing viewpoints; third, do not to trust anyone who is not a Muslim; and finally, be indifferent to other religious claims.¹²¹

If Muslims did truly follow the Quran, Luther added, they would eventually come to the truth and be saved. However, most of them, he continued, are not so noble and ‘remain damned on account of their own Quran.’¹²²

Moving forward, the next argument asked why Muhammad tried to associate himself with God by repeatedly saying things such as ‘believe God and his messenger.’ Such expressions appeared as if he wanted to be thought of as an associate of God, although, Luther added, he insisted throughout the Quran that God does not have any associates.

Christ and Muhammad

None of the former prophets spoke in this manner, he noted, with the exception of Christ who said, in John 14:1, 'Do you believe in God? Believe also in me.' With Christ, however, this was reasonable, given what had been demonstrated above, but with Muhammad there was no evidence that he was a messenger of God. By claiming to be so, the Verlegung argued, he was guilty of unjustly associating himself with God.

Conjoined with the former question, the final argument put forward was a comparison of Christ with Muhammad with the hopes of demonstrating the superiority of Christ. For example, the Verlegung began, Christ was announced by an angel, sanctified by the Holy Spirit, and conceived in a virgin by a miracle from God. Muhammad, according to the Quran, was an orphan who was only looked after by God the way he aided any human in need.¹²³ Christ is called God's word whereas Muhammad was only a prophet. Christ was the promised descendant of Isaac. Muhammad, on the other hand, was a descendant from Ishmael¹²⁴ of whom it was prophesied, in Genesis 16:12, that he would be a wild man, hostile to everyone. Christ committed no sin, unlike Muhammad, who was (once) an idolater, a murderer, a womaniser, and a robber. The most telling evidence, however, was that Christ performed countless miracles both to help humankind and to provide evidence of his deity. Muhammad, on the other hand, performed no miracles of any value. Those that are attributed to him were all unlikely, foolish, and useless legends, occurring in secret, and therefore were not verifiable. The chapter concluded at a loss when it considered that, in light of the above questions, Muslims would probably not convert.

'Why then do the Saracens not now prefer Christ instead of Muhammad? And prefer the gospel instead of the Qur"ān?'¹²⁵ Following these six questions, the argument moved forward, again using the Quran as its starting point, but this time trying to convince Muslims to read the Bible. Paradoxically, although he had previously indicated that the Holy Spirit caused Muhammad to include Christian dogma in the Quran, Luther added in the margin that whatever praise of Christ there was in it Muhammad was not to be admired.

Rather, he wrote, his acknowledgment of Christ was similar to when 'the demons praised Christ, God's son' in Matthew 8:29.¹²⁶ In any case, he then cited Quran 5:46, 'we have prepared the way of men through Jesus Christ, Mary's son, the all truthful prophet, and have given him the gospel, which is the right [way] and light and manifest truth.'¹²⁷

Adding that such affirmations could be found in several places in the Quran, he confidently claimed that, on the basis of these words, a Muslim is compelled to believe the gospel. Nevertheless, whether a Saracen believed Muhammad or not, all they needed to do to see the truth of the gospel was to read the Gospel narratives.

Luther's adoption of Riccoldo's peculiar way of providing reasons for the Christian faith represents a significant shift in Luther's apologetic thought. In fact, it seems as if Luther abandoned his earlier principle of Scripture alone as put forward in the statement above. **What had occurred, however, was not an abandoning of the principle of sola Scriptura but rather a supplementation to it.**

Luther, apologetica și citirea Coranului

For centuries western Christendom, while certainly acknowledging the need for an apologetic response to Islam, had feared that if Christians read the Quran they might be tempted to embrace Muhammad's religion.

Thus, every attempt to disseminate the text was accompanied by a preface, which, to some extent, acted as an apology for the study of the 'blasphemous book.'²

This was not the case with Luther, though, for he was convinced that, particularly since the Turks were threatening the eastern borders of the empire, Christians needed to be made aware of it. The uniqueness of his conviction is especially clear when his preface to it is contrasted with the one Philip Melanchthon also contributed to the project.³ Luther's less confrontational colleague wrote his preface to warn Christians away from the 'delirium' of Muhammad. Giving the short introduction the title Praemonitio rather than Praefatio, he began, 'at the outset, the Christian reader must be admonished to cling to this godly and salutary warning against the raging of Muhammad.'⁴

While there are many similarities between Luther and Melanchthon's text,⁵ even a cursory read makes it clear that **Luther saw no danger in convinced or educated Christians reading Islamic sources, particularly the Quran.** In fact, as will be shown below, he encouraged that it be read especially by teachers of the church so that it could be responded to with a vigorous apologetic. Such a task was indeed necessary for the preservation of the church.

Luther began his preface by explaining the benefits of studying non-Christian religions. He noted how several works had recently been composed describing the customs and religious beliefs of the Jews, all of which not only caused 'pious minds' to be 'greatly confirmed in faith and love for the truth of the gospel' but also 'excited' these same godly people 'with a righteous hatred of the perversity of Judaism.'⁶

Having recently read the Quran, Luther was convinced, and thus informed his readers, that not only did Islam put forward different beliefs about God, but it also proposed a religion that was fundamentally antithetical to Christianity. To demonstrate this he put forward a few theses and their Quranic antitheses in an attempt to show that the latter was a theological innovation and therefore an enemy of the church necessarily deserving the attention of Christian apologetics. His first two propositions read: 'Just as the church of God is perpetual, so it is fitting that the church's teachings be perpetual' and 'the church of God by necessity embraces the prophets and apostles.'¹⁴

Elsewhere in the preface he expressed this with perhaps more appropriate, less ecclesial language, 'the only true religion is that which was from the beginning handed on by God, with clear testimonies, through the prophets and apostles.'¹⁵ For Luther, true religion was both indicative of and defined the church of God or the perpetual church (*perpetua ecclesia*), as he called it, and was established and extended forthwith from the time of Adam (*inde usque ab Adam*).

The two dogmas that defined the essence of this perpetual church concerned theological anthropology and soteriology.¹⁷ Claiming that they have 'always existed' and have been passed on 'from the very beginning', Luther identified the first as the doctrine 'concerning the causes of human weakness, calamity, and death, and especially concerning sin passed on after the fall of the first parents.' The second was the 'voice of the gospel ... that the eternal Father willed that the Son of God become a sacrifice for sins.'¹⁸

In other words, the perpetual doctrines of true religion passed forward from the time of Adam and Eve were original sin and human redemption through Christ. Even though doctrines such as the Trinity and even the deity of Christ could be found in the Quran, as he expressed in the *Verlegung*, he found neither of these two definitive and essential teachings in it.

Concerning Adam and Eve's temptation, the Quran records a similar episode, but in a much different setting and with completely different ramifications. While Adam and Eve did eat from a forbidden tree, Adam repented, was completely forgiven, and made a prophet. No curse is placed upon him, Eve, or their descendants,¹⁹ and, perhaps most significantly, they retained their original righteousness.

Luther wrote that Muslims and the Quran consider the Genesis account of the Fall and its subsequent catastrophic effect upon all proceeding generations to be an 'inane fabrication.'²⁰ With regard to the redemption won by Christ, probably referring to the denial of the crucifixion in sura 4:157 (the essence of the gospel in Luther's thought), he proposed that 'Muhammad scorns this sacrifice and propitiation.'²¹

This was all too obvious for Luther. He wrote, rather strikingly, 'Therefore as you firmly repudiate the beliefs of the Egyptians who worshipped cats and of the Arabians who worshipped dogs, so you shall denounce the new creation of Muhammad.'²⁴ There was no middle ground for Luther. There was true religion and false religion, and whatever proved false was as equally guilty by association as any other erroneous belief, regardless of how absurd.

Even so, while Luther could juxtapose the errors of Islam with Judaism, papal beliefs, and even baser forms of idolatry such as animal worship, he was somewhat aware of the rationale of Islamic theology. In light of this reality and the increasing possibility of contacts between Turkish Muslims and western Christians, Luther asked, 'How will they fortify themselves against their beliefs?'²⁵ And he concluded his preface with the following exhortation:

This must not be thought a matter of light importance, especially by those of us who teach in the church. We must fight on all fronts against the ranks of the Devil. In this age of ours how many varied enemies have we already seen? Papist defenders of idolatry, the Jews, the multifarious monstrosities of the Anabaptists, [the party of] Servetus, and others. Let us now prepare ourselves against Muhammad. But what can we say about matters that are still outside our knowledge? Therefore, it is of value for the learned to read the writings of the enemy in order to refute them more keenly, to cut them to pieces and to overturn them, in order that they might be able to bring some to safety, or certainly to fortify our people with more sturdy arguments.²⁶

Luther și predicarea împotriva Islamului

While his preface to the Quran was written in Latin and located in *Theodor Bibliander's Machumetis Saracenorum principis vita ac doctrina omnis*, which was intended primarily for a scholarly audience,²⁷ what Luther ultimately sought was to educate and equip the laity for whatever *Anfechtung* they might face if and when they encountered the claims of Islam.

One of the reasons he had so firmly supported the publication of the Quran was, he explained in his letter to the council of Basel, that he envisioned pastors using the Quranic text as a reference for their sermons, 'for preaching to the people the abomination of Muhammad.'

As was the case with the publication of tracts on the Jewish religion, preaching on Islam would not only cause the people to grow more hostile towards the Turkish religion but it would also strengthen their own

faith. That way, should they find themselves in Turkey someday they would be prepared and confident enough to proclaim and defend the gospel there.²⁸

Luther himself repeated this suggestion in his final series of sermons before his death on 18 February 1546. While he was in his hometown of Eisleben to aid in political negotiations between bickering German officials,²⁹ he preached a sermon on 31 January wherein he addressed, in addition to other non-Christian faiths, the Turks and their religion.³⁰

The underlying theological argument of Luther's sermon is that God's nature can only be properly grasped through his revealed word contained in the Old and New Testament. While he certainly acknowledged that reason (*vernunft*) was able to achieve a basic knowledge of God's attributes—for example, that he was the one, eternal Creator - to pry any further was beyond the scope of human faculties of reason.

While many such as the Muslim Turks correctly professed that God is one, eternal, and the living Creator of heaven and earth, they failed to truly worship him by rejecting what he had otherwise revealed about himself in his word.

Apologia contra-reformată și contra-Islam

The Catholic polemicists who responded to Luther in his own lifetime—most of whom wrote in Germany and the Low Countries—were concerned with particular points controverted among Christians and not with a general Christian apologetic. For this reason it will suffice to mention only the names of theologians such as **Johann Eck (d. 1543)**, **Johannes Cochlaeus (d. 1552)**, **the Franciscan Nicholas Herborn (d. 1534)**, and **the Louvain controversialists John Driedo (d. 1535)**, **Albert Pigge (d. 1542)**, and **Jacobus Latomus (d. 1544)**, all of whom stoutly defended papal primacy and the Catholic teaching concerning the sacraments and justification. Under the distinguished leadership of Cardinal William Allen (d. 1594) and Thomas Stapleton (d. 1598) in the latter part of the sixteenth century Douay and Louvain became important centers for the training of missionary priests for England. Several of these (such as the Jesuits Campion, Southwell, and Persons) were capable pamphleteers for the Catholic cause.

Catholic apologetics in a more traditional style continued to be written in Italy and Spain throughout the sixteenth century and well into the seventeenth. **In the first quarter of the sixteenth century, churchmen in Italy continued to oppose the new paganism, especially in the form of Averroistic Aristotelianism.**

Cardinal Adriano of Corneto (d. 1521), in his *On True Philosophy from the Four Doctors of the Church*,⁷ argued on the authority of the great Latin Doctors of the Church that faith should take precedence over reason.

Giovanni Francesco Pico della Mirandola (d. 1533)

The Florentine Platonist **Giovanni Francesco Pico della Mirandola (d. 1533)**, following in the footsteps of his distinguished uncle, Giovanni Pico, inveighed against the philosophical errors of the Epicureans and

the Aristotelians.⁸ The humanist tradition of Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (d. 1494) and Marsilio Ficino was carried forward by the Augustinian friar and bishop Agostino Steucho of Gubbio (d. 1548) in his *Perennial Philosophy*.⁹ **Fragments of God's original revelation to Adam, he maintained, survived in Zoroaster, the Hermetic Books, and the great philosophers of Greece and Rome. The concordant testimony of these sages harmonized with biblical revelation and pointed the way to Christ.**

About the same time several brilliant Italian Dominicans were laying the foundations for the revival of Thomism in the sixteenth century. Sylvester of Ferrara (d. 1525) and Tommaso de Vio (Cajetan; d. 1534) were drawn to some extent into **polemics against the Averroists and the Lutherans**, but their main importance lies in their contribution to the Thomistic renewal.

Robert Bellarmine(1509—1564): un

The greatest systematizer of Catholic polemics against the Protestants was the Italian Jesuit St. Robert Bellarmine (1542—1621), who began his teaching career at Louvain (1569) and was subsequently called to the Roman College, where he lectured to missionary students from 1576—1586. He was created a cardinal in 1599.

The three volumes of his Disputations concerning the Controversies of the Christian Faith against the Heretics of this Age¹⁰ put order and coherence into the chaotic exchange of arguments in the theological literature of the previous sixty years. The popularity of this work is attested by the fact that it went through one hundred editions in the next century and a half.

Bellarmino's friend the Oratorian *Cardinal Caesar Baronius (1538—1607)* made a contribution to Catholic apologetics by his *Ecclesiastical Annals*,¹¹ a twelve-volume work intended to offset the propagandistic effect of the Lutheran account of Church history published by the Centuriators of Magdeburg in 1560—1574.

Leonard Lessius (d. 1623)

Among Bellarmine's students was a Belgian Jesuit, *Leonard Lessius (d. 1623)*, who at Louvain wrote prolifically on social ethics, and efficacious grace. He wrote apologetical treatises to prove from Scripture that it is impossible to be saved unless one professes the true religion, which is Catholic Christianity. *Persons who are ignorant of the true faith without personal fault, he asserts, will be damned not for the sin of infidelity but for sins that they could have avoided.*¹² **Real problems here...**

Lessius took up the defense of the Christian conception of God against what he perceived as a recrudescence of ancient atheism. In his *Divine Providence*, without any appeal to revelation, he uses a combination of arguments from metaphysics, from the order of the universe, and from the consensus of wise philosophers, as reported by Steucho.¹³ Natural theology in his treatise emerges as an independent discipline distinct from metaphysics and revealed theology.

Natural theology:

He derives his conclusions "by common sense or ordinary philosophic maxims from astronomy, comparative religion, mechanics, and biology".¹⁴ This non-theological approach was to be adopted by many successors seeking to stem the rising tide of atheism and agnosticism.

Apologetică continentală post-Reformă: Montaigne, Mornay, Pascal, Bossuet, Fenelon, Huet, Abbadie

Apologeți francezi

In France from the mid-seventeenth century the chief apologetical questions concerned the dangers and values of doubt, tolerance, and religious indifferentism. A subtle form of religious indifferentism was inculcated by the political theorist Jean Bodin (1530–1596), who in his interreligious dialogue *Heptaplomeres*³⁰ allows seven participants to set forth their views on religion. The participant who contends that no religion is demonstrable and that all are of equal value evidently speaks for the author.

Michel de Montaigne (1533—1592, catholic)

managed to combine an almost cynical diffidence regarding the powers of the human intellect with an apparently sincere adherence to the Catholic faith. In his *Apology for Raymond Sebond* (written 1575—1576) he takes the position that Sabundus should not be severely censured for his paralogisms, because *the human mind is powerless to deal cogently with philosophical and religious questions*. **The only safe course is to adhere humbly to the teaching of the Church.**

Philippe de Mornay (1549—1623, protestant)

The leading Protestant apologist of the sixteenth century in France is undoubtedly the **Huguenot** layman Philippe de Mornay (1549—1623), a close *adviser of Henry of Navarre* before the latter became a Catholic and ascended the throne of France. In 1578 Mornay published a polemical but not very original *Treatise on the Church* directed against Roman Catholicism. Three years later, during a period of repose in Holland, he composed his most important work, *On the Truth of the Christian Religion*,³³ which *entirely avoids controversies among Christians themselves*.

In his preface Mornay explains his purposes in writing, namely, to combat both the antipathy to religion and religious indifference on the part of many nominal Christians as well as to strengthen their convictions to the point where they will be motivated to live up to the demands of the gospel. Turning then to apologetical method, Mornay calls attention to the necessity of arguing from principles that are accepted by the adversary as well. **In the case of pagans** one may appeal to self-evident principles and to demonstrable philosophical truths; **in the case of Jews**, to the Old Testament. Regarding the relations between **faith and reason** Mornay does not materially differ from many Catholic writers of the Scholastic tradition.

Like most apologetical treatises since the *Summa contra gentiles*, Mornay's begins with philosophical demonstrations. **Follows Aquinas...**

The first nineteen chapters deal with the existence and nature of God, the creation of the world, providence and evil, the immortality of the soul, original sin, and the last end of man. In his doctrine of God Mornay includes two chapters on the Trinity. He seeks to demonstrate this first from created effects and analogies, using the Neoplatonists and other pagan philosophers as witnesses. Then, following Raymond Martini, he invokes rabbinic authorities to support a Trinitarian exegesis of certain texts from the Old Testament.

Chapter 20, a crucial turning point in the treatise, demonstrates the necessity of religion if man is to attain his last end, union with God. Here Mornay makes use of **Ficino**. Then he lays down three notes by which the true religion is to be recognized: it must promote worship of the one true God; it must rely on God's revelation as to the way in which He wills to be worshiped and served; and it must offer effective means of reconciliation with God. In the remaining chapters Mornay shows that these characteristics are verified in the Jewish religion of the Old Testament and even more perfectly in Christianity, which is the fulfillment of the messianic hope of Israel.

Mornay's Truth of the Christian Religion has the strengths and weaknesses of similar treatises issued in early modern times. **Its main importance is perhaps that it introduces into Protestant circles the same kind of apologetical writing that had been customary for centuries in the Catholic world.**

Blaise Pascal (1623—1662, protestant) – matematicieni și fizicieni deveniți apologeți

Blaise Pascal (1623—1662), **after making extraordinary discoveries as a youth in the fields of mathematics and physics, underwent a thoroughgoing religious conversion in 1655** and thenceforth applied the full force of his genius to the service of religion. At the convent of Port Royal, where his sister was a nun, he imbibed a strict Augustinianism and became convinced that the certainties of faith are unattainable except to the heart that loves. About 1656, while seeking to win over two of his friends—charming but worldly “free-thinkers”—he conceived the idea of writing an apologetic for the Christian religion.

Pascal's projected apologetics remained incomplete. It comes down to the present day in the form of scattered sentences and paragraphs, known as the **Pensees**. Although many have tried to reconstruct how these fragments would have fit together in a single work, the evidence is too sparse to permit more than frail conjectures. Many modern critics accept in substance the plan set forth by Filleau de la Chaise that purports to rest upon the latter's recollection of a lecture given by Pascal in 1658 concerning his proposed apology. If this plan is applied to the materials in the **Pensees**, one would get an apologetic in three main sections, somewhat as follows.

A reconstruction of the Pascal-s apologetics in his Pensees....

In Part 1 the author discusses the enigmatic situation of man. Addressing himself to a typical “libertine” of the day (i.e., one who considered himself emancipated from religious belief and religious norms of conduct), Pascal describes this person as self-satisfied, engrossed in present pleasures, indifferent to all questions concerning God and the afterlife. From this indifference Pascal seeks to rouse him: “Seeing the blindness and misery of man, looking upon the whole mute universe, and man without light, abandoned to himself, without knowing who put him there, nor what he has come to do, nor what will become of him when he dies, incapable of all knowledge, I am overcome by dread like a man who has been brought in his sleep to a savage desert island, who wakes up not knowing where he is and without any way of escaping.”⁴⁰

With extraordinary psychological insight Pascal dissects the nature of man, showing both his nobility and his wretchedness. He shows the paradoxes of the human situation, man's foolish pride and vain imaginings, his weakness before the wild powers of nature, and his superiority over those powers insofar as he knows his misery, repents of his failures, yearns for all truth and goodness. “Man is but a reed, the feeblest in all nature, but he is a thinking reed. . . All our dignity, then, consists in thought” (no. 347).

Unlike previous apologists, Pascal makes no effort to give metaphysical arguments for the existence of God. He ridicules those who argue: there is no vacuum, hence God exists (no. 243). Even if such proofs were valid, to what would they lead except an empty deism? What good would it do to arrive at a God whose only importance is to have given the world an initial fillip, setting it spinning on its way. Deism, for Pascal, is almost as remote from Christianity as atheism. The only God he cares to know is the “God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. . . the God of Jesus Christ” (no. 556; cf. Pascal’s Memorial).

Instead of proving the existence of God in the abstract, Pascal draws attention to the strange fact that human nature can neither comprehend God nor do without Him. “If man was not made for God, why is he never happy except in God? If man was made for God, why is he so contrary to God?” (no. 438).

Particularly impressive is the dialectic by which Pascal leads the libertine to admit that the question of immortality concerns himself. He contrives a speech that he puts on the mouth of the freethinker. After describing the weakness and ignorance in which he finds himself, the freethinker says: “And from all this I conclude that I should then pass all the days of my life without thinking of investigating what will become of me. Perhaps I could find some enlightenment for my doubts, but I do not want to take the trouble, or move one step to search. . .” (no. 194). Such an attitude, concludes Pascal, is contrary to a man’s own evident self-interest and can win him no esteem in the eyes of others. Only two kinds of people are reasonable: those who, knowing God, serve Him with their whole heart; and those who, not knowing Him, seek Him with their whole heart (no. 194).

Part 2

In what might have made up the second major part of his apology, **Pascal makes an inventory of the various philosophies and religions.** Do they give a plausible account of the actual state of man and do they offer any remedy that could give man happiness? Most religions and philosophic systems either confirm man in his foolish pride or involve him more deeply in passion or condemn him to despair. Biblical religion, however, is an exception. **By attesting that man was made in the image of God, it establishes his true greatness.** By its doctrine of the Fall the Bible sufficiently accounts for his present inclination to frivolity and evil. Finally, the Bible speaks worthily of God. It makes Him lovable by the doctrine that God Himself comes to make atonement for man’s sin and lead him to salvation.

At this point Pascal has brought the libertine to the point of wishing that he could believe, without having yet proved that Christianity is true. **Here, perhaps, Pascal would have inserted his famous wager. If Christianity is true, you have everything to gain from embracing it; if false, you have lost nothing (no. 233).** But suppose the libertine objects, “I should gladly make this bet, but I cannot believe.” Pascal replies, “Imitate the actions of those who have staked everything on the truth of Christianity. Take holy water, have Masses said, etc., and you will soon find yourself able to believe” (no. 223). To the one who says, “I would quickly give up my pleasures if I had the faith”, Pascal replies, “You would quickly have the faith if you surrendered your pleasures” (no. 240).

Pascal profoundly analyzes the relations between faith and reason. Like Augustine he finds a unity within difference, a concord within contrast. Nothing is more reasonable, he maintains, than for reason to submit to authority (no. 272). In its decision to submit, reason is not governed by probative evidences but rather by “reasons of the heart” (no. 277). This term in Pascal does not mean emotion or blind sentiment but rather an intuitive type of logic. It issues not from the esprit de geometrie but from the esprit de finesse (no. 1). The man who seeks stringent evidence for the truth of Christianity will not find it. God has so arranged things that there is “enough light for those who desire only to see, and

enough obscurity for those who have the contrary disposition” (no. 430). Those who are able to believe without proofs do so because God inclines their hearts (no. 284).

Part 3

The third and last section of the apology, according to the plan here being followed, would have been a **historical demonstration of the truth of Christianity**. Perhaps the following paragraph was intended as its outline:

PROOF.

- (1) The Christian religion, by its establishment, having established itself so powerfully, so gently, while so contrary to nature.
- (2) The holiness, sublimity, and humility of a Christian soul.
- (3) The wonders of Holy Scripture.
- (4) Jesus Christ in particular.
- (5) The apostles in particular.
- (6) Moses and the prophets in particular.
- (7) The Jewish people.
- (8) The prophecies.
- (9) Perpetuity. No religion has perpetuity.
- (10) The doctrine, which gives an account of everything.
- (11) The holiness of this law.
- (12) By the conduct of the world. (no. 289)

Pascal’s treatment of the biblical evidence is strongly **Christocentric**. **Jesus Christ, he says, is the center of both Testaments: of the Old as looking forward to Him, and of the New as its model (no. 740)**. In a **lengthy paragraph, “The Mystery of Jesus”**, Pascal expresses his deep devotion to his Lord (no. 553). This devotion is integral to his apologetic. The great marvel of Jesus Christ is that outside of Him one can understand neither God nor himself: “Outside of Jesus Christ we cannot know what is the meaning of our life or our death, nor what God is, nor what we ourselves are” (no. 548). With an implicit reference to the opening passage of Paul’s First Letter to the Corinthians, Pascal says that although signs and wisdom may prepare a person to accept Christianity, the acceptance itself involves submission to the folly of the Cross (no. 587).

The arguments from miracles and prophecies, Pascal stresses, are not absolutely convincing but are of such a nature that one cannot say it is unreasonable to believe (no. 564). Miracles, as an external and bodily sign, are necessary because man is not a pure spirit: the whole man, body and soul, must be convinced (no. 806). The process of discerning miracles involves a dialectical relationship between miracles and doctrine: miracles discern right doctrine, and right doctrine discerns miracles (no. 803).

The prophecies, Pascal maintains, are “the greatest of the proofs of Jesus Christ. . . for the event which fulfilled them is a subsistent miracle from the birth of the Church to the end of time” (no. 706). Following the then accepted view of biblical scholars, Pascal imagines that the first five books of the Old Testament were written by Moses himself; consequently, he exaggerates the element of predictive prophecy in the Old Testament. He marvels, for instance, that Moses should have been able to foresee so many details of the history of the people under the Old Covenant (no. 711). In addition to prophecy, Pascal finds typological or figurative meanings in many Old Testament realities, as related to their New

Testament counterparts. For instance he holds that the Flood and the Red Sea are types of the water of baptism. This, too, is evidence of divine inspiration (cf. nos. 643-92).

Unlike many apologists, Pascal does not seek to establish the authenticity of the Old Testament by external testimonies regarding its authorship. But he argues from the portrait of Jesus in the Gospels. “Who taught the Evangelists the qualities of a perfectly heroic soul, to paint it so perfectly in Jesus? Why do they make him so feeble in his agony? . . . But when they make him so troubled, it is when he troubles himself, and when men trouble him, he is perfectly strong” (no. 801). To prove the truthfulness of the apostolic testimony, Pascal like Eusebius⁴¹ shows the absurdity of imagining the Twelve plotting to claim falsely that Jesus had risen from the dead and then dying as witnesses to their own lies (no. 801).

Pascal gives only a few indications of how he would have argued to the truth of Christianity from the Church as sign. The Church, he maintains, has the three marks of true religion: perpetuity, virtuous conduct, and miracles (no. 844). “A thousand times”, he writes, “the Church has been on the verge of total destruction, but each time that it was in this condition, God raised it up again by extraordinary feats of power” (no. 613).

At the end of his apologetic Pascal is careful not to claim too much. “It is indubitable”, he writes, “that after all this one should not refuse, considering what life and religion are, to follow the inclination to accept it, should this come into our hearts; and it is certain that there are no grounds for mocking those who accept it” (no. 289).

The reconstruction made here of the approximate order of Pascal’s ideas is very tentative. But even when one does not know how to assemble them, the fragments are more impressive than the finished masterpieces of others. With Pascal thought and life, piety and reflection, were inseparable. His apologetic is shot through with a profound grasp of the human heart and a deep Christian spirituality, only slightly tarnished by the rigorism of Port Royal. Like other apologists of his day Pascal directed his arguments to the religiously indifferent intellectuals. His style almost miraculously combines passion and clarity. Few of his arguments, taken in themselves, are truly original. He has evidently made considerable use of Augustine’s *De vera religione* for his views on the relations between faith and reason. For his scriptural arguments he refers occasionally to Raymond Martini and Grotius. His analysis of the human predicament relies partly on Montaigne. But Pascal has known how to select what is most effective, to give it the stamp of his personal genius, and to express it in immortal prose. Few if any apologetical works have brought so many unbelievers on the way to faith.

Jacques Benigne Bossuet, catholic bishop (1607—1724)

The only apologetic work of the seventeenth century that from a literary point of view bears comparison with the *Pensees of Pascal* is the **Discourse on Universal History (1681)** by the celebrated court preacher and bishop Jacques Benigne Bossuet (1607—1724). Appointed by Louis XIV to serve as tutor to the Dauphin, Bossuet fulfilled this charge very conscientiously from 1670 to 1681. Writing in a simple style for the benefit of his royal pupil (who seems not to have been overendowed with intellectual interests and capacities),

Bossuet divides his work **into three parts, an apologetics starting from history...**

Part 1 summarizes in about one hundred pages the main stages of world history;

Part 2, about two hundred pages, deals with the continuity of religion; and

Part 3, less than one hundred pages, discusses the successive empires from the Scythians to the Romans.

Part 1, which concentrates on biblical history, with a few glances at Greece and Rome and a concluding section on the history of Christian Europe, is a rather dry and shapeless chronicle, but it provides the background for **Part 2**, which is obviously of far greater interest to the author. Here Bossuet shows that the key to the meaning of world history is to be found in religion, which relates events to God, who has fashioned for Himself a chosen people under the Old Law and under the New:

You can easily follow the history of these two peoples, and notice how Jesus Christ effects the union of the one with the other, since he, as expected or as given, has at all times been the consolation and the hope of the children of God.

Hence you see that religion is always uniform, or rather always the same, since the beginning of the world. The same God has always been recognized as author, and the same Christ as Savior, of the human race.⁴²

In the following chapters Bossuet gives an admirably compact and persuasive narrative of the salvation history of the Old and New Testaments. He accounts for the delay of more than 4,000 years between the creation and the Incarnation on the ground that men had to learn from bitter experience their need of a Redeemer (2.1, p. 132). In the Old Testament section he makes much of the prophetic testimonies to Christ, but his exegesis, it must be confessed, is weak even by the standards of his own age. The following paragraph illustrates the synthetic vision, rhetorical power, and untroubled confidence with which Bossuet proposes his arguments. After a number of quotations from the Davidic Psalms, he continues:

The other prophets did not see less of the mystery of the Messiah. There is nothing great or glorious which they did not say of his reign. One sees Bethlehem, the smallest town of Judah, made illustrious by his birth, and at the same time, rising to a still greater height, he sees another birth by which he issues from all eternity from the bosom of his Father (Mi 5:2). Another sees the virginity of his mother, an Emmanuel, a God with us (Is 7:14), coming forth from this virginal womb, and an admirable child, whom he calls God (Is 9:6). This one sees him coming into his temple (Mal 3:1); this other one sees him glorious in his tomb, in which death was overcome (Is 11:10, 53:9). In publishing his glories, they are not silent concerning his disgraces. They saw him sold; they knew the number and the use of the thirty pieces of silver with which he was purchased (Zech 11:12-13). At the same time as they saw him great and exalted (Is 52:13), they saw him despised and hardly recognizable in the midst of men, the object of the world's wonder as much by his humiliation as by his greatness; the most abject of men, the man of sorrows, laden with all our sins: doing good, and unacknowledged; disfigured by his wounds and thereby healing ours; treated as a criminal; led to punishment with the wicked and peacefully delivering himself up to death like an innocent lamb. They saw a long posterity being born from him (Is 53) by this means, and vengeance wreaked upon his unbelieving people. In order that nothing should be wanting to the prophecy, they counted the years until his coming (Dan 9); and unless a man blinds himself, there is no longer any possibility of failing to recognize him.⁴³

Aware of the complexity of the total argument from the fulfillment of prophecy, Bossuet wisely chooses to concentrate on a few essentials. God, he declares, has chosen to make various palpable facts, "attested by the whole world", so evident that their significance is apparent to even the most untutored—namely, "the desolation of the Jewish people and the conversion of the Gentiles, both taking place at the same time, and both likewise coinciding with the moment when the gospel was first preached, and when Jesus Christ appeared".⁴⁴

In his chapter on “Jesus Christ and His Teaching” Bossuet very appealingly presents what is most novel and inspiring in the personality and doctrine of Jesus. “He announces lofty mysteries, but he confirms them with great miracles. He commands great virtues, but at the same time gives great lights, great examples, and great graces.”⁴⁵ Bossuet’s pages in this chapter on the new precept of charity and on the “law of the cross” merit a place among the great pages of apologetical literature. Time has not dimmed their luster.

More questionable, however, is the apparent complacency with which Bossuet dwells on the desolation of the Jews, which he interprets as their definitive rejection as the people of God. He does not hesitate to accuse the Jewish people collectively of the crime of deicide and to depict the legions of Titus as mere instruments in the hands of an avenging God.⁴⁶ The termination of the Aaronic priesthood and the commingling of the families of Israel are for Bossuet evident proofs that the Old Law has ceased and that the Messiah must have come.

With his customary eloquence Bossuet describes the conversion of the Gentiles. While he exaggerates the rapidity with which the Church expanded and the simplicity of those who preached the gospel, he effectively develops the Pauline thesis that the foolishness of the Cross has triumphed over the wisdom of this world.⁴⁷

In the concluding section of **Part 2** Bossuet extols the strength and stability of the Church triumphing over all idolatry and all heresies. “This Church, always attacked, but never conquered, is a perpetual miracle, and testifies brilliantly to the immutability of the divine counsels.”⁴⁸ ***Bossuet makes much of the uninterrupted succession that can be traced from Peter to Innocent XI. Against the Catholic Church, strongly built on the rock of Peter, all heresies and persecutions beat in vain.***

Although **Part 3**, from a literary point of view, is not inferior to Part 2, it need not be considered here. Bossuet’s consideration of the **succession of empires**, while it contains many religious reflections, is not directly apologetical in content.

While Charron and others had sharply distinguished between the apologetic for Christianity and the apologetic for Catholicism, these two phases of apologetics practically coincide in the thought of **Bossuet. He rejects Protestantism because he does not find in it the qualities that draw him to Christianity itself. In his principal controversial work, A History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches (1688), Bossuet impugns Protestant Christianity for its lack of unity and stability.**

The Catholic Church, in contrast to the Protestant sects, “so unalterably attached to decrees once pronounced, that not the least variation can be discovered in her, shows herself a Church built upon the rock, always in full security from the promises she has received, firm in her principles, and guided by a Spirit who never contradicts Himself”.⁴⁹ This exaltation of the changeless uniformity of Catholicism was well suited to an age that identified change with degradation and diversity with chaos.

Bossuet represents almost to perfection the self-understanding of the Church as it would have appeared to a leading churchman of the grand siècle. His work shows the classical order and balance that mark the painting of Poussin and the drama of Racine.

He is perfectly confident of his positions and seems to experience no need to agonize in the search for truth. The critical problems with which biblical scholars such as Richard Simon⁵⁰ were beginning to

wrestle have no interest for Bossuet. “The difficulties raised against the Holy Scriptures”, he writes in the Discourse⁵¹ “are easily overcome by men of good sense and good faith.” It is precisely this unawareness of the precariousness of his own positions that gravely weakens the apologetic of Bossuet. He has no realization how difficult to justify is his own decision to view world history in the light of the Bible and, even more narrowly, in reference to Christ as its center and summit. Pascal, who would not have rejected Bossuet’s interpretation of history, has the advantage of greater sensitivity to the personal options involved. *Pascal, with his personal anxiety before the mystery of the universe, speaks more powerfully to our troubled century* than the self-assured Bishop of Meaux.

Francois de Salignac de Mothe - Fenelon, catholic (1651—1751)

Bossuet’s great rival in the episcopacy, François de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénelon, generally known simply as Fenelon (1651—1751), who served at the royal court as tutor to a grandson of Louis XIV, is principally known as a philosopher and spiritual writer. His *Treatise on the Existence and Attributes of God* and his *seven Letters on Various Themes of Metaphysics and Religion* deal to some degree with apologetical questions.

His Treatise begins, in almost Cartesian fashion, from the author’s experience of *himself as a body that thinks and wills*. He then passes to consider the beauties and order of nature and thereby rises to the apprehension of a transcendent cause, corresponding to the idea of the infinite that springs up spontaneously within the human spirit. The infinitely perfect being can be affirmed, he says, by reflection on the beauty and harmony of the natural world, itself the arena of less divine “infinities”. Fenelon’s feeling for the beauty of nature as a locus in which to detect and affirm God’s existence is one of his most distinctive contributions, preparing the way for the aesthetic sensibility of the Enlightenment and Romanticism.

In his *Letters on Religion* Fenelon summarizes *his natural theology* and goes beyond it to explore the truth of revealed religion. He praises the monotheism of the Jews as superior to the polytheism of the pagans. The messianic expectations of the Jews, he finds, were fulfilled in Christ, who teaches a gospel of universal altruistic love. *The Catholic faith, he reasons, is the only form of Christianity that does not leave the faithful prisoners of their own private judgment*. To come to the truth we must follow the biddings of *interior grace*, which enable us to recognize in the *Church the external authority* we need.

Pierre Daniel Huet (1639—1721, catholic)

While Bossuet was serving as tutor to the Dauphin, Louis XIV in 1670 appointed as his assistant Pierre Daniel Huet (1639—1721), a prodigiously erudite man who later became **Bishop of Avranches**. In several philosophical works on faith and reason⁵² Huet repudiated Descartes’ identification of clarity with certitude, maintaining on the contrary that demonstrations based on moral experience are more solid than mathematical proofs. In religion, he contended, the motives of credibility cannot give more than probability, but grace inclines the intellect to assent with a certitude surpassing any rational proofs.

Huet’s major apologetical work, *A Demonstration of the Gospel to His Highness, the Dauphin*,⁵³ is a bulky folio volume with 650 pages of text and 75 additional pages of indexes.

Spinoza is their target...

In great part it is a response of Christian orthodoxy to the **rationalistic critique of the Bible contained in Spinoza’s Tractatus theologico-politicus** (1670). Influenced no doubt by Spinoza, Huet constructs his apologetics on the analogy of geometry. In the preface he explains that the gospel can be proved by

reasons as valid in their own order as geometrical demonstrations are in the mathematical order. He then lays down seven definitions, two postulates, and four axioms. The body of the treatise consists of ten propositions.

OT and NT

Huet's argument in substance comes down to this: All the biblical books were written at the times to which they are attributed and by their commonly supposed authors. But the Old Testament prophesies many events to be accomplished in the life of the Messiah. These prophecies were fulfilled in the career of Jesus, who must therefore be acknowledged as the Messiah. The Christian religion is therefore true. As a corollary it follows that all other religions are false and impious.

The major part of Huet's effort is taken up with vain efforts to prove what few modern apologists would consider even faintly probable—for example, that **Moses wrote the entire Pentateuch and that all the religions in the world trace their ancestry to Moses**. In his proofs of the Messiahship and divinity of Jesus Huet heaps up such a mass of arguments that the reader is virtually crushed. For all the titles of Jesus (e.g., light, fire, sun, star, flower, font, rock) Huet quotes parallel texts in the Old and New Testaments.

If the learned Huet contributed something to the systematization of Catholic apologetics, his clumsiness offset whatever gains he achieved. The unconvincing character of most of his arguments made it quite evident that the geometrical form of his treatise was ill adapted to the subject matter.

Jackques Abbadie (1654/1657—1727, protestant hughenot)

The most popular apologetical work of seventeenth-century France, and one of the best, was the **three-volume work** of the Huguenot pastor Jacques Abbadie (1654/1657—1727). In Volumes 1 and 2, together entitled *Treatise on the Truth of the Christian Religion*⁵⁴ this work demonstrates successively the existence of God, the necessity of religion, the truth of the Jewish religion, and the truth of the Christian religion. Then in a separate work entitled *Treatise on the Divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ*,⁵⁵ later published as the third volume of the treatise just mentioned, **Abbadie undertakes to prove that Jesus Christ was true God, "of one same substance with his Father"**.

Abbadie's apologetic reflects both the merits and defects of his century. Highly systematic, he orders his questions with the utmost clarity.

Asta este apologetica moderna in dezvoltare... Spinoza si Peyrere

Familiar with the **Old Testament criticism of Spinoza** and with the **paleontological speculations of La Peyrere**, he makes a genuine effort to come to grips with new and urgent questions. At the same time he is a man of piety, who like Pascal can employ the "logic of the heart". In one of the best sections of his book he shows how the intrinsic attributes of the Christian religion correspond with the religious needs of man.

Like most of his contemporaries, however, Abbadie is given to a rigid, syllogistic type of logic that cannot deal easily with literary and historical questions. Complacent in his orthodoxy, he is not seriously open to any evidence that tends to undermine established positions.

He is totally committed to the proposition that Moses wrote the Pentateuch and to the fact that the world could not possibly be older than one would gather from computing the years from Adam to the present day, on the basis of the biblical accounts. In his volume *The Divinity of Jesus Christ* Abbadie assumes an almost defiant tone toward all adversaries. If Jesus was not of one substance with the Father, he argues, then Islam would be better than Christianity, Jesus would have been justly condemned to death by the Sanhedrin, and, indeed, religion itself would be indistinguishable from superstition and magic. This minatory type of argumentation is better calculated to foster apostasy than to convince doubters. For styles of apologetics better adapted to a scientific and empirical era, we may now turn to Holland and England.

Olanda în sec. 17: Grotius, Jurieu, Limborch vs evrei si atei (Spinoza, Bayle)

The leading Protestant apologists of Holland in the seventeenth century were Arminian Calvinists, theologically close to du Plessis-Mornay.

Hugo Grotius (Huig de Groot, 1583—1645), protestant

The most popular Protestant apology of the century was probably that of Hugo Grotius (Huig de Groot, 1583—1645). Originally published in verse form in Dutch (1621) for the **use of sailors traveling to non-Christian parts of the globe**, *The Truth of the Christian Religion*⁵⁶ was expanded and transformed by the author himself into a Latin treatise in 1627. It soon appeared in many *European languages as well as in Persian, Arabic, Malayan, and Chinese*.

In his preface Grotius respectfully acknowledges the work of his many predecessors, mentioning by name *Sabundus, Vives, and Mornay*. His own work is not remarkably different in structure, but several significant changes are introduced.

Book 1, dealing with the general **truths of natural religion**, is brief and easy to follow. The existence and attributes of God, the immortality of the soul, future rewards and punishments, and the necessity of religion are all established by popular arguments chosen more for their persuasive force than for their demonstrative rigor.

Book 2, which seeks to vindicate the preeminence of the Christian religion, begins more positivistically than the works here previously examined. **First Grotius argues to the historical existence of Jesus, alleging the testimony of pagan authors and the admissions of anti-Christian polemicists.** Then he goes on to establish the credibility of the apostolic testimony to the miracles and **Resurrection of Jesus**. After these extrinsic proofs he examines the intrinsic **arguments for the supremacy of Christianity**: the excellence of the rewards it promises, the purity of its precepts, and the moral qualities of Jesus. Then Grotius argues from the marvelous expansion of Christianity, adding the usual comment that if this had occurred without miracles the occurrence itself would be miraculous.

Book 3 differs from the works seen thus far by introducing a somewhat serious effort at source criticism. It attempts to establish, first, that the New Testament is by the authors to whom it has traditionally been ascribed, and second, that these authors were well informed and honest and hence are worthy of credence. In answer to the objection that the Bible contains contradictions, Grotius maintains that the apparent inconsistencies are minor, are not insoluble, and establish the lack of collusion between the biblical witnesses.

The last three books (4-6) are directed respectively against paganism, Judaism, and Islam. They are not remarkable for originality; but the section on Judaism has the merits of being reasonably brief and of

seeking to meet the real objections of the Jews.

From a speculative and dogmatic point of view, Grotius is disappointing. He has **little interest in metaphysical argument**. He gives no clear indication as to whether he accepts the orthodox dogmas regarding the Trinity and the Incarnation. He consequently omits the usual rationes convenientiae in favor of the Incarnation. The main merits of Grotius are, first, that he began to apply documentary criticism to the Bible, especially the New Testament, and, second, that he wrote in a clear and readable style. Although he makes use of very numerous references to pagan philosophers, historians, and rabbinic commentaries, he relegates much of his supporting evidence to footnotes, thus adapting his work better to the ordinary reader without sacrificing scholarly thoroughness.

Pierre Jurieu (1632—1677, protestant calvinist), vs Baruch Spinoza, și Pierre Bayle (atei)

In the course of the seventeenth century, Holland became a refuge for theologians of unorthodox opinions, both Jewish and Christian. It was here that the Jew **Baruch Spinoza (1632—1677)** set forth his pantheistic philosophy and launched his attack on the inspiration of the Bible. He was answered by the contentious Calvinist Pierre Jurieu (1637—1713), also known for his ardent polemics against Bossuet and other Catholics. Jurieu took into his protection the **apostate Catholic Pierre Bayle (1647—1706)** and gave him a teaching post at Amsterdam. When Bayle, however, wrote in favor of the toleration of atheists, Jurieu denounced him as a secret atheist and terminated his academic career. Taking advantage of the ensuing leisure Bayle then composed his gigantic Historical and Critical Dictionary (1697), which was to be used by the eighteenth-century philosophes as the “arsenal of the Enlightenment”.

Philip van Limborch (1633—1712) vs Mozaism

In the closing decades of the seventeenth century two other Dutch Arminians, close in mind and spirit to Grotius, made significant apologetical contributions. Philip van Limborch (1633—1712), Scripture professor at the Remonstrant College in Amsterdam, published a very successful dialogue **On the Truth of the Christian Religion: A Friendly Conversation with a Learned Jew**.⁵⁷ By moderate arguments Limborch defends the superiority of the Christian over the Mosaic revelation.

Germania în sec. 17-18: teologie, stiinta si literatura impotriva ateismului (Leibniz, Lessing)

In no other European country was there so creative an apologetical encounter between theology and unbelief as in England. One may therefore summarize more briefly what occurred in continental Europe.

Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646—1716), vs. Spinoza and Bayle

In Germany the tone for the discussion in the eighteenth century was to a great extent set by Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646—1716). This remarkable **mathematician, physicist, historian, and jurist** wrote several major philosophical works touching on religious questions. In his youthful *De arte combinatoria* (1666) he proposed the development of a universal logic along the lines suggested by Raymond Lull.

In 1669 he outlined the plan of a definitive apology entitled *Demonstrationes catholicae*, which was intended to reestablish the **religious unity of Europe** and to prepare for the successful evangelization of the world. According to Leibniz’s outline this work was to consist of a series of Prolegomena dealing with logic, metaphysics, physics, and practical philosophy, to be followed by four parts:

- (1) a demonstration of the existence of God;
- (2) a demonstration of the immortality of the soul;
- (3) proofs of the Christian mysteries;
- (4) proofs of the authority of the Church and of Holy Scripture.

Leibniz was intent upon forging a philosophical system that would **reconcile the new developments since Descartes and Spinoza with Aristotle and the ancients**. In a letter to his former professor Jakob Thomasius, dated April 30, 1669, he expressed the apologetical importance he attributed to this task:

“I venture to assert that atheists, Socinians, naturalists and skeptics can never be opposed successfully unless this philosophy is established. I believe this philosophy is a gift of God to this old world, to serve as the only plank, as it were, which pious and prudent men may use to escape the shipwreck of atheism which now threatens us.”

Leibniz strongly rejected the contention of Pierre Bayle that faith is contrary to reason and that the act of faith must therefore be blind and irrational. In his “Discourse on the Conformity of Faith with Reason”, prefixed to his Theodicy (1710), **Leibniz replies that faith, while in a certain sense above reason, is never contrary to it.**

But unlike Locke he is not content with a juxtaposition of faith and reason on the basis of mutual noninterference. **He holds that truths of faith necessarily agree with the a priori principles of reason, such as the principle of contradiction and the principle of sufficient reason.** Revelation and miracles, while they go beyond the physical powers of created agents, are within the scope of reason insofar as God must have a sufficient reason for decreeing such exceptions. Whether such interventions have in fact occurred is for Leibniz a question of fact, to be established by historical evidence. He has no personal doubts but what the revelation attested in the Bible is sufficiently founded on reliable testimony and is therefore to be accepted.

In the case of Leibniz, as in that of many other apologists, the effort to defend the faith was inseparable from a critical rethinking of Christian doctrine. He labored to show, for instance, that the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation and the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation could both be properly understood in a sense that did not go against self-evident rational principles. Approximating in some ways the tradition of the Calvinist churches, he regarded the presence of Christ in the Eucharist as a substantial but spiritual presence. So too he sought to defend the eternity of hell by the somewhat novel suggestion that the souls of the damned continually perform new acts of sin. In his Theodicy, replying to Bayle, he attempted to account for evil in the world without prejudice to the power and goodness of God and in this connection propounded his famous thesis that this is the best of all possible worlds. In other works Leibniz sought to give a rational demonstration of the immortality of the soul. He considered that those who based their acceptance of this doctrine on faith alone unduly weakened the rational foundation of Christian faith.

In various controversial writings **Leibniz engaged in debates with Locke, Hobbes, and Spinoza.** In lengthy correspondence with Samuel Clarke he combated **Newton’s view** that it was necessary for God to interfere in the world in order to keep the universe in operation. **Against the Socinians** he wrote the essay *Defense of the Trinity by Means of New Logical Inventions* (1671).

Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729—1781, protestant lutheran), dramaturg si pedagog

The dramatist Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729—1781), who had begun his career as a divinity student, retained a lifelong interest in religious questions, even if he did not staunchly adhere to the Lutheranism of his fathers. In some of his writings he seems to stand close to the deists, but to their philosophy he added at least the idea of progress. In his **The Education of the Human Race (1777)**, building on a favorite theme of Irenaeus and Origen he takes the view that the biblical religion, and Christianity as its culmination, have led humanity to insights concerning God that would never have been achieved by unaided reason.

In particular Lessing valued the religions for promoting the ideals of sincerity, tolerance, and brotherly love—though he also criticized religion when it interfered with these values. **His exaltation of tolerance and his critical attitude toward positive religion best appear in his play Nathan the Wise (1779).**

Lessing's own views on apologetics may be gathered at least in part from his brochure **On the Proof of the Spirit and of Power**, written in reply to a pamphlet by Johann David Schumann (1777), which had reaffirmed the traditional historical arguments for Christianity in answer to Reimarus. Lessing took exception to the idea set forth by Bonnet and others that although historical truth cannot be demonstrated yet one must believe the biblical prophecies and miracles as firmly as truths that have been demonstrated.

“Accidental truths of history can never become the proof of necessary truths of reason.” The passage from historical truth to the truths of faith, he reasoned, was an illegitimate leap from one genus of discourse to another, over “the broad, ugly ditch which I cannot get across”.⁹³

Lessing did not himself reject all proofs for Christianity. At the conclusion of his pamphlet against Schumann **he asserts that one can accept Christianity on the basis of its inner truth, insofar as this speaks with certainty to one's heart. One no longer has to rely upon miracles and prophecies**, though these signs may have been necessary to procure the acceptance of Christianity by the multitude at the time when the religion was strange and new. Now that the building is complete, the scaffolding may be torn down. **Faith is sustained by the “ever continuing miracle of Christianity itself”**.⁹⁴

In addition to the bold and creative thinkers thus far discussed, eighteenth-century Germany and Switzerland had their share of traditionally orthodox controversialists. For example, the Swiss mathematician and physicist **Leonard Euler (1707—1783) in his Defense of Divine Revelation** against the Objections of Freethinkers,⁹⁵ after replying to the deistic objections against revelation, concludes that one can rely firmly on all the gospel promises because they are accredited to man by the supreme miracle of Christ's Resurrection.

Franța, sec. 17-18: apologeți catolici împotriva ateismului, Lamy, Houtteville, Bergier

François Lamy (1636—1711, catholic): against Spinoza

In Roman Catholic countries the apologetics of the eighteenth century took the form of a series of defensive reactions against the new philosophies of the Enlightenment.⁹⁹ **The Benedictine François Lamy** (or Lami; 1636—1711), a disciple of Nicolas Malebranche, published a philosophical polemic, **The New Atheism Overthrown, or, Refutation of the System of Spinoza**. He sought to **refute Spinoza's monism by proving that man is, as Descartes had contended, a composite of two substances: body and soul.** Against

Spinoza's determinism Lamy alleged the immediate experience of free will. He argued further that Spinoza's pantheistic system, if accepted in practice, would lead to disastrous moral consequences.

In other works Lamy set forth the positive grounds for accepting Christianity. *His Evident Truth of the Christian Religion* is a rather jejune demonstration of the "fact of Christian revelation" from miracles, prophecies, and the testimonies of the witnesses to Jesus Christ. In a later and more elaborate apologetic, *The Unbeliever Led to Religion by Reason*¹⁰² he sets forth the Christian evidences in nine rather tedious dialogues between *Arsile* and *Timandre*. He gives both a priori arguments from the antecedent necessity of a mediator and a posteriori arguments from the New Testament witnesses.

Alexandre Claude François Houtteville (1686—1742, catholic): vs. Rousseau, Voltaire, d'Holbach, Diderot

As the eighteenth century progressed, French apologists, **like their colleagues in England, showed an increasing tendency to shift their ground from philosophical reasoning to historical evidence.** This development is already discernible in the work of the Oratorian Alexandre Claude François Houtteville (or Houteville; 1686—1742), who issued in 1722 *The Christian Religion Proved by Facts*.

Book 1, the most original part of this work, demonstrates that the miraculous events narrated in the Gospels are worthy of acceptance according to the general laws of historical evidence. In the first place, he observes, since miracles are not self-contradictory, they are worthy of serious investigation (chapter 6). Further, the Gospel miracles are vouched for by contemporary eyewitnesses (chapter 7) who were sincere and truthful (chapter 8). The Gospel facts, moreover, were public and of general interest (chapter 9). They stand at the basis of certain later facts, such as the willingness of the early Christians to die for their faith (chapter 10). The miracles of Jesus were admitted by the Jews and pagans of the first Christian centuries, although it would have been to the interest of these adversaries to deny them (chapter 11). Finally, the miracle stories have been handed down without corruption (chapter 12).

Book 2 Houtteville sets forth the conventional arguments from Old Testament prophecies of Christ, and in Book 3 he replies to fourteen major objections raised by the deists to the veracity of the Gospels. At the end he appends a dissertation on the systems that the unbelievers propose as alternatives to Christianity.

Houtteville's work is clear and well ordered. His efforts to apply exact historical method to the Gospels represented a real advance, but the undeveloped state of historical science in his day has, of course, made his work quite obsolete by modern standards.

Against Rousseau, Voltaire, d'Holbach, Diderot

Throughout the remainder of the eighteenth century, Catholic apologetics was compelled to reply to brilliant antagonists such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712—1778), who advocated a kind of sentimental deism; Voltaire (1691—1778), who mordantly satirized the ideas of providence and election in a cascade of pamphlets, novels, and historical works; and the Baron Paul d'Holbach (1723—1789), who propounded, especially in his *Systeme de la nature*, a thoroughgoing atheistic determinism. Many of the leading articles in Denis Diderot's famous *Encyclopedie*—a work of eighty-four volumes published from 1751 to 1780—were overtly hostile to Christianity and the Catholic Church. One historical survey reports: "Some nine hundred works in defense of Christianity were published in France between 1715 and 1789, ninety in one year (1770) alone."¹⁰⁴

Nicolas Sylvestre Bergier (1718—1790, catholic): vs. Rousseau, d’Holbach

The most prolific Catholic adversary of the philosophes was the Abbe Nicolas Sylvestre Bergier (also known as Nicolas-Syvian Bergier, 1718—1790), whose collected works in Migne’s edition comprise eight bulky volumes. Against Rousseau he wrote in 1765 **Deism Refuted by Itself**¹⁰⁵ a successful popular work in the form of twelve letters. The first three deal respectively with the possibility, necessity, and factual existence of supernatural revelation; the fourth takes up the authority of the Church as a divine teacher, and the remainder answer various objections that Rousseau, or his mouthpiece in Emile, the “vicar of Savoy”, had raised against Catholic Christianity. Bergier’s primary tactic is to expose the internal inconsistencies in the adversary’s position—a task not too difficult in the case of Rousseau. Bergier’s own proofs for Christianity are primarily drawn from the New Testament miracles, which he, like Houtteville, views as incontestable supernatural facts. Less subtle than Pascal, Bergier holds that while doctrine is proved from miracles, the converse is never the case.¹⁰⁶

Two years later Bergier published, in reply to the now forgotten Freret, a work entitled **The Certainty of the Proofs of Christianity**,¹⁰⁷ which undertakes to defend traditional Christian apologetics from Eusebius to Houtteville against the historical objections that have been raised. Without insisting on the strict authenticity of the New Testament books, Bergier regards their trustworthiness as demonstrable and the efforts to degrade them to the level of the New Testament apocrypha unavailing. He upholds the argument from miracles and denies that it is weakened by the alleged parallel of the false miracles worked at the tomb of the Jansenist Abbe Paris. The Gospel miracles, says Bergier, won converts, but the Jansenist miracles succeeded only in convincing those who were previously confirmed Jansenists.¹⁰⁸

Bergier then replied to the **Baron d’Holbach’s Christianisme dévoile** by his **Apologie de la religion chretienne** (1769)¹⁰⁹ and two years later, in response to d’Holbach’s System of Nature (1770), Bergier brought forth his **Examination of Materialism**,¹¹⁰ in which he takes up d’Holbach’s points one by one. In Part 1, examining the cosmos and man, he seeks to show that materialism is incapable of accounting for movement in the world and, a fortiori, for what is characteristic of human life. He defends the freedom of the will, the spirituality of the soul, and personal immortality. In Part 2 Bergier refutes d’Holbach’s atheism not so much by proposing arguments for the existence of God as by proving that d’Holbach’s objections against Clarke and others do not hold.

Bergier’s masterwork is his twelve-volume Historical and Dogmatic Treatise on the True Religion. Published in 1780, it is an exhaustive treatise from a philosophical, historical, and theological perspective on the existence and justification of Catholic Christianity. It contends that revelation is morally necessary to conserve the truths of natural religion and to keep it from degenerating into deism and skepticism. In his biblical section Bergier labors to prove the historicity of the miracles and prophecies of the Old and New Testaments. He then goes on to reflect on the marvelous conversion of the civilized world to Christianity and on the blessings that Catholic Christianity has brought to individuals and societies. Deism, he argues, is inherently unstable; it quickly relapses into atheism or agnosticism. The many signs in favor of Christianity prove beyond doubt that it could not be a human invention. “Of all known religions, none has produced on earth fruits so precious, constant, and universal as has Christianity. . . . Besides, Christianity has survived for eighteen hundred years in spite of the contradictions, battles, losses, schisms, disputes and revolutions to which it has been subjected; a more powerful hand than that of men has effected this wonder; hence there is a God.”

Bergier was a very industrious, well-informed, courteous, and lucid apologist. He was respected by Voltaire and by the other philosophes of his day as a worthy opponent. **A half century after his death,**

Felicite de Lamennais called him “the greatest apologist of recent centuries and perhaps of all centuries”.¹¹²

His great forte was his ability to pick out inconsistencies in the positions of his opponents, and his principal foible was his failure to rise above the common assumptions of the intellectuals of his day. Thus in writing against Rousseau he seems to accept the latter’s extrinsicist view of revelation. In reply to Freret he falls into a positivism of “miraculous facts”, and in refuting d’Holbach he seems to accept the deistic notion of God that d’Holbach is rejecting. Although he ably restated the traditional arguments, Bergier failed to develop a positive theory of Christian credibility that commended itself to later generations.

Voltaire, the leading publicist for deism in eighteenth-century France, stirred up a host of Catholic adversaries. The Jesuit Claude François Nonnotte (1711–1793) published several works in answer to the sage of Ferney, most importantly his two-volume *The Errors of Voltaire*,¹¹³ which politely and moderately points out where Voltaire misrepresents the facts of history. The wittiest and most effective answer to Voltaire was the *Letters of Certain Jews to Monsieur Voltaire*,¹¹⁴ by Antoine Guenee. Voltaire is chided for his ignorance of the ancient languages and his shortcomings as a biblical scholar, as exhibited in many of his generalizations about the religion of the Jews.

Among the defenders of Catholic orthodoxy in France, a place of honor belongs to Guillaume François Berthier, who was the editor and principal author of the Jesuit *Journal de Trevoux* from 1745 until 1762, when the Jansenist-dominated Parlement of Paris suppressed the Society of Jesus in France. Chiefly known for his spiritual reflections on Scripture, he was esteemed by allies and adversaries alike for his piety, learning, and civility in debate. In his apologetical writings he skillfully exposed errors in Diderot’s *Encyclopedie* and responded to the accusations of Voltaire against the Church.

Italian Catholics in the eighteenth century looked on with horrified anxiety as the waves of deism and atheism swept over England and France. Already schooled by their predecessors of the seventeenth century to detest the heresies of Luther and Calvin, the Italian apologists regarded the new errors as the natural and inevitable outcome of the Protestant principle of private judgment. Faith, in their view, depended in very large measure on the living authority of the Church, especially that of the pope. This general trend to center apologetics on the question of the Church and to refute all the other sects and religions from the standpoint of Catholic Christianity characterizes, for instance, the works of the Jesuit pulpit orator Paolo Segneri¹¹⁵ and those of the Dominican apologists Moniglia, Concina, and Gotti. Cardinal Vincenzo Gotti’s *The True Church of Jesus Christ*¹¹⁶ is a milestone in the development of the apologetics of the Church.

Anglia, sec. 17-18, și apologetica post-Reformă: Cherbury, Boyle, Newton, Locke, Palley

In the latter part of the seventeenth century the intellectual leadership of Europe passed for a time from France to England, and to England one must look for the **most creative advances in apologetics**. The dominant mood of the seventeenth century is one of exuberant confidence in the divinely established harmony between reason and nature. The approach to God through reason and nature, rather than through positive historical revelation, gave rise to deism.

Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury (1583—1648): antidot pentru sceptici

In its early phase deism is best represented by Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury (1583—1648), who came into contact with skeptical ideas during his service as ambassador to France (1618—1624) and **attempted to construct an antidote to skepticism**. Having published his treatise *On Truth*⁵⁹ in 1624, he later expanded it under the title *On the Religion of the Gentiles* (***De religione gentilium***, posthumously published, 1663). Taking the universal consent of mankind as the infallible index of truth, Herbert maintains that **God has impressed upon all men certain common religious notions**. He specifies the following **five** (without however denying that there are others):

1. There is a supreme Power (whom one may call God).
2. This sovereign power must be worshiped.
3. Virtue combined with piety constitutes the principal or best part of divine worship, as has always been believed.
4. All vices and crimes are hateful and should be expiated by repentance.
5. There are rewards and punishments after this life.

All who subscribe to the truths of natural religion are in Herbert's opinion members of a Church that truly deserves to be called Catholic and outside of which there is no salvation. He does not entirely reject the idea of revelation, but he denies that it communicates additional truths. Rather, he says, it makes us more than ordinarily certain of things known by reason and gives us an experience of God's gracious approach to man. Later deists, going beyond Herbert of Cherbury, tended to reject entirely the idea of a supernatural order, including the notions of grace, revelation, incarnation, and miracle.

Robert Boyle (1627—1691): *impotriva deism, ateism, judaism si islam*

Among the **early opponents of deism** was Robert Boyle (1627—1691). While firmly convinced that the progress of science helped to manifest the creative hand of God, Boyle argued in numerous short tracts for the existence of revealed truths beyond the range of human reason.⁶⁰ In a late work, *The Christian Virtuoso* (1690), Boyle defended the truth of the **Christian revelation on the basis of three main proofs**:

1. the sublimity of Christian **doctrines**,
2. the testimony of **miracles**, and
3. the **beneficial effects** of the Christian religion on the history of the human race.

In his will Boyle set up a foundation for an annual series of eight lectures to be delivered in a parish church of London **“for proving the Christian religion against notorious infidels, viz., atheists, theists, pagans, Jews, and Mahometans, not descending lower to any controversies that are among Christians themselves”**.

The first Boyle lecturer was the classical scholar Richard Bentley (1622—1742), who chose for his topic in 1692 *The Folly of Atheism and What Is Now Called Deism, Even with Respect to the Present Life*.

These lectures were essentially an **argument against Thomas Hobbes**, whose *Leviathan* had been published forty years earlier. The first lecture dwells on the evil consequences of atheism both for the individual—whom it deprives of life's best hope—and for society, which is securely founded on religious faith. In his second lecture Bentley seeks to prove the existence of God from the faculties of the human soul. Lectures 3 to 5 proceed to establish God's reality from the design of the human body; and lectures 6 to 8, **taking advantage of Newton's Principia (1686)**, aim to prove God's existence from the wonderful order of the heavens.

Isaac Newton (1642—1727): profetii si minunile lumii vii

Isaac Newton (1642—1727) enthusiastically endorsed the apologetical use that Bentley in his first volume had made of the Principia. In a letter to the author he declared: “When I wrote my treatise about our system, I had an eye upon such principles as might work with considering men for the belief of a Deity; and nothing can rejoice me more than to find it useful for that purpose. But if I have done the public any service this way, it is due to nothing but industry and patient thought.”⁶² **Newton’s own theology was Latitudinarian, probably even Unitarian, but he did not yield to the most orthodox divines in his reliance on Holy Scripture.** Among his posthumously published papers are his curious speculations entitled *Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John, in which he asserts that to reject the prophecies of Daniel is to reject the Christian religion.*⁶³

In the full glow of the Newtonian illumination theologians appealed with increasing confidence to the reflections of the divine attributes in the order of nature. John Ray (1627—1705), who may be regarded as the founder of modern botany and zoology, produced an influential volume on **The Wisdom of God in Creation (1691)**, in which he dwells enthusiastically on the **teleological structure of living organisms and the marvels of animal instinct.**

John Locke (1632—1704): miracole, ratiune si revelatie naturala

In particular, Locke assails the innatism of Herbert of Cherbury, whose five principles of natural theology, he maintains, are neither evident nor universal.⁶⁷ **Locke nevertheless regards the idea of God as “naturally deducible from all parts of our knowledge” with a certitude equal to that of the most evident geometrical theorems.**⁶⁸ In Book 4, chapter 10, he sets forth a rather crude demonstration of God’s existence based on the principle of causality. By means of this proof he concludes to the reality of an eternal and powerful being that stands at the origin of the world.

Locke, as a convinced Christian, unhesitatingly accepts the idea of revelation. In a famous passage he writes:

Reason is natural revelation, whereby the eternal Father of light, and fountain of all knowledge, communicates to mankind that portion of truth which he has laid within the reach of their natural faculties: revelation is natural reason enlarged by a new set of discoveries communicated by God immediately, which reason vouches the truth of, by the testimony and proofs it gives that they come from God. **So that he that takes away reason, to make way for revelation, puts out the light of both**, and does much—what the same as if he would persuade a man to put out his eyes, the better to receive the remote light of an invisible star by a telescope.⁶⁹

Locke explicitly discusses the criteria of revelation in his **Discourse on Miracles (1703)**. Taking for granted as a presupposition the existence of God as creator and governor of the world, he maintains that **a divine mission** cannot be credited except under three conditions:

(1) it must deliver nothing derogating from the **honor of the one, only, true, invisible God** or inconsistent with natural religion and the rules of morality;

- (2) it must **not inform man of things indifferent**, or of small moment, or easily knowable by the application of their natural powers; and
(3) it must be **confirmed by supernatural signs**.

Miracles may be reasonably taken to be divine until such time as disproved, by a contrary mission attested by yet greater wonders: "His [God's] power being known to have no equal, always will, and always may be, safely depended on, to show its superiority in vindicating his authority, and maintaining every truth that he hath revealed."⁷⁰

Locke simply takes for granted the historicity of the biblical miracles. In *The Reasonableness of Christianity as Delivered in the Scriptures* (1695), a work designed to show that the one essential of Christian belief is the acceptance of Jesus as Messiah, Locke holds that Jesus established His Messiahship both by His many miracles and by His fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy. Locke dwells particularly on Isaiah 9, Micah 5:2, Daniel 7:13-14, and Daniel 9:25.⁷¹

Although Locke's version of the Christian creed was, by traditional standards, a very attenuated one, he remained a **committed Christian who accepted the idea of supernatural revelation attested by supernatural signs**. Some of Locke's disciples, however, were to use their master's epistemological principles in support of an anti-supernaturalistic deism.⁷²

In 1696 John Toland, an admirer of Locke, published the treatise *Christianity Not Mysterious*, which rejects the Lockean idea that there could be a revelation superior but not contrary to reason. The only possible function of revelation, in Toland's deistic position, would be the clarification of naturally knowable religious truths.

Typical of the radical deism of the eighteenth century is *Christianity as Old as Creation*, a work published by Matthew Tindal in 1730. Radicalizing Locke's positions, Tindal argues that the Bible is nothing but a republication of the religion of nature.

The early part of the eighteenth century witnessed a great proliferation of apologetical works in defense of supernatural revelation against the deists.⁷³ Noteworthy among these was the immensely popular monograph of Thomas Sherlock, *The Trial of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus* (1729), a work that concludes with the verdict that the Apostles are not guilty of having given false witness. A thorough vindication of the historical basis of the Christian faith was given by Nathanael Lardner (d. 1768) in his *The Credibility of the Gospel History* (published in 13 sections from 1727 to 1755).

William Paley (1743—1805): sinteze de teologie naturala si evidente ale crestinismului

William Paley (1743—1805) did for eighteenth-century England what Abbadie had done for seventeenth-century France:

he summed up in clear and systematic form what was best in the arguments of his predecessors.

Paley is still remembered for his **Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy (1785), which proposes a Christian utilitarianism**. In *Horae paulinae* (1790), his most original work, he amasses arguments for the reliability of the historical indications contained in the thirteen Pauline Epistles, making use of parallels found in Acts and elsewhere. His two best-known works are even more directly and deliberately apologetical.

In 1794 he published **A View of the Evidences of Christianity**, which was so successful that it remained compulsory reading for all seeking entrance to Cambridge University until the twentieth century. In 1802 he issued his **Natural Theology, one of the classical presentations of the argument from design**. Something deserves to be said about both of these major works.

Underlying Paley's apologetic is **a moralistic and utilitarian theory of revelation**.

The purpose of revelation, he holds, is to influence human conduct by informing men of the rewards and punishments that await them in the future life.⁸⁴ In the opening pages of the Evidences he argues skillfully for the antecedent likelihood of revelation, granted the existence of a wise, beneficent Creator and the need that man experiences for additional light and assurance. He then replies to Hume's argument against the discernibility of miracles. The argument does not hold, he maintains, for there can be no presumption that miracle stories must be false. If God is capable of intervening in the world, if revelation is likely, and if miracles are the appropriate way of sealing revelations, then miracles are likely in the context of what appears to be a revelation.

Paley's Evidences of Christianity, 1794

In the first major division of **Part 1, A**, Paley aims to show that there is satisfactory evidence that the original witnesses of Christianity were converted to a radically new manner of life and passed their lives in labors, dangers, and sufferings in order to bear witness to their beliefs. Those beliefs, moreover, were substantially the same as contained in the New Testament and therefore centered on the miraculous history of Jesus. In this connection Paley demonstrates at length the credibility of the New Testament accounts, drawing on the voluminous work of Lardner, mentioned above. Then Paley concludes that the *testimony of the New Testament must be true for it is evident that the Apostles would not have gone about lying in order to teach virtue*.

In the second major division of **Part 1, B**, Paley seeks to establish, **by comparison with other religious movements, that there is no satisfactory evidence that other pagan miracles performer had around such persons pretending to be original witnesses of any other similar miracles have acted in the same manner, like Jesus had...**

"that persons pretending to be original witnesses of any other similar miracles have acted in the same manner, in attestation of the accounts which they delivered, and solely in consequence of their belief of the truth of those accounts".⁸⁵ He takes up in particular the alleged miracles of persons such as Vespasian and Apollonius of Tyana and shows how unimpressive and poorly attested are these miracles compared with those of Christ. In these pages Paley leans heavily on the arguments drawn up by Adams and Douglas in their answers to Hume.

In Part 2 Paley furnishes **nine auxiliary arguments, for the truth of Christianity**. They are

the arguments from prophecy,
from the originality of the New Testament code of morality,
from the character and doctrine of Christ,
from the candor of the New Testament writers,
from the agreements of the New Testament writers in their portrayal of Christ,

from the originality of Christ's character,
from the agreements between the New Testament and profane history,
from the undesigned coincidences among the New Testament writers,
from the impossibility of accounting for the Easter faith without supposing the real Resurrection of Christ, and, finally,
from the rapid and extensive propagation of the Christian religion.

In Part 3 Paley takes up **seven popular objections** that might seem to militate against his own arguments for Christianity. He explains, for instance, why many Jews and pagans did not accept the Christian message and why miracles were not greatly stressed by the early Christian apologists. To the objection that "if God had given a revelation, he would have written it in the skies", Paley replies with arguments borrowed from Bishop Butler to the effect that if revelation has the same author as nature one might expect it to contain a like obscurity and that there might be good reasons why God would not wish to compel our assent with overpowering evidence.

While the fame and popularity of Paley's *Evidences* are sufficient testimony to its merits, the book has little more than historical interest today.

Paley was a skillful advocate, but he remained on the surface of things. He did not probe deeply into metaphysics or criteriology and therefore failed to justify his extrinsicist view of revelation and his extraordinary insistence on the evidential value of miracles.

His argument from the biblical miracles, although it may have seemed solid in the eighteenth century, has lost much of its force because it presumes that the Gospels and Acts are, on the whole, eyewitness reports. Paley knew nothing of oral tradition, of the complex processes by which legends are formed, or of the subtle shades of difference between various forms of popular history. For him, as for Abbadie and others, there were but two alternatives: factual history and imposture.

The *Evidences* presupposed the existence and the essential attributes of God. Only later, in his *Natural Theology*, did Paley give his rational justification for this presupposition. This work begins with the famous (though even in Paley's time far from original) comparison between the world and a watch. As it would be irrational to assert that a watch required no maker, so, he reasons, it is necessary to postulate a designer for the world.

Ortodoxia rasariteana în sec. 16-17: M. Pegas, C. Lukaris, P. Moghilă

The XVI and XVII centuries have confronted the Eastern Orthodox Churches with a triangle of survival policies: **their relationship with Rome, with the Protestant world and with the Ottoman Empire**. Maybe this triangle could involve a four-cornered arena if one would add the specific relationships between the Orthodox Churches themselves, the inner dynamic between the inside reformers and the staunch religious conservatives and the problem of national identity (not that the Church is national, yet the European East has developed nationalistic forms of Christianity – in Serbia and Russia, for example, and also in Hungary – in the form of Reformed Hungarian Church). These confrontations were amplified by the historical coexistence and contrast between the Eastern Orthodox Churches and the Eastern Rite Catholic Churches (the Uniate Churches). All of these cultural interactions gained a special dimension when considered over against the tremendous advance and development of the printed book, the

Gutenberg revolution. The media was influent at that time, as it is today, and communication of ideas and policies became all of a sudden a tremendous force in the world of faith.

This is the world in which Meletios Pegas (patriarch of Alexandria, 1590-1601), became very aware of the need for survival and for cultural progress (at least, adaptation). He let Cyril Loukaris to succeed him (1601-1620), paving his way towards becoming a very famous patriarch of Constantinople (1621-1638). Many studies focused on Cyril Loukaris's challenges, achievements and short-comings, and saw him mainly as a major hero of the Greek Orthodox Church attempt to survive the rule of the Ottoman Empire and the pressures of Rome. Among those Orthodox leaders who reacted against Cyril Loukaris and his leanings towards Protestantism, quite notable was the response of Peter Moghila, the metropolitan of Kiev. Usually, theological and history articles focus on his role as a promoter of Conservative Orthodox beliefs and practices, in the context of promoting the Orthodox identity of the Ruthenians (Old Russians and Ukrainians), while they were part of the Poland-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

This article draws attention that, despite the fact that these two major Orthodox leaders where in different ideological camps, within the Orthodox Church, Loukaris and Moghila arguably shared the same spiritual and political aims and even methods, and provided the means of a fruitful interaction with the Protestant Churches.

Meletios Pegas (1549-1601): supraviețuirea Ortodoxiei Răsăritene

This parallel between C. Loukaris and P. Moghila, actually a parallel between the Constantinople (Central European) and Romanian-Ukrainian (Eastern European) Orthodox cultural policies, needs to look first, in a short review, at the life of the Alexandria patriarch Meletios (or Meletie) Pegas (1549-1601). He was the uncle of C. Loukaris and was born in Crete, studied medicine and philosophy in Padua, Italy, and became patriarch of Alexandria (1590-1601), while also serving as an overseer (epitiritis, deputy) patriarch of the Ecumenical Patriarchy in Constantinople (1596-1598). During his studies at Padua, he became acquainted with Roman-Catholic theologians, and this explains why he nurtured a certain admiration towards Thomas Aquinas, although he did not embrace all of latter's theology. Studying in Padua and Venice, where there lived a sizeable Greek community, was bound to accommodate students to the world of Roman-Catholic influence, which proved for some an excellent opportunity for higher education and for others, an ideological and religious trap and temptation to change the Church.

Due to the fact that since Stephen III, the Great (1433-1504), of Moldavia, the kings of the Romanian principalities acted as patrons of the Orthodox Church, in a very Byzantine style, wishing to support the Church and to interfere, as well, in the politics of the Ottoman Empire, Meletios found himself in a close relationship with these kings, in several directions. He kept an active correspondence with both the Wallachian kings (e.g., Michnea, the Turk, 1564-1601) and with the Moldavian ones (such as Peter the Lamé, 1537-1594, and Jeremiah Moghila, 1555-1606) and particularly mediated between the Sultan Mehmed III, and king Michael II, the Brave (Michael II of Wallachia, 1558-1601). This is surprising, given the fact that Michael II was openly rebellious towards Mehmed III, and tried to unify the three Romanian principalities under his rule (1601). Yet he was also a keen supporter of Orthodoxy and tried some third party alliances with Sigismund Bathory of Transylvania and with Rudolf II, the Holy Roman Emperor, opposing to the full Ottoman control over Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania. Thus, Meletios was very aware that Michael II did consistently support the Orthodox Churches in Russia, Ukraine (Poland-Lithuania), with important finance, as well as those in Greece (Mount Athos). This was highly important as they were under the Turkish dominion and were also facing constant Jesuit pressure.

In fact, this was the policy of both Michael II, of Wallachia, and of Jeremiah Moghila, of Moldavia. In particular, Michael II and Jeremiah Movilă tried both to help the Orthodox Church of Poland-Lithuania to oppose the Union of Brest (1595). As the patriarchal residence was confiscated by the sultan Murad III, the Constantinople patriarchs lived in the Constantinople palace of the Walachian Romanian princes (1586-1600). Jeremiah Moghilă helped the building of new residence of the Constantinople patriarchs. Later, king Basile Lupu of Moldavia, would generously contribute for the financial recovery of the Patriarchy, after Turkish confiscations.

In Transylvania, turned autonomous after the Turks briefly conquered Hungary (1526-1541), the Protestant Churches were very well received, and the Catholic prince Stephan Bathory, joining Michael II of Wallachia, even accepted to establish an Orthodox metropolitanate of Transylvania (1577-99). This was abolished, however, in 1701, by emperor Leopold I, of the Holy Roman Empire, who decreed that the Orthodox Church in Transylvania should become a Uniate Church. This decision led to a strong crisis which lasted until the Edict of Toleration in 1769, when the Orthodox Church was acknowledged, again, although only as an "Eastern Greek Cult". True acceptance of Eastern Orthodoxy in the Habsburg empire was regained only after the Edict of 13 October 1781, of emperor Joseph II.

Patriarch Meletios was, then, a very important witness and actor in the middle of all these efforts of survival and reorganizing of the Eastern Orthodox Church. Trained himself in the West, he knew that the way forward for the Orthodox Church was bound to rely on establishing alliances with the other Churches and in developing the spiritual strength and identity of the Orthodox believers. He knew that times were very unstable and the strengths as well as the internal weaknesses of the Orthodox Churches were quite evident.

Cyril Loukaris (1570/72-1638): înnoirea Ortodoxiei Răsăritene

Born also in Crete, in Herakleion, as a nephew of Meletios Pegas, Constantine Loukaris (1570/72-1638) was sent to study, like his uncle before, classical studies in Venice and Padua. Here he learned the passion for printing, too, from Maximos Margounios. This was the right thing to do, at the time, for the aristocratic families of Crete, for the island was under the control of Venice, as the Venetian Kingdom of Candia, 1205-1669. Venice was rather Roman-Catholic in her religious profile, although the city inherited a strong Byzantine influence. Thus, young Constantine became acquainted with both Church traditions.

In Padua, Loukaris had as a colleague, the future king of Wallachia, Michnea Radu the 9th, or Michael Bassaraba (1611-16, 1620-1623), with whom he kept in touch in the following years, and was helped by him. Upon his return, in 1594, Constantine was ordained as monk, and changed his name to Cyril, Cyril Loukaris.

In 1595, Cyril was sent by the patriarch Meletios, to Poland, to the orthodox prince Basil of Ostrog, ruler of Wolhynia, to prevent if possible the Council of Brest-Litovsk (June 1595), where the Orthodox Churches in Poland were called to join Rome as Catholic Churches of the Eastern Rite (Uniates). Cyril was the exarch sent to express the views of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Constantinople, to king Sigismund III, of Poland-Lithuania.

The Roman offer was to accept the authority of the Pope and the doctrine of the Roman-Catholic Church, while being granted the right to keep the Eastern form of liturgy, the Communion in both

forms, the Julian calendar, and the marriage of the priesthood. Cyril arrived too late to influence or prevent the Union. He did participate, however, to the second Council of Brest, in 1596, yet his influence was not very high. The Council endorsed the Union and their submission to Pope Clement VIII. Cyril had enough time, though, to visit the huge region and learn about the lives of the Orthodox believers in Poland-Lithuania and in the Romanian countries.

In 1601, Meletios called him back to Alexandria, for his last days arrangements. On his return journey, Cyril visited king Jeremiah Moghila of Moldavia, in March-May 1601, in Jassy, the capital of Moldavia. He had a number of meetings there, being invited to preach and address the priests. Soon, after arriving in Alexandria, he became patriarch when only 29 of age, and 20 years later he was elected Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople (1590). The election ceremony was held in the Dutch embassy of Constantinople, for the Dutch ambassador, Cornelius von Haga, was a great supporter and a long-term ally of Loukaris. It was through him that, later, Loukaris met the famous Calvinist theologian, Johannes Uytenbogaert. The other great friend and influencer of Loukaris was Antoine Lèger, the Calvinist chaplain of the Dutch embassy in Constantinople. Loukaris also established good relationships with the English ambassadors, Eduard Barton and sir Paul Pindar.

Cyril's five years spent in the Poland, helped him understand how the Counter-Reformation was getting increasingly victorious in these lands. These experiences convinced him that Constantinople needed a sort of „counter-Romanization Reformation”, with the help of an active Orthodox - Protestant alliance.

Some scholars wondered whether Cyril was too heavily influenced by the Protestants in Constantinople - or in the Netherlands, especially by the Dutch and English ambassadors, in writing his bold Orthodox Confession of Faith and in adopting new Church reform policies. However, he seems rather himself convinced that the only way to survive was a sort of return ad fontes, while this did not mean a de facto departure from the traditional Orthodox worship and beliefs (veneration of saints, of icons, etc.).

Loukaris was very keen on establishing new orthodox schools, on encouraging the translation of the Scripture in the vernacular Greek, and on printing good books for the Orthodox readers. The Jesuits themselves were interested via their Propaganda Fide program, in a cultural renewal, in the printing of new books, and in developing good, outstanding and influential schools, so, Cyril's policy was very bold and very realistic, too.

II.A. High standard Orthodox schools

Education in good Orthodox schools was a priority. Or, such schools were very much missing. The Jesuits strategy, and even sometimes, the Protestant strategy, as well, was to attract the young people in their own denominational schools and subminate the Orthodox community, more that equipping it for the future. On their part, the Jesuits tried to attract the Orthodox Churches on the Uniate camp, and create a group of Orthodox leaders that would favour the Roman-Catholicism, anyway, in liturgy and politics, thus creating a powerful “crypto-Roman party” within the Orthodox Church.

As a an early response, according to the mission he has formally received, while in Poland, C. Loukaris has reorganized the school in Vilna, and then also founded a Greek school for the education of the Greek Orthodox people, in Lviv. Despite his efforts, the need for good schools and proper education in the Orthodox regions was still a great need, one hundred years later.

Going back to Constantinople, Loukaris invited Theophilus Korydalleus, the famous Greek scholar from Venice, to restructure the old patriarchal Academy. After his arrival, the Academy adopted a new curriculum using sacred texts and classical Greek, Latin, and neo-Aristotelian philosophy.

Also, Cyril Lucaris sent talented Greek theologians to study further in universities in Holland, Switzerland, and England, at Oxford, where he himself has spent quite a number of years. In 1616, Loukaris sent Metrophanes Kritopoulos to England to spend five years at Balliol College, then travel extensively in German lands and Switzerland before coming back to the East and eventually became the Patriarch of Alexandria in 1636.

In Constantinople, there was an on-going political and religious competition to win the favor of the Sultan. The Sultan's palace was aware of it and was ready to lend its support, to the highest bidder. The Protestant countries, like the Netherlands, had to face the redoubtable force of the Roman-Catholic France, the main ally of the Ottomans in Europe. The French actively supported the Jesuit and Capucin missions and opposed the Orthodox and Protestant initiatives, in all areas, including education and printing. In time, France did establish twin schools in Izmir, Pera and Paris, for their students from the East, especially the Paris school, where these students could grow sympathetic towards France, even turn Roman-Catholic.

II.B. Translating the Bible in modern Greek, and even the Quran

Following his renewal programme step by step, Loukaris commissioned Maximus Kallipolites, a monk from Gallipoli, to translate the New Testament in vernacular Greek. The project took place amid much opposition, for many Orthodox leaders saw it as close to blasphemy, for nobody should try to replace the old Greek testimony of the apostles. For others, making the Bible available to all people meant to push them towards misinterpreting the authentic divine message.

The work began in March 1629, yet Maximus died in 1633. Cyril had then to finish himself and read the proofs. The actual printing of the modern Greek translation of the New Testament took place later at Geneva in 1638, being published by Pierre Aubert. Cyril did not live to see the great event, since he was executed by the Ottoman authorities in 1638, in Constantinople. This was not the first translation of parts of the NT, into modern Greek, yet it was the first complete one.

Another great gesture related to Bible translation and communication was the fact that Cyril brought the Codex Alexandrinus (A) from Alexandria (or mount Athos) and made it a gift to king Charles I of England, in 1628. Coming from the 5th century, this Greek Codex contains the Septuagint, the New Testament and the Epistles of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians (I and II). In 1753 it went into the British Museum. Cyril was thus very active in bringing the Bible in the hands of the modern reader, according to the best extant sources, and in the language of the people.

His interest in defending the Gospel, took Loukaris even in the world of the Quran. He tried to translate the Quran into Greek, so that scholars may better interact with it and refute its views. This made perfect sense in a world where the Orthodox Churches were to a very high degree under Ottoman control. Cyril Loukaris left an important legacy in view of the modernization of Orthodoxy, in the Ottoman Empire. He, for example, was the one who convinced the Orthodoxy, to leave in 1628 the ancient dating from the beginning of the world, and replaced it with the more modern dating method from Jesus Christ' birth.

In terms of his interest in the Quraan, it is worth mentioning a very similar initiative from the part of Martin Luther (1483–1546). In 1542 Luther intervened that a Swiss publisher named Johannes Oporinus (1507–1568), may let be free from imprisonment, and publish the Quran in Latin. The translation was printed in 1543, complete with a preface penned by Luther himself.

II.C. Encouraging good Christian literature

Good literature and good education were extremely needed in the Orthodox Church. The main enemies of Cyril reforms, from inside the Orthodox community, were “ignorance” and “superstition”. Lack of reading and preaching was so spread among the priests that the pulpit disappeared as a piece of furniture in their Orthodox churches. Therefore, Cyril acted in two major directions, to encourage the writing and the printing of good books.

While staying in Poland (1595-1600), as instructed, Cyril set up a printing house at Vilna to publish books for the Orthodox people. Later, in 1627, Cyril started a printing house in Constantinople for the publishing of spiritually refreshing Orthodox literature. He was helped by Nicodemus Metaxas, a Greek trained in London. The press was the first in the Greek world and printed mainly anti-Catholic literature.

In fact, the Jesuits (Congregatio de Propaganda Fide) were first in this race, and started a printing press in Rome, one year before (1626). Noticing the competition, the French ambassador to the Ottoman Court, in Constantinople, Savary de Brèves de Cessy, a great sympathiser of the Jesuits, managed to attack and destroy the press, with the help of some Ottoman order forces, in 1628. In order to restart it, Cyril had to rely on Antoine Leger, the Dutch chaplain.

Among the books printed by Cyril was, of course, his Confession of Orthodox Faith, *Confessio Christianae Fidei*, printed first in Latin at Geneva, in 1629, and then in Greek in 1633. In 1631, the authentic Greek translation of the Confession was published together with the original Latin text. Eight pages written in Latin were immediately translated into English; four translations were made later in French and one in German. The entire work was later translated into French in 1631 and, later, into English, in 1671.

Cyril dedicated this Confession to Cornelius van Haga, the Dutch ambassador in Constantinople, who supported very much his ministry, and it was considered an Orthodox Confession with a certain strong Calvinistic emphasis. A strong Orthodox reaction was soon to be known, yet only after Loukaris' death. Six Orthodox councils condemned Cyril's Confession: four in Constantinople (1638, 1642, 1672, 1691), one in Jassy (1642); and one in Bethlehem (1672). It has received, in response, two other Orthodox Confessions of Faith, one of Peter Moghila, metropolitan of Kiev (1633–1647) and the other by Dositheos, Patriarch of Jerusalem (1669–1707). Interestingly, although both aimed at correcting Loukaris, they both departed in certain points from the traditional tenets of Eastern Orthodoxy and displayed a tendency to use Roman-Catholic arguments.

Cyril's Confession of Faith was built in eighteen articles with four questions appended. He considered that in the case of difficult passages, the faithful should seek the help of teachers who are Orthodox. However, he did not presuppose that Scriptures are the monopoly of the few learned theologians. On the contrary, the authority of the Scripture is based on the Holy Spirit and is higher than that of the Church, where people could still err. For him, all the believers are “the saints” and are “elected”. He is very Protestant on Predestination and Election, on salvation through faith, and on justification by faith and not by works. He admitted only two sacraments, Baptism and Eucharist, and is explicitly

against the Roman-Catholic teaching on the Purgatory. Through its evident shortness (in contrast with Peter Moghila's much longer Confession), Cyril's synthetic mind provides the Orthodox believer with an important Constitution or Axioms of Faith, from which, the reader can develop his or her own system and Creed.

Cyril accepted the veneration of the saints, yet only as good examples of Christian character, not as saints to worship to. In a similar way, he accepted icons, too, yet only as historical forms of art and decoration.

Interestingly, in all this, Loukaris did not feel he betrayed Orthodoxy. He aimed in fact, in our opinion, at being rather Biblical, as opposed to Protestant innovations or to Roman liturgical traditions or authority claims, and, as well, as opposed to Orthodox superstitions themselves. This is why he really wanted to write a Confession, not a Refutation, and was looking for a Renouveau, not for a Reform.

Peter Moghila (1596-1646): restaurarea și consolidarea Ortodoxiei Răsăritene

Peter Moghila (old Romanian; Petru Movilă, modern Romanian, or Petro Mohyla, Ukrainian, 1596-1646) was a Moldavian (Romanian) prince, who took refuge in his youth to his relatives in Ruthenia (Volhynia, Ukraine), then part of Poland-Lithuania. After receiving a mixed private and public education, in his youth, and studying military arts, he served under king Sigismund III, of Poland. After a number of unsuccessful plans and attempts to accede to the Moldavian throne, Peter took the cloth and became an Orthodox monk (1625). He became archimandrite of the Caves Monastery (1627, when 30 years old) and, later, metropolitan of Kyiv (1633-1646).

Peter was born in Suceava, the capital of Moldavia, in 1596. His father, Simion, was the brother of Jeremiah Moghila, then king (voievod) of Moldavia, and of Gheorghe (George) Moghila, the Orthodox metropolitan of Moldavia, in 1588-1589 (an orthodox leader with a certain sympathy towards the Roman-Catholic Church). Simion Moghila himself was for a short time, 1600-1601 and 1601-1602, king of Wallachia, with the help of Poland-Lithuania, when Michael II, the Brave, has lost his kingdom. On his father's family, Peter was also the grandson of king Peter Rareș of Moldavia (1483-1546), and the grand-grandson of Stephan II, the Great, one of the most famous king of Moldavia (1433-1504, who ruled between 1457-1504, one of the longest rules amongst Romanian kings).

Peter fled to Poland-Lithuania with his mother, Marghita (Margareta), after his father Simion was killed in September 1607. The murder was very possibly plotted by Ecaterina, Jeremiah Moghila's wife, who after her husband's death, wanted the Moldavian throne for her son, not for her husband's relatives. So, Peter embraced an ecclesiastical career, instead, although he usually emphasised he is a prince from a royal Moldavian family. His royal connections were not only on the Moldavian side, but also on the Polish side. Stefan Potocki, voivode of Braclav, married his sister Maria, and Michal Wisnowiecki, great nobleman of Braclav, married Peter's sister, Regina. Michal's son, Jeremy Wisnowiecki, was one of the greatest Polish military commanders and his son, in turn, called also Michal, Peter's grand-nephew, became king Michal I Koribut, of Poland-Lithuania.

For a short while, Peter and his mother lived in Kamianets-Podilskyi (1607-1608), yet from 1608 until 1620 they moved to the castle of their family relative Stanislaw Zolkiewski, a military commander of Poland-Lithuania (1547-1620), in Dziadziłow (Diadyliv). Stanislaw was also, a great sympathizer of the Movilești family and had helped Jeremiah Moghila to accede the throne. Peter's education started here in Lviv (Lemberg - at that time), in private, and with the Lviv Orthodox Brotherhood (Bratstvo). Then he continued at the Zamoyski Academy founded by the Polish Chancellor Jan Zamoyski (also known as Hippaeum Zamoscianum). Later, Peter's studies continued in Paris.

In terms of linguistic and religious heritage, Peter Moghila found himself on the side of the Slavonic Orthodox world, yet he understood very well the importance of the Latin, Roman-Catholic culture. Many consider that he was very aware of Latin and Polish as political languages in the Polish Commonwealth, while the Old Slavonic (Ukrainian or Rus language), were used at home. However, there is another perspective that should be known.

His Romanian cultural matrix combined the virtues of a speaking a Latin language, Romanian (that helped him learn with great ease Latin, French, and Greek), with an Orthodox setting of mind, expressed via Greek and Slavonic cultures. From a linguistic point of view, the Moghila family found itself in two different and similarly challenging bilingual cultures. First, while in Moldavia, they spoke a Latin language, Romanian, and the official documents were in Slavonic. Second, here, in Ruthenia, they spoke Slavonic at home, while Latin was used in official documents, in Poland-Lithuania. So, he felt deeply the linguistic tension of his culture, yet he was in a special way, very prepared to face it.

Using Church Slavonic was thought as "barbaric", in Poland, while the use of Latin was international and elevated. Peter Moghila reportedly said quite often "We shall have Greek ad chorum [for church use], and Latin ad forum [for political use]. Adopting a policy of cultural reform and resistance, in the name of Ruthenian culture, Peter Moghilă was helped, as well, by the common 16-17th century ideology, according to which Moldavians and Ruthenians had common ancestors. While identifying themselves as old Rus, Ruthenians claimed to descend of Sarmatians, the old tribe of Roxolani, while Moldavians were proud to see themselves as descending also from old Sarmatians, yet from the tribe of Jazyges, to which history added the major Roman influence, both ethnically and linguistically. Moldavia has always had, and still has, Jassy, as their cultural capital. Thus, Peter shared with Ruthenians, their use of Greek and Slavonic, their Eastern Orthodoxy brotherhood, their need for survival, as well as something of a common ancient origin.

There is an amazing amount of data on Peter Moghila, written in the last decades, after 1989, when the Ukraine and Romania became free from Soviet rule, yet the present article will focus now on a rather specific thesis. Although from a point of view Peter Moghila was sitting in a different camp than Cyril Loukaris, while both were Eastern Orthodox believers, he still followed the same general aims and even methods in looking for a revival of Orthodoxy and for ensuring its survival in the modern world.

III.A. High standard Orthodox schools

The state of public education in the 16th century Ruthenian territory was, thus, a matter of concern. Church supported schools trained mainly for the Church administration and needs, and most of the study was conducted in Greek and Slavonic. Meanwhile the standards were set by the Jesuit colleges. In less than half a century (1565-1600) they started 36 schools in Poland-Lithuania, and 23 were in Ruthenia. Their main teaching language was Latin. The Ruthenians were suffering from this specific cultural tension, being culturally and ethnically Ruthenian, yet politically - Polish citizens. The formula *gente Ruthenus, natione Polonus*, was straining the integration education of the Polish Orthodox to the maximum.

One of the early Ruthenian responses came in the form of religious lay confraternities (Bratstvo) focused mainly on Church education. Lviv Bratstvo taught Church Slavonic and Greek (no Latin). In Vilna, their curriculum included Ruthenian, Greek, Latin and Polish. In Brest (1590), these schools taught liturgical singing and Church Slavonic, Ruthenian, Greek, Polish, and Latin. In Minsk and Luck, and Kiev, things were quite similar.

In particular, in the Kyiv schools, Polish and Latin were added when Peter Moghila became the archimandrite of the Kyivan Lavra. When Moghila was elected as metropolitan of Kiev (1632-1647), he created this school, the Kyivan or Lavra Academy, which was one of the first Orthodox theological schools in Ukraine. To be sure, it was preceded by the Collegium in Ostrog (1585), founded by Prince Ostrozhskij, yet it reached a greater fame and influence.

Peter organized the school at Kyiv according to the Jesuits model, trying to fight them with their own methods. The school, thus, included five years of study: infima, grammatica, syntaxima, poetica, and rhetorica. The initiative was met with some sharp and nationalistic opposition from the conservative Orthodox teachers, who were afraid of apostasy and even threatened Moghila's life and that of his lecturers. Moghila's skilful solution was to get the two schools united. So, the Lavra Academy (started by him in 1631) and the Kyiv school of the Ephiphany Bratstvo, were brought together, in the famous Moghila Academy (1632). His emphasis on poetics and rhetorics, was both beneficial, as a bit idealistic. It was said at times that the Moghila Academy was producing more poets and Orthodox bards, than theologians and apologetes.

For a while, the school was supported with the income of the Moghila lands in Rubejovka. In the following years, Peter Moghila has started other schools as well in Ukraine (Ruthenia, Poland), such as a second Academy in Vinnytsia, and a College in Kremenits, and others. In addition, Mohyla was directly involved in the founding of an Orthodox college in Iassy, where he sent a team of teachers from the Mohyla College led by Sofronii Pochasky.

III.B. Bible exegetical studies, good Orthodox literature

Although Peter Moghila did not try to translate the whole Scriptures, like Cyril Loukaris, he was interested in the reading and the study of the Bible. For example, in 1637 he published an exegetical edition of the Four Gospels.

Moghila published several books related to the Orthodox liturgy, such as Triodion (1631), a collection of poems and sermons: The Cross of Christ the Savior and of Every Man (1632, *Krest Khrysta Spasytelia i kazhdoho cheloveka*), an Antologhion (1636), the Sluzebnik (Missal, 1639), and the Great Trebnik (Euchologion, or Sacramentary, 1646, where he revised the Orthodox ritual).

In a writing named Lithos (Gr. Stone) 1644, he examined the right and the need of the Ruthenian to use both Greek and Slavonic, for the Church liturgy, and Latin, for the state matters. This double usage was challenged, for different reasons, by several parties: by the Orthodox conservatives, the innovative Uniates, and by the superiority-conscious Roman-Catholics. Moghila argued, overwhelmingly, for the retaining of both cultures and languages in the life of the Ruthenians, as Orthodox believers and as Polish citizens.

Further, he wrote Short Scientific Essays about Points of the Faith and planned an edition of the Bible, as well as a Lives of the Saints, which he could not complete, for he died in 31 Dec., at Kyiv.

By far, his best known work is the Orthodox Catechism (or Orthodox Confession of Faith, 1640), printed originally as *Expositio fidei Ecclesiae Russiae Minoris*. The Confession was counter-signed by Patriarch Partenios I, and then, also by other patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. In places, it was modified after being submitted to the Council of Jassy in 1642. Meletios Syrigos, a former protege of Cyril Loukaris, turned into an active critic of Loukaris, was instrumental in the evaluation and translation of Peter's work from the original Latin into Greek (later, the Confession was translated in several languages, including arabic).

A master-piece of Orthodox exposition, Moghila's Confession is built around the three virtues of Christian life: faith, love, and hope. Very Pauline and also, a bit Talmudic in its approach, Peter's Confession structure is creative and it allows for a good exposition of Scripture and of Tradition, explaining progressively the basis of the Orthodox-Catholic and Apostolic faith.

In the first part, about Faith, the Confession asks and answers 126 questions about different articles of Christian faith. Its general structure is given by the statement of the Niceean Creed. The second part, on Hope, answers 63 questions and is structured around the Lord's prayer and Jesus' Beatitudes on the Sermon on the Mount. The third part on Love answers 72 questions and focuses on various qualities of Christian character and on holy life, ending with a special focus on the Ten Commandments. Through its length and detailed presentation, Peter's Confession is a brilliant work of concise Bible exegesis and detailed Church Creed discussion. It is rather a Catechism, very similar, in a way, to Luther's Shorter and Longer Catechisms.

Aimed at replacing the Calvinist statements from Cyril Loukaris' Confession, Peter Moghila's Confession was criticized, as well, for certain leanings towards Roman-Catholicism. Dositheos, the Patriarch of Jerusalem (1669-1707), tried to compose as well a counter-Confession, to replace that of Loukaris, yet his also was criticized for deviating in places from the mainstream Orthodox tradition. However, after Peter Moghila's death, in 1672, his Confession was adopted as the Orthodox Standard Catechism by the Synod of Jerusalem. All have appreciated his balance in presenting and defending the Orthodox tradition, in opposition to the counter-arguments used by the Reformers and the Roman-Catholic Counter Reformers.

In his efforts to produce new good books for the Orthodox reader, Peter Moghila was very active in encouraging the printing of liturgy and Bible study texts. At Lavra Pecerska he was busy with printing for about two decades, from 1616 on, often type-setting the texts himself, and teaching the new apprentices. He brought the best printing masters and engravers at this press at Lavra Pecerska. The books he printed included all kind of titles, among which his own, of course: biblical texts, sermons, liturgy, scientific discussions, poetry. Between 1616-1654 the Lavra Press printed 80 books, out of which 12 in Polish and Latin, and the rest in Ruthenian (Old Slavonic, Ukrainian) and some in Greek. There was really difficult to print books in Greek, as well as in Polish and Latin, in this ultra-conservative Rus context. Due to the Russian aversion and distrust for foreign books, Greek clergy were not able to start a Greek press in Moscow, for example, in the 17th century, although they were led by Patriarch Dositheos.

Peter supported printing outside Ukraine, as well, for example, in the Romanian kingdoms. He provided king Matei Basarab of Wallachia with printing presses, in the monasteries at Govora-Vâlcea (1637), Dealu (Târgoviște) and Câmpulung (1630s). Then, he also sent a printing press to metropolitan Varlaam

of Moldavia, who placed it in the Three Hierarchs Monastery in Jassy. Here he produced the first Romanian printed book, *Cazania lui Varlaam* (The Sermons of Varlaam, 1643). The Church books printed there followed the model of the Kyivan editions.

III.C. Influencing Eastern European culture

Peter Moghila's influence on his time was far-reaching and diverse. He managed to defend Orthodoxy at a time of immense extinction pressure and adopt a series of important spiritual survival measures. On a first level, Eastern Orthodoxy needed to be saved from lack of education and from extreme Slavonic nationalism, from the grab of the ultra conservative Orthodox. There was a problem of identity and of performance, of heritage and of spiritual growth. Peter Moghila was able to use the history of the Church and the talent of the local Ruthenians, in order to trigger a major revival.

Peter Moghila was then able to use Roman-Catholic heritage, influence and models, such as the Jesuits schools and their academic curriculum, and the rich heritage of Latin scholarship, as useful tools in his reform actions. He did so while emphasizing the Eastern Orthodox identity and her own heritage. He has the merit of acknowledging that the Eastern Orthodoxy has much to learn from the Latin West, yet it has a liturgical and theological richness of herself, that needs to be highlighted and developed through creative effort. He himself composed religious poems, songs, new liturgies to be used for special celebrations and royal functions. Under his influence, the Kyiv Church Council accepted the new editions of Orthodox Liturgy prepared at the Lavra Pecerska Monastery, such as *Liturgikon* (1629), in Church Slavonic (Ukrainian) and *Passia* (Great Lent service).

In 1629 the Kyiv Church Council affirms the new edition of «*Liturgikon*» in Church Slavonic language (Ukrainian version), prepared and issued in the Kyivan Caves Monastery. This edition marked the beginning of the forming the culture of the codification of the liturgical text. The Kyiv Church Council of 1629 also accepted the *Passia*, the new Great Lent service, which united traditional Great Lent texts with meditations about sacramental contents of the passions of Jesus Christ.

He ensured a certain academic and political balance in his discourse, being able to acknowledge the performances of the Catholic Latin culture and, as well, the value of Protestant teachers and Protestant approaches. His moderate model of Orthodox Survival was regarded with some suspicion, yet it proved solidly built, easy to adjust and very successful.

The width of Moghila's views can be noticed as well, in the books he used to hold on his library. Apart from *Catechismus Romanus*, he used to consult books like the *Summa doctrinae Christianae* by Peter Canisius, and the post-Tridentine liturgical publications, such as *Breviarum Romanum* (1568), *Missale Romanum* (1570), *Pontificale* (1596), *Ceremoniale* (1600) and *Rituale Romanum* (1614). Moghila's interests went beyond theology proper and extended to other subjects of the time, like medicine, arithmetic, philosophy. He provided the Lavra Academy with many books on many subjects. For him, Greek books were expensive, and few, while Latin books were by far more affordable, in much greater number (copies), and dealt with many subjects.

A number of Orthodox scholars have criticised Moghila's Latinising spirit, as reflecting a crypto-Romanist policy. However, he was just a realist Orthodox leader, and reflected the mixt character of his world, a "mixture of Western constructs with Eastern theology". The truth is that Moghila's reform - or revival - "remained within the Eastern Rite tradition, although he used previously unfamiliar methods of reform".

Moghila extensively used his properties to support the restoration of old, medieval Churches in the area of Kyiv, such as Saint Sophia Cathedral, the Church of the Tithes, the churches at the Cave Monastery, the Transfiguration Church in Berestove, Saint Michael's Church at the Vydubychi, and the Church of the Three Saints.

Conclusions

Cyril Loukaris, the patriarch of Constantinople, and Peter Moghila, the metropolitan of Kiev, realized in the 16th -17th centuries, the need for survival and spiritual renewing in the Orthodox Churches. The sources of trouble were at that time the force of Ottoman conquest and ruling, the narrow nationalism and cultural protectionism of the ultra-conservative Eastern Orthodox communities and leaders (such as Russians - or Ruthenians, or others), the multi-faceted Roman-Catholic pressure towards Uniatism and political control, via political measures, or via cultural movements, like the schools of Jesuits. At the same time, in the years after the Reform, there was a need for spiritual renewing and freshness.

They experienced these needs living in the same world, around the same period in history, travelling to the same places, by and large, interacting with the same people and kings (Greeks, Polish, Lithuanians, Romanians, Ruthenians, Turks, Germans, Italians, French, Hungarians, etc.).

Cyril Loukaris adopted a policy according to which he pursued a renewal in the Eastern-Orthodox Churches, through a partial alliance with the Protestant world. Peter Moghila worked towards a renewal of the Ruthenian and Romanian Orthodox Churches, by designing a two-approach policy, one at the level of the Polish state, and one at the local level of Ruthenian culture and Church life. This led to a dual set of values, and standards in politics, in religious life and in culture, Latin-Polish-Catholic and Slavonic-Greek-Orthodox.

Both leaders thought that it is important to redefine or reformulate the Orthodox Creed, so both produced Orthodox Confessions. Both thought that encouraging high standard education among the Orthodox clergy and believers, was of paramount importance, both thought that improving cultural and religious life via good books and by developing printing presses (under the control of the Church, of course) was of utmost importance.

Both thought that keeping a certain alliance, or at least dialogue and exchange of scholarship, with the Protestant world was beneficial for the schools and for the academic life of the Orthodox, and also for a greater strength in facing the overpowering political force of the Roman-Catholic Church. Peter Moghila was against the Orthodox Confession of Cyril Loukaris, yet in terms of Church policy, both tried a similar type of "spiritual reform" within the Orthodox Church.

Their programme represents a good heritage in engaging a refreshing of spiritual life and Christian culture in the Eastern European countries. As well, it represents a precious historical example for the dialogue between the Evangelicals and the Orthodox. In our contemporary world, there is no need to counter-balance the Roman-Catholic Church policies, at present, yet there is an acute need for answering the questions of the modern seekers when they are challenged by historical events, technological progress, with the pressures or threats of the Islamic world, or with the need for personal and community identity.

The mixed challenges of their world in terms of ethnic and religious identity, in terms of culture, creativity and dialogue, in terms of surviving the pressures of the Islamic world, and in terms of using

the media in order to create a better access to information and a better education in Universities, are still alive today.

Concluzii

Apologetics in the early modern period takes on a very different shape than it had had in earlier centuries. For the Fathers it was a debate about the relative merits of paganism, Judaism, and Christianity. For the medieval theologians, apologetics was a contest among the three great monotheistic faiths—Judaism, Christianity, and Islam—all of which appealed to historical revelation. But after the Renaissance, apologetics had to address thinkers who rejected revelation entirely and who in some cases denied the existence or knowability of God. For the first time in history, orthodox Christians felt constrained to prove the existence of God and the possibility and fact of revelation. In so doing they sometimes conceded too much to their deist adversaries, making it appear that unaided reason could erect a satisfactory natural religion that in many respects reduplicated Christianity itself.

These years did not produce any grand apologetical syntheses comparable in magnitude and depth to those of Augustine and Aquinas. The authors who did compose summas on a vast scale, such as Vives, Mornay, Abbadie, and Paley, were not notable thinkers in their own right. Bossuet, whose *Discourse on Universal History* has a certain grandeur, lacked the learning and critical spirit needed for the full success of his project. Devoted though they were to natural theology, the apologists of this period were too shallow in philosophy to attain a lofty, comprehensive vision of reality comparable to those of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas.

Partly as a result of the weaknesses already noted, the initiative in this period no longer lies with the protagonists of the Christian cause but rather with the adversaries. Seeking to meet the objections of Voltaire and his cohorts, the apologists are vexed and harassed, anxious and defensive. They seem unable to turn the tables on the adversaries by mastering and correcting the new currents of thought—as Origen had done for middle Platonism, Augustine for Neoplatonism, and Aquinas for Averroistic Aristotelianism.

On the positive side, we may take note of progress along systematic lines. Scholastic authors excelled in analyzing the various kinds of apologetical evidence—subjective and objective, deductive and inductive, historical and contemporary. But their work, especially in the seminary manuals, tended to be dry, formalistic, and aprioristic. Treating revelation very abstractly, they failed to communicate a vibrant sense of Christ and His Church. In combination with other approaches, this Scholastic apologetics will eventually feed into the official teaching of the Church, notably at the First Vatican Council.

The efforts of some Scholastics, Catholic and Protestant, to construct fully demonstrative and quasi-mathematical proofs for the truth of Christianity (Huet, Elizalde, Gonzalez, Wolff) are generally recognized to be unsuccessful. At the opposite extreme were skeptics who called for blind faith to compensate for the feebleness of human reason (Montaigne, Charron). In exploiting skepticism they were playing with a dangerous instrument that could easily be turned against faith itself.

Pascal, building on the work of the skeptical fideists, sets forth with singular power the contrast between “reasons of the heart”, serviceable in apologetics, and “reasons of the mind”, valid in the scientific sphere. His insight into the role of subjectivity in the decision of faith strikes a modern, existential note.

The British and German apologists in their dialogue with deism grappled seriously with the relationship between the natural sciences and Christian evidence. This problem, which seemed to have been solved in a way favorable to biblical faith by the time of Paley, was to break out with new virulence in the nineteenth century, especially in connection with the theory of evolution.

British apologists such as Butler and Paley, building on the empiricism of Locke and Hume, made effective use of probabilities and presumptions in apologetics. While their common-sense approach injected a healthy note of realism, they sometimes fell into an unfortunate legalism that their greater disciple, Newman, was to detect and correct.

Partly through the assaults of adversaries such as Spinoza and Reimarus, modern biblical criticism began to develop in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Moderate Christian thinkers, such as Simon, Grotius, Leclerc, and Lardner, made use of this incipient science to enrich their apologetics. Controversialists such as Houtteville advanced the discipline of historiography.

The almost exclusive insistence on biblical and historical evidences in the eighteenth century involved certain dangers. The “fact of revelation” came to be considered too positivistically as an arbitrary intervention from on high, and the reasonableness of faith was made to depend too much on bookish erudition. Lessing perceived this danger more clearly than his more orthodox opponents, and he pointed to the need for grounding one’s conviction in the contemporary performance of the Church. Many apologists of the nineteenth century, from their own point of view, were to look for present “proofs of the Spirit and of power”.

In summary, then, the centuries considered in this chapter are transitional. Apologetics is beginning to reorient itself, almost reluctantly, to the problems and thought forms of the modern mind and is thus preparing the paths of the future.