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ABSTRACT

Daniel Kałaj (d.1681) was a Polish Reformer of Hungarian background, born in Little Poland (Malopolska) and trained in Franeker, Friesland under some of the most brilliant Reformed theologians of seventeenth-century Europe, such as Cocceius and Cloppenburgh. Kałaj’s ministry in the Reformed Church of Little Poland was abruptly interrupted when he was wrongly accused by Catholic authorities of spreading then-outlawed Arianism and being called a “Calvinoarian.” Kałaj became the first Polish Protestant minister to receive a sentence of capital punishment as a result of the new anti-toleration law issued in 1658 against Arians, under the false pretext of military treason during the Second Northern War (1655-1660). He escaped the ax by fleeing to Lithuania (and later to Gdańsk), where he wrote his best-known work, A Friendly Dialogue between an Evangelical Minister and a Roman Catholic Priest.

The Friendly Dialogue is both Kalaj’s own personal defense and a compendium to Polish Reformed doctrine, which has a strongly irenic disposition. In contrast with many Reformed thinkers of his day, Kalaj is capable of communicating Reformed doctrine in a friendly and peaceful manner. He places special emphasis on the unity of the catholic Church, as expressed in his statement that “the three churches Roman, and Lutheran and Reformed are all part of one true church before God,” while at the same time attempting to retain his Reformed orthodoxy.

The first part of this project describes the social circumstances that impacted Kalaj’s life and work, placing him properly within the historical and theological context of the Reformation and Post-Reformation periods and providing analysis of
his own self-defense against charges of Arianism. The second part examines four theological chapters of Kalaj’s *Friendly Dialogue*, in which Kalaj presents his approach to Scripture, justification, sacraments and the church.

Going beyond the presently-existing literature on Kalaj and seventeenth-century Reformed Polish theology, this dissertation analyzes these key doctrines while setting them against the intellectual trajectory of Reformation and Post-Reformation thought in Western and Central-Eastern Europe. It examines Kalaj’s method and fundamental stances on issues that characterized the significant debates of his time, which went on not only between Reformed theologians but also among Polish Jesuits, Lutherans, and Socinians, as well as the Czech Brethren.
CHAPTER ONE:
HISTORIOGRAPHY

1.1. INTRODUCTION

The need for a better understanding of the nature and character of Polish
Reformed theology in the seventeenth century is the main reason we find it necessary
to engage in this research. In the sixteenth century, “Polish Calvinists” (a pejorative
name given to them by their opponents) gained much influence in Poland and abroad.
The most significant leader of that era, Jan Łaski (Johannes a Lasco, [1499-1560]),
was widely recognized, and his irenic influence continues to be further explored by a
number of Reformation scholars. Because Reformed Polish Christians lost their
influence and were harshly persecuted in the seventeenth century, however, many
assumed that this meant the intellectual death of the Polish Reformed community.
Yet, despite great difficulties, some Evangelicals—as Reformed Polish Christians
preferred to be called—remained in Poland and continued to struggle for their
existence and for doctrinal orthodoxy. In this work, we will explore the life and
theology of one such individual, Daniel Kalaj.

Daniel Kalaj (d.1681) was a Polish Reformer of Hungarian descent who was
born in Little Poland (Malopolska)\(^1\) and trained in Franeker, Friesland, under some of
the most brilliant Reformed theologians of seventeenth-century Europe, such as
Cocceius and Cloppenburgh. Kalaj’s ministry in the Reformed Church of Little
Poland was abruptly interrupted when he was wrongly accused by Catholic
authorities of spreading then-outlawed Arianism and was called, somewhat

---

\(^1\) Malopolska historically was known as an area of southern Poland stretching from
Częstochowa in the west to Lublin in the east, encompassing Kraków. Today, the name is still
in use and refers to one of Poland’s sixteen administrative provinces.
perplexingly, a “Calvinoarian.” He was subsequently sentenced to death for this offense, making him the first Polish Protestant minister to receive a sentence of capital punishment under the new anti-toleration law of 1658. The law was issued against Arians, under the false pretext of military treason during the Second Northern War (1655-1660). Kałaj escaped the ax by fleeing to Lithuania (and later to Gdańsk), where he wrote his best-known work, *A Friendly Dialogue Between an Evangelical Minister and a Roman Catholic Priest.*

1.2. STATEMENT OF THESIS

The Reformed faith had a longer-lasting impact on the Polish Reformed Church than has often been recognized, specifically in regard to the influence of Polish ministers and theologians trained in Franeker, the Netherlands—a place where many Polish Reformed theologians and pastors found safe haven and in which Polish Reformed theology flourished. Furthermore, through an analysis of Daniel Kałaj’s work, we will demonstrate that he does not fit neatly into the historical trajectory that elevates tolerance at the expense of commitment to Reformed orthodoxy. Rather, he remains almost entirely Reformed in doctrine, combining this with the irenic framework of doctrinal formulation and practice that became characteristic of the Polish Reformation.

---

2 Daniel Kałaj, *Rozmowa przyjcielska ministra ewangelickiego z xiedzem katolickim o księżce jednej w Krakowie, tak rok przeciwko D.K. wydaney ... która roku pańskiego 1671 napisana Eladin a Lacik Ren Mitis Gerson dedicuite y prezentuié* (Gdańsk, 1671).
1.3. The State of the Problem

The theology and history of the Polish Protestant tradition has not been sufficiently researched, especially when it comes to the second half of seventeenth-century thought in Poland. Also, the discussion—carried mostly by historians—lacks a theological dimension that is crucial for a complete understanding of the material. Conversely, significant work has been done on the rise and development of Socinianism in Poland and on the eventual banishment and dispersion of the Polish Brethren. There have been, in addition, some efforts to locate the works of several significant Polish Reformed or “Calvinist” thinkers in the broader context of the

\[3\] Much of the research (mostly on the sixteenth century) has been presented in the Polish journal called Reformacja w Polsce (Reformation in Poland) which, after World War II, was renamed Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce (Rebirth and Reformation Poland). For a comprehensive bibliography of the source please see: Anna Budniewska, Agnieszka Mitura-Karkowska, Bibliografia zawartości czasopisma “Odrodzenie i reformacja w Polsce” v. I-XLIII (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper, 2000); “Biografia roczników Reformacja w Polsce 1921-1956,” Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce 3 (1958): 217-287.

\[4\] Exceptions to this include works such as: Darius Petkūnas, “Holy Communion Rites in the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed Agendas of the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries,” (PhD diss., University of Helsinki; 2004); Kai Eduard Jordt Jørgensen, Ökumenische Bestrebungen unter den Polonischen Protestanten bis zum Jahre 1645 (København: NYT Nordisk Forlag Arnold Busck, 1942).

European Reformation: note here Mikolaj Rej⁶ (1584-1641), Jan Łaski⁷ (1499-1560), Bartholomaeus Keckermann⁸ (1572-1609), Jan Makowski⁹ (Johannes Maccovius, [1588-1644]), and Mikolaj Arnold ¹⁰ (Nicolas Arnoldi, [1618-1680]).

Recent scholarship has also identified significant connections between the Dutch and German Reformed universities and academics in the Reformed communities that continue to exist in Central and Eastern Europe, as evidenced not

---


⁸ Danilo Facca, Bartłomiej Kekermann i filozofia (Warszawa: Instytut filozofii i socjologii PAN, 2005); Joseph S. Freedman, Philosophy and the Arts in Central Europe, 1500-1700: Teaching and Texts at Schools and Universities (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999).


¹⁰ Also known as Nicolaus Arnoldi (1618-1680). For detailed information see: Biografisch Lexicon voor de Geschiedenis van het Nederlandse Protestantisme, vol. 2 (Kampen: Kok, 1978), 37-38.
only by the work of Jan Makowski at Franeker,\textsuperscript{11} John Alsted at Gyulaferhervar,\textsuperscript{12} and Bartholomaeus Keckermann in Gdańsk,\textsuperscript{13} but also by the substantial exchange of students and ideas across Central Europe.\textsuperscript{14} Still, comparatively little work has been done on the ongoing life of the Reformed Church in Poland or on the specifics of its theological development in the seventeenth century under the impact of the rising Counter-Reformation, the success of Roman Catholic attacks on the Socinians, and the altered political context in Poland. In fact, some extant literature gives the impression that seventeenth-century Polish Reformed churches were not truly faithful to Reformed doctrines as expressed in the Reformed confessions.\textsuperscript{15}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[11] Kuyper, Johannes Maccovius, 3-100; Bell, “Propter Potestatem, Scientiam,” 5-29.
  \item[13] Freedman, Philosophy and the Arts, 305-325; Facca, Bartłomiej Keckerman, 15-16.
  \item[15] An exception to this rule we find in Wojciech Kriegseisen, Ewangelicy polscy i litewscy w Epoce Saskiej (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper, 1996).
\end{itemize}
1.4. The State of Research on Daniel Kalaj

English historiography contains little information about Kalaj’s life or his theological contribution. His name is found neither in encyclopedias nor history books, except where Kalaj is briefly mentioned in the English translation of the Polish book by Janusz Tazbir titled, A State Without Stakes.16 In German we find a few more sources, including a small brochure titled, Daniel Kalaj, A Forerunner of Ecumenism, also by Tazbir. Both works provide valuable biographical information about Kalaj and recognize the irenic contribution of this forgotten Polish minister. Tazbir, however, describes Kalaj as a “liberal Calvinist” for whom “Catholics and Protestants are actually members of the same Christian Church, as the basic convergence of ethics and foundational dogmas are more important than the secondary differences of doctrine and rite” and where “religious debate between various faiths was useful” but “to be carried on in an atmosphere of complete freedom of conscience and expression,”17 a perspective from which we will diverge in the following pages. Also in German we find an earlier article by Paul Wrzecionko titled, “Das ökumenische Program der Union von Sandomierz des Bartholomeus Bythner und des Daniel

---


Kałaj’s ideas on religious tolerance were rooted in the Polish irenicism inspired by Erasmus and later developed by Jan Łaski (1499-1560) and Bartłomiej Bythner (1559-1629). Wrzecionko thought Kałaj’s idea of religious tolerance was an unrealistic contribution to the slow decline of Polish Protestantism, since love cannot keep the churches together unless their doctrinal differences are cleared—a condition that proved impossible in the context of the seventeenth-century debates.

Naturally, we find more biographical information about Kałaj in Polish historiography. However, even here the discussion of Kałaj’s theology is unsatisfactory. We find short biographical sketches of Kałaj’s life and work in Szczepanowice in Roman Darowski’s History of the Catholic and Calvinist Churches in Szczepanowice by Dunajec as well as Zbigniew Ogonowski’s, Philosophy and Social Thought of Seventeenth-Century Poland. The most important analysis of Kałaj’s life and work is available in Marek Wajsblum’s “Ex regestro arianismi:


19 Roman Darowski, Szczepanowice nad Dunajcem: Dzieje wsi, parafii katolickiej i gminy kalwińskiej, 2nd ed. expanded (Kraków: Wyższa Szkoła Filozoficzno-Pedagogiczna Ignatianum WAM, 2004), 85-91, 111-112.

Sketches from the History of the Fall of Protestantism in Little Poland.” Wajsblum includes more information than anyone on Kalaj and the seventeenth-century history of Polish Calvinism. His extensive article consists of well-researched background information concerning the persecution of Polish Evangelicals and provides a well-developed and helpful resource. However, even here we do not find an in-depth analysis of Kalaj’s theology. Wajsblum merely fits Kalaj into the established paradigm of the gradual growth of the modern idea of tolerance, which seems to dominate late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century historiography. In this article, Wajsblum argues that Kalaj departed from the rigid Calvinism of the seventeenth century under the Socinian influence that shaped him before and during his studies in Franeker. Tazbir later took up the same argument. In Wajsblum’s view, Kalaj took the teachings of his master, the liberal Johannes Cocceius, and expanded them even further, paving the way for German irenicism and the teachings of the Dutch Collegiate. Wajsblum thus summarizes Kalaj’s contribution to seventeenth-century Polish Calvinism:

…Kalaj departed far from the Polish Calvinism of the seventeenth century…We know well who influenced Kalaj. Without a doubt, while still young, he had to have been impacted by the pure atmosphere of


22 Marek Wajsblum was a secularized and polonized Jew and one of the most famous students of the renowned professor Stanisław Kot. Despite his difficult life and lack of academic opportunities he contributed much to the study of Polish Calvinism in the early twentieth century. He felt particularly passionate about these aspects of Reformation history which related well to the Marxist longing for equality and Esperantists visions for world peace. For more info see Wajsblum’s personal correspondence with professor Kot. Marek Wajsblum, Zawsze byłem Żydem dla Polaków i Polakiem dla Żydów: Listy Marka Wajsbluma do Stanisława Kota z lat 1927-1961, vol. 4, Biblioteka Jagellonica Fontes Et Studia ed. Zdzisław Pietrzyk i Zbigniew Koziński (Kraków: Nakładem Biblioteki Jagiellońskiej, 1996).
the Socinian congregations. While in Franeker the shell of official Calvinist orthodoxy did not prevent Kałaj from being warmed up by the rays of German irenicism and the Dutch religious liberalism of the Collegiants, which were advancing thanks to the lively and future-oriented thought of the professor Cocceius—Kałaj’s own master and guide.  

Next, we find multiple remarks on Kałaj’s crucial role in the development of the education of the Polish Reformed Churches in Stanisław Tworek’s *The Cultural and Pedagogical Activity of Calvinism in Little Poland*. However, Tworek does not seem to provide any new information when it comes to Kałaj’s theology. He writes:

In the Calvinist literature of the period, special attention needs to be given to Daniel Kałaj … [who] discusses the idea of tolerance, so relevant in his own day and life. [His experience] proved the harmful effects of fanaticism and intolerance toward individuals as well as toward whole church communities … His entire doctrine of tolerance was well developed and based on humanitarianism, patriotism and optimism. Unfortunately, his book was not read and made no echo in history; yet it stands as an honorable testimony to the existence of this very relevant and indestructible concept.

---


Finally, we find the most recent reference to Kałaj in the second expanded edition of by Roman Darowski’s history of the Szczepanowice village and its two parishes: Catholic and Reformed. However, Darowski follows the secondary sources and does not discuss Kałaj’s theology.\(^25\)

In sum, although the biographical material on Kałaj’s life seems to be sufficiently discussed in Polish historiography, Kałaj’s theology and its place in the context of Reformation and post-Reformation thought are insufficiently addressed, thus making the goal of this study to further that discussion in an in-depth and thoughtful manner.

1.5. **Method and Outline**

In the first part of this project, we will describe the social circumstances that impacted Kałaj’s life and work, placing him properly within the historical and theological context of the Reformation and post-Reformation periods, filling the biographical gap currently present in the English historiography. Chapter 2, “The Life and Work of Daniel Kałaj,” will concentrate on the history of the persecution Kałaj’s family experienced and examine the situation of Central-Eastern Europe’s Reformed churches in the seventeenth century. We will also discuss Kałaj’s upbringing, education, and the theological treatise he authored—*Apologia pro divinitate salvatoris nostri, contra antiquos et modernos Pharisaeos*—which he wrote while studying at the Reformed Academy in Franeker. Next, we will concentrate on Kałaj’s

---

ministry among the Calvinists of Little Poland to explain how he became associated with the Socinians and was later sentenced to death for “Calvinoarian heresy.” We will conclude this section by commenting on Kalaj’s escape and further work among the Polish-speaking Calvinists in Gdańsk and Lithuania. Chapter 3, “Kalaj’s Irenic Defense in Overview,” will survey the first seventeen pages of the Friendly Dialogue, which include Kalaj’s denial that he authored an anonymous brochure that was used as evidence in his trial. We will analyze the way Kalaj justified his escape and address questions surrounding the authorship and dating of the Friendly Dialogue, which he wrote in exile. In chapter 4, “Irenic Thought in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth,” we will trace the continuities and discontinuities between Reformed, Lutheran, and Catholic irenic thought in Central-Eastern Europe. In this analysis we will search for the governing principles behind the irenic, ecumenical, and tolerant approaches to ecclesiastical union present in early modern Europe, so as to locate Kalaj in his broader context.

In the second part of this dissertation, we will examine the remaining portion of the Friendly Dialogue, in which the particular theological loci of Reformed-versus-Roman doctrine are presented in irenic form. We will explore Kalaj’s method and fundamental stances on issues that characterized the debates of his time—not only among Reformed theologians, but also between Czech Brethren, Catholics, Lutherans, and Socinians—going beyond the presently existing literature on Kalaj and the theology of seventeenth-century Polish Reformed churches. The material discussed here will follow Kalaj’s own ordering of the theological topics, beginning with chapter 5: “The Evangelical Doctrine of Scripture.” In this chapter we will
analyze his understanding of *sola Scriptura* and his responses to the questions of biblical cannon, the proper use of the Bible and reason in exegesis, and the perspicuity and authority of Scripture. Chapter 6, “The Reformed Doctrine of Justification,” will tackle issues related to soteriology, referencing imputed and inherent righteousness and the role of good works in the process of salvation.

“The Calvinist Doctrine of the Sacraments,” chapter 7, will discuss Kalaj’s irenic approach to the five sacraments rejected by Protestants and present his understanding of two—baptism and communion—against the backdrop of the *Sandomierz Confession* of 1570 and other confessions. Chapter 8, “The Irenic Doctrine of the Church,” will be dedicated to Kalaj’s irenic ecclesiology, seeking to reconcile with Reformed orthodoxy some of his most irenic statements, such as the following: “Roman Catholics, Lutherans and Reformed constitute one true Church and people of God”; “It is better to be a good Catholic than a bad Evangelical”; and “A great number of bad Evangelicals will be condemned, and a great number of good Catholics will be saved.” Finally, in chapter 9 we will draw final conclusions about the place and character of Daniel Kalaj’s irenic theology.
PART ONE: BIOGRAPHICAL

CHAPTER TWO: THE LIFE AND WORK OF DANIEL KAŁAJ

2.1. INTRODUCTION

We will begin by bridging the gaps in the English-language historiography of Kalaj’s life and work, his family background, and the complex situation of the Reformed churches in the seventeenth-century Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Each of these elements will assist us later in better understanding the Calvinoarian controversy and will bring insight into Kalaj’s irenic-spirited theological discourse. Our analysis will correspond primarily—but not exclusively—to the findings of Stanisław Tworek as well as Marek Wajsblum (1903-1962), a student of well-known Polish scholar, Stanisław Kot (1885-1975) who has extensively researched the topic in a series of articles titled, “Ex regestro arianismi.” We will also consult a variety of other non-English sources in order to fill in the gaps left by the previous research.

2.2. THREE GENERATIONS OF PERSECUTION

The place and date of Kalaj’s birth is unknown, but it is estimated that he was born sometime in the first half of the seventeenth century in Little Poland and was a descendent of a Hungarian Reformed family. Janusz, his grandfather, was a Protestant goldsmith who came to Poland to serve at the court of Stephen Batory (1533-1586), who in 1576 was elected king of Poland. After Batory’s reign, Janusz decided to remain in Poland and raise his family.
The political situation of the *dissidents in faith*—as Protestants came to be called at the Warsaw Confederation (1573)—was slowly declining. Roman Żelewski, in his book about the history of Protestants in Kraków between 1551-1590, provides us with multiple sources describing the increasing persecution of the Protestant community. His analysis of the presented sources defines three stages in the increasing persecution: (1) growth of Protestant influence (1551-1573), (2) equal sense of power between Catholics and Protestants (1574-1578), and finally (3) rapid waves of intolerance beginning in 1578 toward Protestants.¹

This third stage reached its climax in 1591 with the destruction of the two Protestant congregations in Kraków.² Also, two years later, Kałaj’s grandfather and family were attacked.³ Catholic zealots physically injured Janusz and his wife and plundered their home. However, this did not result in any major criminal or political repercussions, despite the Warsaw Confederation’s act of tolerance (1573). The two students who initiated the attack, Posnaniensis and Calisiensis, were not punished since the university professors denied the students’ involvement in the attack and

---


claimed they were falsely accused. All these events greatly contributed to the exile of Evangelicals from Kraków.

Kałaj’s parents, Michał and Katarzyna, joined the exiles but did not move far, instead settling in their small estate in the village of Chorowice, a few miles outside Kraków. Despite the move, Michał continued to be involved in the city’s Reformed congregation – he was often nominated as a representative to the local church synods, and in 1641 was elected to the office of elder. On 15 August 1643, Michał shared his father’s fate when another group of university students attacked and robbed him in Chorowice. Fortunately, this time the oppressors were brought to justice by the voivode of Krakowian, Stanisław Lubomirski, who ordered a search for the young criminals. The first four were quickly captured, judged, and executed in Kraków. The remaining two at first somehow managed to escape, and later were judged and executed in Tarnów. Although the situation was brought to justice, it did not help Michał to support his family financially, and he sought the church’s help, especially in educating some of his sons. The church responded with generous assistance: Daniel’s older brother, Michał Jr., went abroad to Franeker, which in the seventeenth century was one of the most prestigious Reformed universities in Europe. Daniel

---

4 University professors denied the guilt of the accused university students and argued that the guilty ones were falsely recognized. Zelewski, *Materiały do dziejów*, 192-194.

5 Zelewski, *Materiały do dziejów*, section IX


7 Wajsblum, *Ex Regestro Arianismi*, 245-246.
remained in Poland for a time, studying and working as a tutor at the local church school in the town of Bełżyce, and was not sent to Franeker until some years later.  

2.3. STUDIES IN FRANEKER

That Kałaj and his older brother were sent abroad for education was not unusual in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, especially for children of Protestant families who desired the new generation to be educated in the Protestant spirit (Poland never managed to establish an Evangelical college within its own borders). The University of Franeker thus attracted many Polish students. Throughout the year 1644, more than eighty Poles studied at Franeker, half of whom majored in theology. This high number of Poles was due partially to the very successful and also controversial Polish Reformed theologian Jan Makowski (1588-1644).

---


was born in Łobżenica to the Reformed family of Samuel Makowski, who educated his son in Gdańsk under another famous theologian, Bartholomew Keckermann (d.1601). Jan Makowski traveled and studied in Lublin, Prague, Marburg, Heidelberg, and Lipsk before finally arriving in Franeker in 1613. At the age of twenty-six, he defended his doctorate under Sibrandus Lubbertus (1555-1625) and quickly became one of the youngest professors in the history of the academy. He also married the sister of the artist Rembrandt’s wife. Theologically, Makowski was supralapsarian and a faithful follower of the scholastic method he applied. What made him stand out among all the other professors, however, was his exuberant Slavic personality. It gained him much popularity among the students, who treated him as one of their own.\footnote{One of the students described his favorite professor this way: “What the angelic doctor, the subtle mystic, the profound poet, and the chief master of all the other scholastics have ever said: the one and only Makowsky not at last bequeathed into posterity.” The poem quoted from Andreas Petri, \textit{Loci Communes} (Franeker: Sumptibus Joannis Arcerii, bibliopolae, 1650) after Willem J. van Asselt, “The Theologian’s Tool Kit: Johannes Maccovius (1588-1644) and the Development of Reformed Theological Distinctions,” \textit{Westminster Theological Journal} 68, no. 1 (2006): 23-40.}

When Kałaj’s elder brother Michał arrived in Franeker, Makowski was still alive, and he was able to study under the famous Polish scholar. Daniel Kałaj went to Franeker a few years after Makowski’s death (1644), by which time his brother was no longer there. Fellow student Stanisław Herman accompanied Daniel on his departure from Poland. Both first went to Bremen to take some classes at the city’s gymnasium in preparation for the demanding and much more rigorous program of the University of Franeker. The two Poles did not stay in Bremen long: Stanislaw
transferred to Franeker in January of 1646, while Daniel waited until the end of the academic year.  

Although unable to study under Makowski himself, Kałaj received an excellent education from Johannes Cocceius (1603-1669), one of Makowski’s best students whom the university had hired in 1636. Cocceius’s fame spread quickly as he became widely recognized for his unparalleled language and exegetical skills, which he used in advancing Federal Theology. He held to the more liberal interpretation of the Sabbath, which caused controversy among the Reformed theologians. Throughout his work Cocceius confronted Roman Catholics, Jews, and Socinians.  

Brian Lee’s analysis of Cocceius, Epistolae ad Hebraeos explicatio, cites the following statistic when it comes to Cocceius’s Anti-Socinian polemic:

A brief survey of the text itself indicates clearly which opponent Cocceius has in view. Given the likelihood of a polemical condition and his contemporaneous labors against the Socinians, it is not surprising to find that the work is overwhelmingly oriented against the Socinian errors. About 360 times in the course of the work Cocceius refers to other authors, and at least sixty different individuals are named. References to both “Socinians” in general and individuals such as Socinus, Enjedinus, Wajsblum, Ex Regesto Arianismi, 249; F. Postma and J. van Sluis, Auditorium Academae Franekerensis Bibliographie der Reden, Disputationen und Gelegenenheisdrckwereke der Universitat und des Athenäumus in Franeker, 1585-1843 (Leeuwarden: Fyske Akademy, 1995). Kałaj is mentioned on pages 118-119 and 127.  


Johannes Cocceius, Opera omnia theologica, exegetica, didactica, polemica philologica, vol. 10 (Amsterdam: 1701).  

Johannes Cocceius, Epistolae ad Hebraeos explicatio et eius veritatis demonstratio. Leiden, 1659. 
Smalcius, and Schlichtingius make up over half of all references. If you include Hugo Grotius, whom Cocceius often mentions in the same breath with the Socinians as their “follower” or “disciple” the number of occurrences to this group is two-thirds of the total. While frequent reference is also made to rabbinic literature, it is overall a much smaller percentage, less than ten percent.\footnote{16}

Furthermore, Lee points out that of all the Socinian writers Cocceius mentioned, he most directly pointed his pen against Jonasz Szlichtyng (1592-1661), a prolific member of the Polish Brethren community and co-author of the Racovian Catechism.\footnote{17} Szlichtyng also advocated an ecclesiastical union of the Reformed and Socinian and wrote an irenic confession; the two together were to serve as a basis for the reconciliation between divided Polish churches.\footnote{18} The union was never realized because of opposition from the Reformed side. Later, Kalaj worked for one of the families which was sympathetic to the Socinians. We will discuss this in greater detail in the next chapter.

Being aware of Cocceius’s interest in the Anti-Trinitarian polemics and the Polish Socinian controversy, we should not be surprised that Kalaj concentrated his studies on the defense of Reformed doctrine, especially against Arian teachings. In 1648 Kalaj published his Anti-Socinian treatise titled, *Apologia pro divinitate*


\footnote{18} Williams, *The Polish Brethren: Documentation of the History*, vol. 2, 489. The union was never realized because of opposition from the Reformed side. Later, Kalaj worked for one of the families which was sympathetic to the Socinians. We will discuss this in greater detail in the next chapter.
Salvatoris nostri contra antiquos et modernos Pharisaeos. The work had been presented to the ministers of the Krakovian classis, which had sponsored his education. Also in the treatise is a poem dedicated to Kałaj by a fellow student from Lithuania, Jan Audziejewicz, with whom Kałaj had apparently became good friends. In the dedication, besides thanking God and his parents, Kałaj also explains that the inspiration for his work and even its title came from the Polish minister John Laetus, whose book he had read while living with Rev. Levinij (or Levinius, probably Daniel). If Laetus’s work targeted Roman Catholics whom Laetus called “modern Pharisees,” Kałaj decided to confront another group of “modern Pharisees,” namely Socinians.

Kalaj’s Apologia pro divinitate Salvatoris consists of seven disputations bearing Cocceius’s approval, different from those he presented during his studies. Kalaj’s Apologia shows that he had acquired basic exegetical and polemical skills in Hebrew and Greek and had read Reformed, Jewish, Catholic, and Socinian writings. Of all of them, however, Kalaj refers most frequently to the Socinians – such as Enjedinus, Smalcius, and Socinus himself – as well a reference to Racovian Catechism. Kalaj’s overall goal was to prove to the reader that Socinian doctrine

---

19 Daniel Kalaj, Apologia pro divinitate Salvatoris nostri, contra antiquos et modernos Pharisaeos (Franeker, 1648).

20 Kalaj, Apologia pro divinitate Salvatoris, 8

21 Kalaj, Apologia pro divinitate Salvatoris, 4.

22 References made to Theodore Beza (Kalaj, Apologia pro divinitate Salvatoris, A5), Rabbi David Kimchi (A3, A6), Robert Bellarmino (A8).

23 Kalaj, Apologia pro divinitate Salvatoris, A2, A8, C5, F6, G6.
resembles that of the Pharisees. Thus, for example, in Disputation VI, Kalaj brings up Christ’s discussion with the Pharisees in which he claimed, “Before Abraham was, I am” (John 8:56–58), positing his eternity. He then contrasts it with the teaching of the Racovian Catechism which states that Christ has taught us how to attain eternal life by his example.24

In addition to the Apologia pro divinitate Salvatoris, Kalaj also participated in a number of regular academic disputations, characteristic of post-Reformation theological education. These disputations were not necessarily written by him but most likely reflected his views, and were to exercise his polemic skills.25 The university records show that Kalaj presented under Johannes Cocceius,26 Johannes Cloppenburgh,27 and Christianus Schotanus.28 Kalaj’s final doctoral dissertation was

24 Kalaj, Apologia pro divinitate Salvatoris, F1-F6.


26 Participates in Disesrtatio [sic] theological, exhibens brevem praecipuorum et famosiorum, moderni seculi, errorum, cum succincta rationum singulorum errorum, inductione et refutatione, catalogum, Resp. Petrus Teschemacher a Loo, e ducatu Montium Barmensis (Franeker, 1657). In response to Cocceius’ Collationes de foedere et testamento Dei, ... doctrinae pietatis in Scripturis traditiam. (Franeker, 1648) Kalaj offers Disp. XXX de foedere Dei cum homine, agens porro de lege Novi Testamenti Resp. Daniel Kalay, Polonus.


28 Christianus Schotanus taught in Franeker between 1639-1671. Kalaj responds to his Colleguim institutionum theolog. disputatarum in Academia Franekerana ab illis studiosis juvenibus, quorum nomina post Praefationem ad lectorem habentur (Franeker,
defended under Johannes Cloppenburgh (1592-1652) and published in the same year as the *Apologia pro divinitate Salvatoris*.  

Kalaj left Franeker in 1648, but the university continued to host a number of Polish students and professors, including Mikołaj Arnold (1618-1680). Arnold had been residing in Franeker since 1641 and later took over Cocceius’s position when Cocceius accepted a teaching position in Lyden. Arnold become a rector of the school and published writings of his famous Polish predecessor, Jan Makowski.

### 2.4. Return to Poland

In 1648, Kalaj returned to Poland with Stanisław Herman and soon after was delegated to the congregation in Wielkanoc, where he served as a deacon and teacher in the church-school. Wielkanoc, which was located close to Kraków, was one of the important centers of Little Poland’s Calvinism, and so served Kalaj as an excellent place to begin gaining necessary pastoral experience. In May of 1653, at the Synod of Bieżyce, he finally was ordained (other sources suggest that he might have

---

Daniel Kalaj, *Disputatio historica-theologica de episcoparum et presbyterorum discrimine, quam D.O.M. praeside reverendo, clarissimo, doctissimoque Viro D. Johanne Cloppenburgio S.S. theologiae doctore ejusdemque in Alma Frisiorum Academia professore primario praeceptore suo omnigna observantia colendo, publico subjecit examini Daniel Kalay Polonus* (Franeker, 1648). I was unable to access this work. Wajsblum identified it as being in the library of the Synod in Wilno: Wajsblum, *Ex Regestro Arianismi*, 253.


been ordained in 1652, or even in 1666 in Chmielnik)\(^{32}\) and called by the classis of Góry to serve the influential congregation of the city of Oksza. Unfortunately, the aforementioned Jan Laetus immediately appealed the decision of the classis, for he had been ministering to the congregation and was unwilling to move and retire in Szczepanowice. In this situation, the synod decided to respect the decision of the aged, respected theologian and sent young Kałaj to Szczepanowice.

The Reformed congregation in Szczepanowice, though less prominent and probably more controversial than the one in Oksza, was still quite significant. The church was established and sponsored by the Chrząstowski family, whose members enjoyed vast religious and political influence. Szczepanowice also had a school at which Kałaj taught, in addition to his involvement with the schools in Bełżyce and Chmielnik. \(^{33}\) He was being assisted by Daniel Reder (Redner) whose help he had earlier requested.\(^{34}\) Kałaj’s popularity as a preacher grew. In 1653, he delivered a eulogy for Tomasz Węgierski\(^{35}\)—a relative of the famous Andrzeja Węgierski, author of *Libri Quattuor Slavoniae Reformatae*.\(^{36}\) A year later, he also preached at the funeral of well-known Dutchman living in Poland, Baltazar Van Meteren.\(^{37}\)


\(^{33}\) Wajsblum, *Ex Regestro Arianismi*, 254-256.


\(^{36}\) Andrzeja Węgierski, *Andreae Wengerscii libri quattuor slavoniae reformatae continents historiam ecclesiasticam ecclesiarum slavonicarum inprimis Polonicarum, Bohemicarum, Lighuanicarum, Russicarum, Prusicarum, Moravicarum...* (Amsterdam
2.5. The Chrząstowski Family

While in Szczepanowice, Kałaj’s life became closely associated with the Chrząstowski’s family, a family whose affairs culminated in a lawsuit and a death sentence against Kałaj. An examination of the family’s affairs – and of the gradual and tacit changes in the legal status of religious dissidents of the time period – is necessary to understand the circumstances in which Kalaj found himself.

The Chrząstowskis had participated extensively in Polish political and religious life for years. In 1568 Cyrł Chrząstowski had joined the Reformed Church, and later his son, Andrzej Chrząstowski (d.1632), continued to be a dynamic leader among Polish Evangelicals. As had been the case with many members of the Reformed gentry, Chrząstowski enjoyed a close relationship with Polish Brethren (also called Anti-Trinitarians, Minor Church, and later Socinians), a part of the Reformed Church which had broken off soon after Jan Łaski’s death and was later harshly persecuted and ultimately exiled from Poland. In 1618, Chrząstowski wrote


37 Nagrobek abo Pogrzebowy Sermon nad grobem śl. pamięci J.M.P. Báltazara van Meteren Grafa van Cuick etc. uczyniony i przezacnej freqentiej wystawiony w Kościele Szczepanowskim R. P. 1654 dnia 16 marca ... przez X. Daniela Kalajiego, Słowa Bożego tamże Kaznodzieje (Leszno, 1654). Darowski, Szczepanowice nad Dunajcem, 86.

Marek Wajsblum covers the history of regestro arianismi quite extensively. Here we will simply sketch the way the Chrząstowski family came to be associated with Arianism and how this affected Daniel Kalaj.

In 1632 an amendment was made to Warsaw Confederation as to exclude Polish Brethren from being protected as the dissidents in faith. The new formulation of the article added the word Christian and argued for the protection only of the confessions which adopted Confession of Sandomierz 1570. Sławomir Radoń, Z dziejów polemiki antyariańskiej XVI-XVII wieku (Kraków: Universitas, 1993), 16-17.
Dialogue of an Evangelical gentryman with an Evangelical minister,\textsuperscript{40} in which he proposed a Calvinist-Socinian union on the basis of common morality. His irenic ideas were refuted by the Reformed polemicist Jakub Zaborowski for whom uniting with Socinians was unacceptable, unless the Socinians confessed the Reformed doctrine and stopped accusing Reformed ministers of immorality.\textsuperscript{41} Andrzej Chrząstowski’s irenic proposals were never realized, but he found them supported by some of his relatives, including Stanisław Chrząstowski (d.1660 or 1658) and later his son, Piotr.

Stanisław Chrząstowski served in a number of public civil positions, including an envoy to the parliament (\textit{Sejm}).\textsuperscript{42} He also served the Reformed Church as a participant in numerous synods and as president of the synods of district of Kraków, 1636, 1641, 1647. In 1648, he established a Reformed congregation and school in

\textsuperscript{40} Andrzej Chrząstowski, \textit{Rozmowa szlachica ewangelika z ministrem ewangelickim, przy tym też i list do Panów ewangelików przez Andrzeja Chrząstowskiego olim dworzania, teraz, ziemianina}. This brochure has been lost; however, as has been pointed out, based on other sources we can establish most of Chrząstowski’s original arguments as well as that the work was printed some time around 1618.


\textsuperscript{42} Interestingly, his political leadership was considered to be so high-profile that he was buried by the Bishop of Poznań in St. John’s Cathedral, due to his assumed conversion to Catholicism on his deathbed.
Szczepanowice,\textsuperscript{43} which later was nourished and developed by his son, Piotr (d.1686), and pastored by Daniel Kałaj. The Chrząstowskis proved their friendly disposition toward Socinians after Piotr fell in love with and married a Socinian widow named Aleksandra, who, subsequently, was able to avoid exile because of her marriage to a Catholic. However, after the death of her husband, her immunity expired and she was left with a choice between life in exile with her young son, Jan, or conversion back to Catholicism (conversions to a Reformed Confession were no longer allowed under the new anti-Arian law).\textsuperscript{44} However, the Chrząstowskis devised an alternative solution, which provided safety by covering up her Socinian upbringing and pretending that she always had been a Calvinist. This became possible when pastor Samuel Prusicki from Kransobród agreed in 1660 to let her join his congregation— not as a convert, but as a transferred member. The conspiracy, however, was quickly discovered and exposed by the Reformed ministers who had already become frustrated with the Chrząstowskis’ pro-Arian affairs and were afraid of the political repercussions that could result from close association with such heretics.\textsuperscript{45} However, the Chrząstowskis were determined to save Aleksandra and her

\textsuperscript{43} The Reformed Church and school in Szczepanowice slowly became an important center for Kraków and Sandomierz Evangelicals and attracted numerous Reformed students, even from abroad. Darowski, Szczepanowice nad Dunajcem. Dzieje wsi, 61-134.


\textsuperscript{45} Wajsblum, “Ex Regestro Arianismi,” 226-227.
son, and they assisted her in acquiring special amnesty from the King, which was approved by the Sejm in May of 1661.

2.6. Kalaj’s Work for the Chrząstowskis

It seems difficult to understand why Kalaj, who studied under Cocceius and wrote treatises against the Socinians, accepted a call from a church founded by “Arian-lovers,” a reputation which the Szczepanowice congregation had carried for quite some time. Here we can only speculate. It is possible that he did not have a choice, since many of the Protestant benefactors ignored the anti-Arian rhetoric of their ministers who often were poor and came from the lower social groups. Perhaps Kalaj also hoped to educate, the family on the important doctrinal differences dividing Socinians, and the Reformed and prevent further education of Reformed youth in the Arian schools. In 1655, the Northern War broke out, which Polish historiography refers to as the “Swedish deluge.” Exhausted by its military conflicts in the east and suffering internal political strife, Poland was completely unprepared for a military conflict of this magnitude. Although the Swedish troops finally conceded, the five years of war left Poland desolated and destroyed. Despite the war, Kalaj continued to work in Szczepanowice and faithfully assisted the Chrząstowski family in rebuilding the church and school, which soon trained even children of the Scottish expatriates residing near Szczepanowice. Wajsblum explains that during those years Kalaj’s ministerial and educational skills were at their peak. He was not only able to preach and teach but also to mentor young men, such as Stanisław

---

Parlaya and Stanisław Wartensius (Warteński, Wartęski), who were preparing to enter the ministry in the Polish Church or to pursue further study at Franeker. In 1667, the local synod in Oksza decided that the school in Szczepanowice was to merge with a school in Chmielnik, creating one gymnasium to serve the Kraków and Sandomir districts. In 1659, Kałaj was honored with the title of elder (cosenior) of the Kraków district, and continued his active involvement in the life of the Reformed Church and Reformed education in Little Poland. Kałaj continued to be appreciated among his co-religionists and was often called upon to preach at important events, such as the funerals of Elżbieta Czarmerowej, Krystyna Dembicka, and Mirosław Czapski.

Despite his successful work in Szczepanowice, Kałaj’s close association with the Chrząstowskis did not benefit him in the long run. He became entangled in family conflicts with the Zaborowskis and with Franciszek Czarnecki about Aleksandra and her boy, whom Kałaj had catechized. The conflict escalated and resulted in a series of court trials at which Kałaj appeared as the family theologian. In 1669, the courts of Sandomierz convicted Kałaj of heresy ex regestro arianismi, stripping him of his title, his property, and even his life. The verdict set a precedent, as no Reformed minister had yet been executed. Everyone was shocked by the judge’s decision, and the verdict

47 Darowski, Szczepanowice nad Dunajcem, 88.
48 Tworek, Działalność oświatowo-kulturalna, 346.
49 Kałaj, Fasciculus viventium abo nagrodek pamiętny ... Helżbiecie Czamerowej Mieszczce i Kupczynie Zacnej Krakowskiej sermonem pogrzebowym wystawiony przez X. Daniela Kolajowego ... w kościołku Wijatowskim 21 Oct. R.P. 1665 (Gdańsk, 1666), Kazanie placowe na pogrzebie sl. p. jej mści paniej Krystyny Dembickiej z Gołuchowa w concursie zacnej frequentje odprawione przez X. Daniela Kalajego konseniora distr. Krakowskiego, kaznodzieje kościoła Szczepanowskiego w Sielcu MDCLXVI 24 Maja. (Toruń, 1668), Kazanie na pogrzebie Fr. Mirosława Czapskiego podkomorzego malborskiego miane przez X. Daniela Kalajego conseniora districtu krakowskiego (Gdańsk, 1669). Darowski, Szczepanowice nad Dunajcem, 91.
was hastily appealed and voided in 1670. The charges against Chrząstowski and Kałaj were dropped. However, Kałaj’s case had been sent to and confirmed by the tribunal in Lublin. Ironically, during one of the trials—which took place without Kałaj—Czarnecki had presented Kałaj’s anti-Arian Apologia pro divinitate Salvatoris from Franeker as evidence against him and argued that he actually taught Arianism.\(^{50}\) He also claimed that Kałaj was the author of an anonymous brochure that had been circulating for years in the Protestant churches, outlining the basic differences between Calvinists and Arians on one side and Catholics on the other.\(^{51}\) The book was the major source of accusation brought against Kałaj because it suggested that he secretly embraced Arian heresy. Finally, yet another book was submitted anonymously to the judge (most likely authored by Czarnecki himself) in which the author, called Anonim (Anonymous), claimed that even the Bishop of Krakow recognized Kałaj’s heresy and had approved his death sentence.\(^{52}\)

How Czarnecki managed to accuse Kałaj of Arianism is difficult to grasp. The official court verdict was “Calvinian heresy,” a term which did not exist in the world of Protestant theological disputes, since to be an Arian and a Calvinist

\(^{50}\) Wajsblum, *Ex regestro arianismi*, 275.

\(^{51}\) Wajsblum reports that the brochures have not been identified. He suspects that the copy which Czarnecki had perhaps belonged to or was copied by Kałaj. Interestingly, the same brochure and legal strategy used against Kałaj was made later against two other Calvinists, Szymon Akwila and Jan Petroselin.

simultaneously was theologically impossible, especially when one remembers Servetus’s execution in Geneva. Czarnecki, however, knew how to exploit both Chrząstowski’s association with Socinians and also the ignorance of the judge, who apparently did not know much about the theological differences between the Reformed and Socinians. Thus he created a term which would allow him to frame Kałaj—and, in effect, the whole Chrząstowski family—for breaking the anti-Arian law, expanding the act of intolerance to Polish Calvinists.  

It is important to realize that Czarnecki’s plan was carried out not only because of Chrząstowski’s close relationship with the Socinians but also due to Jesuit anti-Protestant propaganda, which often simply kept repeating sixteenth-century charges that Protestant theologians had refuted long ago. Perhaps Chrząstowski knew of the accusations of Trinitarian heresy voiced against Calvin by Peter Caroli (1480-1545), and later restated by major Roman Catholic polemicists like Robert Bellarmino (1542-1621), and Gilbertus Genebrardus (1537-1597). In Kałaj’s own time, Francis Turretin (1623-1687) still saw the need to refute them. In Poland, Marcin Łaszczy (1551-1615) was one of the Catholic polemicists who contributed to

---

53 The numerous conflicts between the Chrząstowski and Czarnecki families are described in Wasjblum, *Ex Regestro Arianismi*, 230-243, 262; and Darowski, *Szczeapanowice and Dunajcem*, 82-128.


56 Martin Łaszczy (1551-1615) wrote under several different names: Grzegorz Piotrkowski, Marcin Tworzydło, Szczęsny Żebrowski, Mikołaj Issiora, Maciej Szałajski, Wojciech Słupski, Jan Paulis, Jan Przylepski, Piotr Skarga, and Jan Gurski. He was a well-
the popularization of the often emotional and inaccurate arguments of the sixteenth-century Polish Jesuit preacher, Piotr Skarga (1536-1612). In his work called The disgrace of the New Arians and the call to their repentance and return to Christian Faith from Rev. Skarga, Łaszczy refers to Erasmus as the serpent, Luther as the cobra, and Calvin as the great Lion described in Psalm 91. He argues that Arianism never would have been reborn if not for the Reformers.\(^{57}\) He also supports his arguments with Skarga’s reflection on the character of Protestant theology when he writes:

The Fathers of the Arianism of our age can rightly be identified as: Luther, Erasmus, Calvin and their comrades; for no one who is a Catholic simply becomes an Arian without first being schooled by Luther and Calvin. [There he] receives the teaching that allows him to build the foundation for Arian doctrine and a denial of the glorious Trinity and Divinity of Christ …\(^{58}\)

Furthermore, for Skarga the Protestant motto *Sola Scriptura* inevitably results in a denial of the Trinity since the word itself is not found in Scripture. It also undermines the Church Fathers and the fact that Holy Spirit used them to defend the idea that Christ is equal with the Father. Skarga also argues that Protestants necessarily fell into Arian error since they called the Pope, the most faithful defender of the divinity of Christ and the doctrine of the Trinity, the anti-Christ.\(^{59}\) Next, Skarga accuses Luther specifically of hating the Greek word *homousion* and alleges that he known anti-Protestant polemicist, known for his harsh and intolerant tone.

\(^{57}\) Jan Górski, *Zawstydzenie nowych Arianów y wzywanie ich do pokuty y wiary chrześciańskiej od X. Piotra Skargi* (Kraków: Mikołaj Laba, 1608), 190.


\(^{59}\) Górski, *Zawstydzenie nowych Arianów*, 63.
made efforts to remove from German theology the word *Triune*. Calvin, on the other hand, is accused of ascribing the name *God* only to the Father and not to the Son, and of struggling to accept the Nicene Creed. Finally, he argues that Calvin’s condemnation of Servetus was not a proof of his orthodoxy but rather of his “fiendish deceit.”

Calvin dared to teach that the name *God* belongs foremost and only to the Father and not to the Son, so that God’s Son is lower than the Father. He also writes that the Son as person is not the creator of heaven and earth, but became part of the creation...This he [Calvin] teaches when he writes: “this is hard speech in the Nicene Creed, God from God, light from Light”... and although he burned Servetus, he did it out of a devilish deceit...

Considering that Skarga and Łaszcz continued to be popular sources of theological knowledge to many and that Reformed gentry often stayed in close relations with the Socinians, we can grasp how the idea of “Calvinoarian doctrine” was possible in seventeenth-century Little Poland.

### 2.7. Escape and Defense

Kalaj had no time to lose. In the fall of 1670 he escaped to Lithuania, where the Radziwiłł family hosted and protected him. His journey was sponsored by the

---

60 Górski, *Zawstydzenie nowych Arianów*, 63. This idea of gradual “purification” of Christianity was to some extend present in the teaching of Socinus and called a doctrine of *Doskonałość Chrześcijaństwa* (Perfection of Christianity); for further discussion, see chapter 4.

61 “Kalwin miał nauczać iż to imię Bóg przednie się y nawyżej daie samemu Oycu a nie Synowi. Toć Syn Boży mniejszy y niżeli Bóg Ociec. Tamże pisze: iż Syna ze strony persony nie właśnie zowia twórcą nieba i ziemie a Ojca właśnie. Toć Syn między storzeniem zostanie ... Tamże mówi: iż to grube y twarde słowo w kredzie Nicejskim Bóg z Boga światłośc ze światłości ... choć Serveta jako sie niżej powie ten Kalwin popalił przedsie z czartoskiej chytrości...” Górski, *Zawstydzenie nowych Arianów*, 63.
Szczepanowice congregation, which continued to pay his regular salary of 200 zlotys, adding extra funds donated by the local Reformed congregations. Stanisław Wartensius temporarily took over his ministerial post in Szczepanowice, since the Chrząstowskis were hoping for Kałaj’s quick return as they continued to appeal the court’s decision concerning him. However, their minister had already accepted a call to the St. Peter and Paul Church in Gdańsk. While in exile, Kałaj eventually responded to all the accusations made against him in his own work, *A Friendly Dialogue between an Evangelical Minister and a Roman Catholic Priest*, published in 1671. In the form of an irenic dialogue with a fictionalized Roman Catholic priest, Kałaj denies authorship of the brochure and his supposed adherence to Anti-Trinitarian doctrine. He also tries to educate his Catholic interlocutor on the actual teaching and doctrine of the Reformed churches, and at one point even argues that Catholics and Protestants belong to one church because they are built on Christ, who was fully God and fully man. Convinced of his own innocence, he went so far as to dedicate the book to the Bishop of Kraków. His defense, however, did not free him from the false charges. Kałaj’s trials and exile exemplified well the diminishing tolerance toward Protestants and the permanent fall of the Reformed Church in Little Poland.

---

62 For further history of the Reformed congregation in Szczepanowice see: Darowski, *Szczepanowice nad Dunajcem*, 111-134.

63 Daniel Kałaj, *Rozmowa przyjcielska ministra ewangelickiego z xiedzem katolickim o księżce jednej w Krakowie, tak rok przeciwko D.K. wydaney ... która roku pańskiego 1671 napisana Eladin a Lacik Ren Mitis Gerson dedicuie y prezentuie 1671* (Gdansk, 1671).
2.8. Kalaj in Gdańsk

In 1672, Kalaj traveled through Prussia and went to Gdańsk. As a wealthy coastal city consisting mostly of German- and Polish-speaking citizens, Gdańsk was a haven for Polish Protestants. Its Calvinist nobility and wealthy Lutheran gentry prospered in relative peace and tranquility. The St. Peter and Paul Church was one of Gdańsk’s larger congregations and consisted of a high number of Polish-speaking parishioners. Kalaj’s relocation brought him, at last, some long-overdue stability. He continued to grow as a writer and concentrated more on sermons, poems, and eulogies. In the following piece, he praises the city of his refuge:

In a word—Gdańsk has all fortune
A precious jewel in the Polish Crown
An abundant marine food pantry
A lighthouse for those lost at sea
A guard and a key to the Baltic Sea
And what is most important: the treasure of God’s Word!  

While still in Gdańsk, Kalaj wrote some of the most significant patriotic poems of the period. In 1673 he celebrated the November 11 victory of the future Polish King Jan Sobieski over the Turks in the Battle of Chocim in the paean titled, Klimakteryk heroiczny. The work consists of sixty-three rhyming stanzas in which Kalaj portrays

---

64 Kalaj, Klimakteryk Heroiczny, 3r. “Gdańsk jest jednym słowem sład wszelkiej fortuny/Korona y ozdoba cney Polskiej Korony/Nieprzebrana Zamorskim jest chleba spiązarnia/Przeswietna z morza z lądu dalekim latarnia/Baltyckiego zaś Morza klucz jest y strańica /A co największsa: Słowa Bożego skarbica!”


66 Daniel Kałaj, Klimakteryk Heroiczny to jest szesdziesiat y trzy poematów, abo krokóry y składow heroicznego rymu przekładanego w którym opinia jest przesłowna wiktorya choimsk z Łaski Bożej zaraz nazajutrz posmierci S.P.K.I.M. Michała Korybuta, niegdy Króla Polskiego, Wielkiego Xiązęcia Litewskiego, Ruskiego, Pruskiego, etc. etc. Za szczyścię倒闭ą directia Jasne Wielmożnego jego Mości Pana, Pana, Jana Sobieskiego, Marszałka y Hetmana Wielkiego Koronnego, etc. etc... (Gdańsk: David Fridrich Rhet, 1973). For
Hetman Sobieski as the defender not only of Poland but of the whole Christian world. Moreover, Kalaj praises Poland’s religious peace and encourages Sobieski to fight against Muslims and not fellow Christians. These patriotic and irenic elements are well-captured in stanza sixty-two, in which he writes:

We shall not fight with fellow Christians
Like other Europeans today—May God have mercy
Kings and Rules quarreling, ready to
Steal and drink the blood of one another
But you, our Hetman, fight with Turks and protect the wall
Separating us from the pagans, may your rule extend even to Perykopa!
Your father, Jakub, was good for peace
But your name is Jan and you will be victorious in strife.\(^\text{67}\)

Kalaj was correct in predicting Sobieski’s fortune in battle against the Turks. In 1674, he published another patriotic poem on the occasion of Sobieski’s enthronement titled, *Idea Regis.*\(^\text{68}\)

Two years later, in 1676, Kalaj was called by the Lithuanian Reformed Church to serve as the minister in Kiejdany. He accepted the call and left Gdańsk. After three years he was appointed as superintendent of the Samogitia (Żmudź) region. It is important to note here that, after his move to Kiejdany, Kalaj changed his


\(^\text{67}\) Daniel Kalaj, *Klimakteryk Heroiczny*, D4v. “Inszy niech wojny wiodą z krześcijany/Których dziś pełne - żał się Bog - w Europie!/Między sprzeczni roznym królestw pany/Jeden drugiego dobra i krew żłopie;/Ty Turki wojuj, hetmanie, panuj i w Prekopie!/Ojciec twój, Jakub, dobry do pokoju!/Jan imię twoje, ty szczęsny do boju!”

\(^\text{68}\) Daniel Kalaj, *Idea regis to jest na szczesliwą elekcyą naiasnieyszego y niezwyciężonego Monarchy Jana III, z Łaski Bożej Króła Polskiego, Wielkiego Xsącecia Litewskiego, Ruskiego, Pruskiego, Zmudzkiego, Mazowieckiego, Inlandzkiego, a negdy Jasnie Wielmoznego, Jego Msci Pana, Pana Jana Sobieskiego, Marszałka, y Hetmana Wilekiego Koronnego, ... kazanie na pamiętną elekcią. Daniela Kalajowego Słowa Bożego kaznodzieje odprawione w Gdańsku, w Kościele Ss Piotra i Pawła w same octawe elecciey to jest w poniedziałek po pierwszej niedzieli Trójcy Świętej.* (Gdańsk Dawid Fridrich, Rhet., 1674).
name to Daniel z Kałowa Mikołajewskiego, or simply Daniel Mikołajewski, which prevented older scholarship from tracing him down after he left Gdańsk. However, thanks to Stanisław Tworek and his research in the Republican Library in Vilnius, we are able to learn about the final years of Kałaj’s life.  

In his article, Tworek describes how Kałaj greatly contributed to the life of the Lithuanian Reformed Church. He reports that, in 1661, Kałaj joined the committee responsible for funding the translation of the Bible into the Lithuanian language, and later, in 1682, joined another committee for the rebuilding of the Reformed Church in Vilnus. His participation in these committees proved to be especially effective, thanks in part to his various contacts with wealthy Protestants in Gdańsk and Prussia. Furthermore, Tworek associates the Kałaj conflict (which started in the second half of 1683) with Princess Ludwika Karolina Radziwiłł. Although she was away, the Princess kept a close eye on her land and property in which Kałaj was called to minister. In one of her letters, she questions his rather high salary, accusing him of sloth and of disturbing the peace and unity of the church. Local ministers defended Kałaj and wrote to the princess on January 2, 1684, describing Kałaj as “honorable, godly and knowledgeable, and well deserving the high salary.”

But the princess remained dissatisfied and continued to bring false charges against Kałaj in an effort to remove him from office. This time, the whole local

---

69 Tworek, “Materiały do dziejów kalwinizmu w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim” 212-215. Among the discovered documents Tworek found Kałaj’s autobiography, which he edited and attached with the article among other church documents..

70 Tworek, “Materiały do dziejów kalwinizmu,” 206.

71 Tworek, “Materiały do dziejów kalwinizmu,” 202-204.
Synod of Kiejdany undertook the task of defending Kałaj against false accusations and the princess’s preposterous demands. On June 15, the ministers rejected the charges made against Kałaj and sustained his generous salary of 1000 złoty annually. At the same time, the ministers also convinced Kałaj to write a cordial letter in which he apologized if he had unconsciously offended the princess, which seemed to put an end to the conflict between them. A friendlier relationship became evident when she accepted the proposal to fund studies for twelve men who desired to be trained at Kiejdany College under Kałaj’s supervision and academic instruction.\footnote{Tworek, “Materialy do dzieków kalwinizmu,” 205.}

Besides his active participation in the life of the church and school, Kałaj continued to write. He produced his own brief autobiography as well as a registry of the Kiejdany congregation. As reported by Tworek, we find in it that a number of Scotsmen married Polish women who actively participated in the community and worked with a church orphanage that did not distinguish between Protestant and Catholic children but took care of all in need.\footnote{Tworek, “Materialy do dzieków kalwinizmu,” 206-207.} Kałaj’s last project, which unfortunately he never saw completed, was the translation of the study notes from the Dutch Bible to be included in the Polish edition of the Biblia Brzeska (1563), or more likely the Gdańsk Bible (1632). Before his death in 1691, Kałaj produced a translation of the notes to the Gospel of John, the Epistles, Romans, and Hebrews. The project was later completed by a group of Reformed ministers called by the
Lithuanian Church. Kałaj’s place was taken by Jerzy Lutomirski, who until this point had served as the consenior of the Nowogród region.\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{74} Tworek, “Materiały do dzieków kalwinizmu,” 206.
CHAPTER THREE:
KAŁAJ'S IRENIC DEFENSE IN OVERVIEW

3.1. INTRODUCTION

In the Early Modern period, accusations of heresy or gross immorality were an effective rhetorical tool in disqualifying an opponent. Professions of false doctrine or immoral behavior were considered dangerous crimes because they could jeopardize one’s eternal soul or bring God’s judgment on the community that tolerated them. Desiderius Erasmus (1466/1469-1536), for example, was accused of Arianism because of the controversy galvanized by his edition of the Greek New Testament. Also, William Farel (1489-1565) and John Calvin (1509-1564) were charged with the ancient heresy by Pierre Caroli (ca.1480-ca.1550), and in 1537 were called upon to clarify their doctrinal stands. Bernard Cottret in his biography of John Calvin has pointed out that accusations of Anti-Trinitarianism persisted throughout Calvin’s life.¹ In the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Catholic polemic literature has often dehumanized and even demonized non-Catholics—accusing them of heresy, murder, and political treason.² The charge of Calvinoarianism leveled against Daniel Kałaj was a natural continuation of this customary polemic practice.

¹ Bernard Cottret, *Calvin a Biography*, trans. M. Wallace McDonald (Grand Rapids, MI; Edinburgh: Eerdmans, T&T Clark, 1995), 125. Polemicists would also charge their opponents with immorality, such as when Jerome Bolsec (d.1584) accused Calvin of homosexuality and frivolous sex with multiple women in the midst of the predestination controversy.

² On the peresecution of Jews in Poland see: Magda Teter, *Jews and Heretics in Catholic Poland: A Beleaguered Church in the Post-Reformation Era* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 91. Despite the fact that Teter’s views have been negatively evaluated by Wojciech Kriegseisen, *Odrodznie i Reformacja w Polsce* v. 50 (2006): 328-332, it is agreed that she has brought into the discussion some previously
3.2. Authorship of the Friendly Dialogue

Kalaj did not sign his book, but he left a number of clues that help us to firmly establish his authorship. The name written on the front cover (and later under the dedication) is “ELADIN a LAIK,” which is a simple rearrangement of the letters of Daniel Kalaj’s name. Also printed on the front is a brief poem he composed, telling the reader that his name in Hebrew means “the Lord is my judge.” Kalaj gives the following enigmatic hints in the poem as to his last name: draw a cross and then write the first letter of the alphabet on each side of the horizontal line. Next, write the first letter of Christ (in old Polish it is spelled Krist) on the left and the first letter of the Lord’s name on the right. Since the cross might serve as the Polish letter “ł,” the effect is to produce the word, “Kalaj.”

```
  K  A ---------------- A  J
```

Yet another clue which helps to identify this as Kalaj’s work is the dedication, which he signs as “A Guest in Meshech.” Meshech refers to the descendents of Japheth, a tribe mentioned in Genesis 10:2 and later in Psalm 120:5. The people of Meshech settled north of Israel in Caucasus between the Black and Caspian Seas, giving birth, as some argue, to the Russian nation (hence the similarity between the words “Moscow” and “Meshech”). Kalaj describes himself as a guest in Meshech, pointing out his current residence in Lithuania, northeast of Little Poland. He concludes with unknown sources.
the following self-description, inspired by writings to the Corinthians from the
Pauline Epistles (II Cor. 6:9–10):

As \{ unknown \text{ deceiver} \} \quad \text{known}
\quad \{ unknown \text{ dying} \} \quad \text{known}

\text{however} \quad \text{truthful}
\quad \text{alive}

3.3. DATING: WHILE IN A DISTANT LAND

It is difficult to pinpoint when Kalaj started to write his work. It is unlikely
that he was still in Szczepanowice, since, as has been pointed out already, he claims
to have written the book “in northern exile.” The publishing date printed on the book
is 1671, which is soon after his arrival in Lithuania but a few years before he is called
to serve in the St. Peter and Paul Church in Gdańsk. This is also the date of dedication
and seems to be confirmed in the book’s foreword, in which Kalaj mentions his lack
of theological resources while residing in a distant land. He writes, “I did not have
access to the necessary books. The Bible, prayer, and meditation was my whole
library.”\textsuperscript{3} However, one must wonder about his multiple references (which we will
discuss later) to patristic, medieval, and early Reformation writers. Kalaj either must
have had an extraordinary memory or had to use notes from his sermons, school
lessons, or lectures at Franeker. In Wajsblum’s view, it is also evident that the book

\textsuperscript{3} Kalaj, \textit{PR}, AIII4: “Ani książ nie było, do tego potrzebnych. Biblia, modlitwa,
meditatia, ot moja była Biblioteka.”
was composed in exile and without access to theological sources which could have contributed to its unique theological approach.\textsuperscript{4}

\textbf{3.4. DEDICATION: LOVING HIS ENEMY}

Kalaj’s \textit{A Friendly Dialogue between an Evangelical Minister and a Roman Catholic Priest} begins with a dedication to the Bishop of Kraków, the man who had approved his death sentence. Determined to prove his innocence, Kalaj argues in the very first sentences of the dedication that the charges brought against him were based on the false assumption that he had authored the aforementioned anonymous brochure detailing the differences between Catholics and religious dissidents, including Arians. Kalaj not only refused to claim authorship of it but also passionately condemned the brochure itself, saying that it would be better if that book had never seen daylight, since it had done so much damage. Despite the dividing confessional differences, Kalaj wrote that he was convinced of the bishop’s good conscience and honesty. Therefore, he asked him to assume the role of a mediator like that of King Solomon, who was asked to judge which of the two prostitutes was the true mother of the dead infant (see I Kings 3:16). Kalaj hoped the bishop would determine if he truly was the author of the despised brochure after hearing his defense presented in the book on his own behalf.\textsuperscript{5}

The minister goes on to explain that the charges made against Kalaj could be substantiated neither \textit{de jure} nor \textit{de facto} because Kalaj was a Reformed minister and should not have been judged as an Arian one. So, although Arianism was punishable

\textsuperscript{4} For a more extensive discussion, see: Wajsblum, \textit{Ex Regestro Arianismi}, 278, 280.

\textsuperscript{5} Kalaj, \textit{PR}, i.
de jure, de facto he was not guilty of it: even if de facto he could be considered a Calvinist, de jure he was not guilty because he still subscribed to the Apostolic Confession of Faith, the ancient creeds, and the Evangelical confessions which had been protected by the Polish law from the reign of Sigmund Augustus (1530-1572) through the reign of the current King Michał Korybut (1669-1673). And those who committed acts of intolerance were persecuted in the past. We can speculate that he was referring here to the judgment passed on the four university students who robbed and beat Kalaj’s father, events which were already discussed in the previous chapter. He writes, “There is no guilt worthy of death in the accused Kalaj, neither in respect to Arian blasphemy nor Calvinist error.” Furthermore, it is explained that it was physically impossible for Kalaj to have written the anonymous brochure, since one copy had been critiqued by the Jesuit theologian Wojciech Wijuk Kojałowicz (1609-1677) long before Kalaj even had been ordained. Kalaj concluded the dedication by speculating that the Bishop had abused his authority in the case by approving such an obviously unjust sentence on innocent Kalaj, and that the credibility and integrity of his persecutor should be questioned since he showed no love of his enemy.

3.5. Foreword to the Reader: The Structure of the Work

Following the dedication, Kalaj included a brief “Foreword to the Reader” in which he sets forth the structure of the book. It consists of three parts: first, a defense of and evidence for innocence; second, an exposition of the Evangelical faith in six articles; and third, an epilogue summarizing all the responses to the accusations. Parts

---

6 Kalaj, PR, iii. “I żadnej winy nie masz godnej śmierci w obwinionym Kalaju, ani względem Bluźniersztwa Ariańskiego, ani względem błędu Kalwińskiego,”
one and two are written in the form of a conversation between an Evangelical and a Roman Catholic priest while the third part consists of brief sections that concretely address Franciszek Czarnecki’s (who called himself “Anonim”) accusations, often repeated from the previous two sections. The whole work, despite its defensive and polemical character, is written in an irenic tone made visible by the respect with which both clergymen treat each other. Naturally, the whole conversation is dominated by the Evangelical minister, who, point-by-point, refutes the charges made against Kalaj and takes almost any opportunity to educate the priest on Reformed theology, often explaining basic similarities and differences between Catholics, Lutherans, and Socinians.


The actual conversation between the two clergymen begins when the Evangelical minister pays a visit to the Roman Catholic priest. The priest warmly welcomes his guest, assuming that he is hosting another fellow Roman clergyman because of his ministerial robes, which many Reformed pastors in Poland continued to wear. Realizing the confusion, the minister quickly explains that Polish Evangelicals continue to wear priestly robes not to be misleading or to annoy Catholics, but simply to preserve the reverence of their clerical office. He then adds that if Jews are allowed to wear robes (also similar to Roman Catholic robes), so much more should an Evangelical minister have the right to do the same.

Still, he refuses to be called by a title usually reserved for Polish clergy, namely, “priest” (ksiądz or kaplan), preferring only “minister.” The priest seems to understand and accept this explanation, but he is surprised and rather uncomfortable
to be speaking with a Protestant. Exposing his ignorance, he assumes his visitor is Lutheran and says that it is probably inappropriate for Catholics to speak with a heretic, in the same way that Jews did not talk with Samaritans.7

The minister proceeds to convince the priest that if their conversation is done in love, they ought to continue it. He also explains that Christians have a God-given command to love, especially their enemies, when he says, “Sir, whoever you are, either my friend or my enemy, I still have a commandment to love you so that the words of Christ might be fulfilled.”8 He then presents the motto he has adopted for Protestant-Catholic relations, saying, “My personal maxim is this: one could be a friend to the Roman Catholic church but not submit to it, following here Christ’s words from Mark (9:40)—he who is not against me is with me.”9 The minister justifies his irenic outlook with a reference to the relationship between Israel and Judah, where God’s people, even while divided, were still considered as one before the Lord. When the priest hears the minister’s explanation and sees his friendly disposition, he is willing to change his mind and affirms that it is appropriate for them to continue their conversation. Then he thanks the minister for his visit and asks him about the book that the minister has been holding in his hand.10

---

7 Kałaj, PR, Br.

8 Kałaj, PR, Br. “Lubo mi W.M. przyjaciół, lubo nieprzyjaciół, powinieneś Cie kochać, a nienawisić i zło, oto odrzucić abym zakon krystusowy wypełnił.”

9 Kałaj, PR, 1. “Ja mam tę maxime w sobie: że może kto bydzić, Ecclesia Romanae amicus, choć nie subditus, według owego, co mówi Zbawiciel, kto nie jest przeciwko nam, jest z nami (Mark 9:40).”

10 Kałaj, PR, 2-3.
The book the minister had brought with him is the aforementioned anonymous work, *Errors and blasphemies*, most likely written by Czarnecki and presented earlier by the judge. The priest looks at the book and is shocked, especially since he has known Kałaj for years and has always thought that, for a religious dissident, Kałaj was a peace-loving, educated, and humble man who never slandered the Catholic Church. Since the book has the bishop’s approval, however, the priest begins to reconsider his pacific views toward Kałaj. The Protestant minster responds by defending Kałaj. He argues that since the bishop never examined Kałaj, he should not condemn him, and asserts that the author of the brochure has used his title without authorization. He also wonders if one of the reasons why the author did not sign his book is because he was abusing the bishop’s authority and feared repercussions. Writing under the bishop’s name and authority is an abomination, testifying against the author of the brochure.

Next, the minister speculates on the possible identity of the author, quickly dismissing the idea that the brochure could have been written by someone with theological training. He reminds the priest that Kraków’s university offers a quality education and produces students who are sufficiently aware of current theological disputes to know the difference between Arian and Evangelical teaching, assuming that most of them are, at least to some extent, familiar with the work of Daniel

---


Clementinus, who, in his treatise against Arians, clearly differentiated between the two.\textsuperscript{13} For the same reason, he dismisses the idea that the brochure could have been written by some hate-driven Jesuit, since Mikołaj Cichowski (1545-1616) proves that Polish Jesuits read Reformed writings and openly recognized how they condemned Anti-Trinitarism.\textsuperscript{14} The minister completes his argument with the following conclusion:

What we are left with is this opinion, that the author of this book is some ignorant man, completely unaware of theological controversies. Being allured by evil and hate toward Kałaj, he ascribed to him this script.\textsuperscript{15}

The priest listens carefully to the minister’s speculations, then comments that he has heard some of Kałaj’s sermons, read his numerous eulogies, and even looked through the work he had written against Arianism while studying in Franeker titled \textit{Apologia divinitatis contra antiquos & modernos pharisaeos}.\textsuperscript{16} Based on these sources, says

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{13} Also known as Klementyn Klimkoviú (d.1644), was a prolific minister of the Reformed Church in Jodłówka, entered in intense polemics with Jonasz Szlichttyng, wrote: \textit{Antilogiae et absurda} (Kraków, 1623), \textit{Antapologia, to jest odpowiedź na odpowieć Jonasza Szlichtynga} (Baranowo, 1630). For further information see: Kai Eduard Jørgensen, \textit{Ökumenische Bestrebungen unter den Polonischen Protestanten bis zum Jahre 1645} (København: NYT Nordisk Forlag Arnold Busck, 1942), 352-360. Roman Darowski, \textit{Szczeponowice nad dunajcem dzieje wsi, parafii katolickiej i gminy kalwińskiej}, 2nd ed. expanded (Kraków: Wyższa Szkoła Filozoficzno-Pedagogiczna Ignatianum WAM, 2004), 72-73.

\item \textsuperscript{14} Kałaj, \textit{PR}, 3. Kałaj quotes here from Cichowski’s \textit{Speculum Antitrinitariorum}, (1662).

\item \textsuperscript{15} Kałaj, \textit{PR}, 3. “Pozostawami tedy ta opinia, że autorem tey książeczki, jakiś nie świadomym controversiey prostak, umyślny jakiś złośnik, nienawiścią Kałajego uwiedziony, coś tam za scrypt y czyiści niewidzieć napadawsky, wziął sobie materyą marnej chluby tego pisania, y na wielką nienawiść, a publicznego ochydy podania niewinnego Kałajego.”

\item \textsuperscript{16} Daniel Kałaj, \textit{Apologia divinitatis contra antiquos & modernos pharisaeos} (Franeker, 1648). For a discussion of the work, see chapter two.
\end{itemize}
the priest, it seems very unlikely to him that Kalaj could be an Arian or a promoter of Socinian teaching. He then asks the minister whether it is possible that even if Kalaj did not write it, perhaps he copied the brochure with his hand.\textsuperscript{17}

The minister responds that since no one really knows what is in Anonim’s (or Czarnecki’s) possession, it is impossible to confirm or deny whether the brochure was even copied with Kalaj’s hand. What seems interesting is that Kalaj, through the Protestant minister’s voice, does not dismiss the idea that he might have copied the brochure; but he does categorically repudiate the claim that he authored it, emphasizing that other copies had been in circulation for years. Furthermore, he reminds the priest that the work has no confessional value since it was never officially approved by any church and simply contains a private opinion. Furthermore, the minister says that many polemical books written in Latin and Polish against Rome could have been used against Kalaj, but instead Anonim picked an obscure, anonymous, never-published work as the basis of his accusations.\textsuperscript{18}

3.7. RATIONALE FOR FLEEING: BIBLICAL PRECEDENT

Next, the two clergymen discuss the reasons behind Kalaj’s absence during the trials and his eventual escape. The priest asks why Kalaj did not stand before the judge to defend himself if the accusations leveled against him were so preposterous. He adds that Kalaj had no right to flee but rather an obligation to stand up with courage and honor to defend himself. The minister disagrees and argues that in certain circumstances it is permissible for a man of God to flee. His rationale is

\textsuperscript{17} Kalaj, \textit{PR}, 4.

\textsuperscript{18} Kalaj, \textit{PR}, 4.
supported by the example of young David, whose escape from Saul was assisted by
the Lord (see II Sam 24:13). The minister goes on to categorize biblical stories of
escape into the following categories: (1) Praedictum, when escapes were prophesied
in John (see John 16:1–2) and were later symbolized by a woman who flees from the
Dragon (see Rev. 12:6–14); (2) Mandatum, when Christ commands Christians to
escape (see Matt. 10:13) or not to escape, just as he did when he compared himself to
the good shepherd and condemned the hired man who abandoned the sheep upon
seeing a wolf (see John 10:12); and finally, (3) Exemplum, citing the time Mary and
Joseph escaped Herod’s persecution by going to Egypt (see Matt 2:13), or when Jesus
exited the scene knowing that the people intended to make him a king (see John 5:13)
or stone him at the temple (see John 8:59). And, of course, there are times when Jesus
willingly gave himself up.19

The minister also references the principle of justified escape present in early
church history, namely when Cyprian, the bishop of Carthage, fled in the face of
Roman persecution.20 Since the minister also believes that it is sometimes
inappropriate to escape, such as when Christ allowed himself to be crucified, he
narrowss the reasons under which a minister is permitted to escape to the following
three: (1) when the minister is being persecuted and God’s people are dispersed, just
as Zechariah prophesied (see Zech. 13:7); (2) when charges are brought only against
God’s servant and not the whole congregation, such as in the book of Acts when the
newly-converted Paul escaped from the Grecian Jews who tried to kill him (see Acts

19 Kalaj, PR, 4-5.

20 Kalaj, PR, 6-7.
9:30); and (3) when someone else is ready to take his place in the leading of God’s people, as was the case with John the Baptist, who willingly stepped down preceding Christ (see John 3:30).\textsuperscript{21}

Despite these arguments, the Catholic priest insists that Kalaj should not have escaped since he always had the option of facing ecclesiastical court or inquisition, especially if he doubted the secular court. The minister explains that this was not a possibility Kalaj could have considered, since he was also unjustly accused of illegal proselytism and sheltering Arians. Therefore, even if the inquisition would realize that Kalaj was not an Arian himself, they would surely condemn him as a willing accomplice.\textsuperscript{22} (The minister, of course, was referring here to the situation with Aleksandra Chrząstowska and her son, Jan).

Upon hearing this new evidence, the priest is greatly outraged. The minister quickly interrupts, asking for patience. He explains that Aleksandra’s conversion to the Reformed church, although illegal, had been exempted and approved by an official decree that the Polish parliament (\textit{Sejm}) had made in 1661. He further explains that this evidence was unknown to the judge in Sandomierz and that the tribunal in Lublin failed to take it into account. The priest remains unconvinced, so the minister decides to shift his attention.\textsuperscript{23} He argues that Scripture clearly discourages us from exposing ourselves to unnecessary danger. He even quotes from

\textsuperscript{21} Kalaj, \textit{PR}, 7-8.

\textsuperscript{22} Kalaj, \textit{PR}, 8.

\textsuperscript{23} Kalaj, \textit{PR}, 9.
the Apocryphal, writing, “He who loves danger will die from it,”24 (see Sir. 3:26) and later from the Gospel of Matthew (see Matt. 4:7), in which Christ banishes the devil. He then cites examples from early Christian history of times when Christians escaped from persecution. It was Caesar Julian the Apostate who encouraged early believers willingly to give themselves up when facing persecution, since they claimed to consider suffering a blessing; Cyprian, on the other hand, stridently argued that it would be more beneficial for them to escape and continue to bless the church from the outside than simply to be killed. 25

3.8. ACCUSATION BASED ON THE ANONYMOUS BROCHURE: CALVINOARIANISM

At this point, the priest wishes to redirect the conversation and concentrate on the anonymous brochure, since its allegedly heretical content is what condemned Kałaj. The minister explains that Czarnecki’s (or Anonim’s) charges of Arianism brought against the brochure (which was anonymous, but ascribed to Kałaj) are based on an incomplete confessional statement, where words were either accidentally or purposefully changed to make is sound like Arian heresy. 26

---

24 Kałaj, PR, 9.

25 Kałaj, PR, 10.

26 Anonim quotes, “Bóg Ociec jest pierwsza osoba wiecznego Bóstwa, sama od wieków będąca.” Kałaj, PR, 10), while Kałaj argues that the orginal sentence was probably “Bóg ojciec jest pierwsza osoba wiecznego Bóstwa, sama przez sie od wieków będąca” (Kałaj, PR, 12). Furthermore, the minister goes on to cite a number of biblical and historical situations in which words are taken out of context or in which small changes in the text create a colossal difference in meaning: the devil, who quotes Scripture while tempting Christ in the desert (see Matt. 4:6); the Pharisees, who accuse Jesus of destroying the temple and rebuilding it in three days (see Matt 26:1; Mark 14:58); and the Trinitarian controversy around the terms homoousios (of the same substance) versus homoiousios (of the similar substance), in which one letter made all the difference.
In return, the priest acknowledges that the unaltered statement quoted by Kałaj, “God the Father, first person of Eternal Divinity, selfsame from eternity existent,” is orthodox Catholic and Evangelical teaching, and is only an Arian error if one argues that the “Father alone from eternity exists.” The minister then continues to argue that Anonim once again showed great ignorance of theology. He suggests that if Anonim had been wise enough simply to say, “First person of the Eternal Divinity,” his crime would be perfect. He writes:

If one considers the Father to be the First Person of the Divinity, then the Son has to be the Second person because the Son follows the Father. If there were no first person there would be no second person. So Anonim! why do you lie when you write that Kałaj should be ashamed of his Arian blasphemy while you are the one who should be ashamed of such a stupidity, which once appeared to you as wisdom but in the end revealed who you are.

After listening patiently, the Catholic priest asks, what if Kałaj actually wrote exactly what Anonim says he wrote and did not delete any words? The minister responds that he had already shown how, even if one considers this possibility, Kałaj is hardly guilty of heresy but only of a mistake of omission, and he still affirms that there must be more than one person in the Godhead. The minister compares both theological statements to the two infants and their mothers who were brought before king Solomon (see I Kings 3). If the original statement could be symbolized by the living child, the altered statement is the dead infant. Kałaj, as the righteous mother, is

27 Kałaj, PR, 10.

willing to accept even the death of the child, and by that proves his innocence. Nevertheless, he is ready to repent and apologize for such a mistake, but not ready to die for it.

The minister complains, asking why Kałaj should be treated differently from other theologians in church history who were sometimes guilty of these sorts of mistakes. He refers here to words of the early Roman Christian poet Aurelius Prudentius Clemens (348-405), who excused Peter’s denial of Christ, and to Jerome, who tells us a story of the Pope Liberius (352-356), who condemned Athanasius for fear of persecution. Also, if an omission is the grounds for judgment against Kałaj, then the minister wants to argue that Anonim is guilty of the same, since he ignores the Holy Spirit and therefore is guilty, if not of Arianism, then of Macedonianism, a 4th-century Christian heresy that denied the full personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit. The priest concludes their conversation with the following: “I see that Kałaj has found a great Apologist in you, Sir. Whether he wrote the brochure or he did not, he is completely innocent—the slander of Anonim vanishes, and he is not guilty of Arianism.” This proclamation of Kałaj’s innocence concludes the biographical section of the Friendly Dialogue, and the conversation turns toward specific areas of theology.

29 Kałaj, PR, 15.

30 Kałaj, PR, 16-17.

31 Kałaj, PR, 17. “Dobrego widze ma Apologiste z W. M. ten Kałaj, y na któralówie stronę sie rzecze, lubo to on pisał lubo nie pisał lubo tak lubo inak, tedy niewinność in toto tutoque zostawa, a potwarz Anonima evanuit, zadanego mu Ariaństwa.”
Although the imaginary priest becomes convinced of Kalaj’s innocence and Trinitarian orthodoxy, the real events turned out much differently. We have no evidence that Kalaj’s book was widely read, or whether it even reached the bishop of Kraków or any other officials who could have granted him security.

3.9. CONCLUSION

Based on our overview of Kalaj’s defense, we are prepared to draw some preliminary conclusions. We have noted that charges of Arianism were aimed at Reformed Christians in Poland as often as in the rest of Europe, especially during the sixteenth century; but in Poland, Reformed ministers were actually put on trial for something they did not confess. This was contrary to the fact that some Polish Jesuit polemics recognized the general orthodoxy of Reformed teaching on the Trinity while the stereotype of the Anti-Trinitarian Protestants persisted among the general public. This was due partially to the friendly relationships some Reformed families had with Socinians, but also to the popularity of Piotr Skarga, whose writings were republished and widely read by Roman Catholics in seventeenth-century Poland.

In respect to the *Friendly Dialogue*, we have confirmed that Kalaj wrote it while he resided in Lithuania and that the Evangelical minister represents Kalaj himself. The dedication of the book strikes one as being extremely hopeful (if not outright naive). Kalaj expects the Catholic bishop to review his case and recognize that the accusations are false and hateful. In the course of his defense, he reminds the priest that the Reformed confessions actually oppose Arianism and that he wrote anti-Socinian polemics while studying in Franeker. Furthermore, he argues that he could
not have authored the anonymous brochure, since the work was in circulation long before he was even ordained to ministry. Furthermore, he argues that even if it could be proven that the brochure belonged to him (or that it was copied with his hand), the work carries no confessional value and therefore cannot be used in proving his Calvinoarianism. He also justifies his escape from Little Poland by using biblical and historical precedence to show how his persecutor altered (or ripped out of context) certain passages in the brochure, trying to make them sound heretical.

Overall, the defense Kałaj adopts has a distinctly irenic tone. The Evangelical minister patiently explains to the Catholic priest all the details that testify to Kałaj’s innocence. He treats his opponent with brotherly love, showing respect and recognizing the importance of the non-biblical sources such as church fathers and the Apocrypha. Kałaj’s defense against the accusation of Arianism is unique in that no other Polish Reformed minister was officially charged with and sentenced for Arianism in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries. However, the irenic tone in which he carries on the dialogue stands in continuity with the trajectory of Protestant irenic thought, which we will in turn discuss.
PART TWO:
THEOLOGICAL

CHAPTER FOUR:
POTENTIAL SOURCES OF KALAJ’S IRENIC THOUGHT

4.1. INTRODUCTION

Irenicism has been an important theme in theological developments in the
Reformation and Post-Reformation periods, with its antecedents in early Christian
history and Middle Ages. 1 The term “irenic” traditionally has been used to describe
areas of agreement or compromises among Christians who have some perspective on
the unity or peaceful relationship between various Christian churches. The movement
has found particularly potent soil among various Protestant theologians, in the second
half of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century. 2

The early development of ienic (or conciliatory) thought in the sixteenth
century traditionally has been ascribed to such figures as Desiderius Erasmus, 3 as

1 See for example Thomas Aquinas in Summa Theologica. “Whether the rites of
unbelievers ought to be tolerated? (II. 2. Q.10, Art. 3) “Whether heretics ought to be
tolerated?” St. Thomas Aquinas: Summa Theologica, 5 vols., (Allen, Texas: Christian Classics
Thomas More Publishing, 1981), II. 2. Q.10, Art. 11. For a more detailed analysis see: Joseph
Heiko A. Oberman, “The Travail of Tolerance: Containing Chaos in Early Modern Europe”
in Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation, ed. Robert W. Scribner and Ole
Peter Grell, 13-31 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Karlfried Froehlich,
Paris Conciliarists During the Great Schism,” in Conciliation and Confession: The Struggle
for Unity in the Age of Reform, 1415-1648, eds. Howard Louthan and Randall C. Zachman,

2 Marian Ciszewski, “Kilka myśli o irenizmie,” Seminare –Poszukiwanie Nukowe-
Pastoralne 12 (1996): 1-16, 4. For the bibliography see Axel Hilmar Swinne, Bibliographia

3 Hilmar M. Pabel, “The Peaceful People of Christ,” in Erasmus’s Vision of the
well as Georg Cassander and Georg Witzel, whose irenic postulates were not realized in the face of counter-Reformation and confessionalization. However, in face of the increasing religious persecutions and conflicts at the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century number of Protestant theologians made further irenic proposals. These include most notably: Franciscus Junius (1545-1602), *Eirenicum de pace ecclesiae catholicae*; David Pareus (1548-1622), *Irenicum sive de unione et synodo Evangelicorum concilianda*; Leonhart Hütterus (1563-1616), *Irenicum vere christianum*; Paulus Steinius, *Concio irenica*; Nicolaus Hunnius

---


7 David Pareus, *Irenicum sive de unione et Synodo Evangelicorum Concilianda liber votivus paci ecclesiae et desideris pacificorum dicatus* (Heidelberg: 1614).


9 Paul Steinius, *Concio irenic, oder Friedens Predigt—Aus dem Geistreichen Lehrer
(1585-1643), Diaskepsis Theologica,¹⁰ Moïse Amyraut (1596-1664), Eirenikon sive de ratione pacis,¹¹ Jean Daille (1694-1670), De usu patrum ad ea definienda religionis capita,¹² or Pierre Jurieu (1637-1713), De pace inter Protestantes ineunda consultatio.¹³

Poland played a significant role in early modern irenic discourse. It not only produced important irenic thinkers (such as Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski [1503-1572], Jan Łaski [1499-1560], Bartłomiej Bythner [1559-1629], Jonasz Szlichtyng [1592-1661], Jan Crell [1590-1633], but had also influenced expatriate theologians such as Faustus Socinius [1539-1604], John Dury [1696-1680], Jan Amos Komeński [1592-1670], Georg Calixt [1586-1656], and Valerian Magni [1586-1661]). The most important Polish irenic documents of the era include the Confession of Sandomierz Sprach (Cassel: Wessell, 1618).


¹² Jean Daillè, De usu patrum ad ea definienda religionis capita, quae sunt hodie controversa (Genevae: Sumptibus Ioan, Antonii Choët, 1686).

¹³ Pierre Jurieu, De pace inter protestantes ineunda consultatio, sive, dispositio circa quaestiones de gratia quae remorantur unionem protestantium utriusque confessiones Augustanae & Reformatae & circa rationem quâ hae lites & aliae componi possint (Ultrajecti: Franciscum Halma, 1688).
(1570),\textsuperscript{14} the Warsaw Confederation (1573),\textsuperscript{15} the Synod of Thorn (1595),\textsuperscript{16} the Racovian Catechism (1605),\textsuperscript{17} and the Colloquium Charitativum (1645)\textsuperscript{18} the latter of which has been recognized as one of the most progressive irenic documents in Reformation and Post-Reformation Europe.

In this chapter, we will concentrate on a few of these individuals who will not only help us to identify potential sources of Kałaj’s irenic thought, but who also will provide us with a better understanding of the religious atmosphere immediately preceding the publication of Kałaj’s Friendly dialogue between an Evangelical minister and a Roman Catholic priest.

\textsuperscript{14} Rafał Leszczyński, The Confession of Sandomir - A History of the Text (Warszawa: Semper, 1994).


\textsuperscript{16} Wojciech Sławiński, Toruński Synod Generalny 1595 (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper, 2002).


\textsuperscript{18} Edmund Piszczyk, Colloquium Charrtativum geneza i przebieg, vol. 20 Diecezja Toruńska (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Konserwatora Diecezjalnego, 1995).
4.2. Historiography

The irenic activity in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth has become a growing field of research. Kai Eduard Jord Jørgensen’s *Ökumenische Bestrebungen unter den Polonischen Protestanten bis zum jahre 1645*¹⁹ provides a detailed analysis of the movement starting with Łaski and concluding with Colloquium Charitativum (1645). There are also numerous references to the development of irenic thought in the extensive literature on the history of the Polish Anti-Trinitarian movement, previously cited in chapter one. In addition to this list, it is worth mentioning Jerzy Lehman’s discussion of the *Confession of Sandomierz* in the context of other Polish confessions,²⁰ Lech Szczucki’s work concerning the Socinian-Reformed union,²¹ and as part of a more general discussion on the idea of tolerance and freedom of conscience the works of Zbigniew Ogonowski,²² Joseph Lecler,²³ and Janusz Tazbir.²⁴ Most recently the discussion has been advanced in the

---


volume edited by Howard Louthan on Valerian Magni as well as Mariusz Pawelec’s historical analysis of the life and work of Barłomiej Bythner, and Wojciech Sławiński in his article on the ecumenical program of Polish Evangelicals debated at the Council of Thron 1595.

4.3. Remote Sources Background (16th Century)

We begin our overview of the more remote irenic sources with Desiderius Erasmus. Although this renowned humanist and irenic thinker never lived in Poland, he had a significant influence on the Polish Renaissance and on the trajectory of irenic thought in Poland as noted in the majority of the literature on the Polish Reformation. In his book, Renaissance Culture in Poland, Harold Segel argues for

---


defining the Erasmian influence (1466/1469-1536) in the development of Polish humanism in this way:

When the full range of the Erasmian influence in Renaissance Poland is brought clearly into view, it seems incontrovertible that the Dutchman’s impact on the sixteenth-century Polish political and religious thought overshadowed that of any other contemporary Western thinker.29

Erasmus’s fame reached Kraków early on and quickly spread among the Polish students.30 The first lectures on Erasmus were delivered at the university in Kraków in 1519 by the English humanist Leonard Coxe, one of Erasmus’ most faithful admirers. Coxe greatly contributed to the spread of early humanist thought. In 1522, he held a public lecture on Erasmus’s De duplici copia verborum ac rerum.31
Encouraged by Voivode Szydłowiecki, Coxe wrote a compelling note to Erasmus in 1527 that provides a glimpse of the intensity with which Erasmus the faculty and students at the Jagielonian University adored Erasmus.32 Coxe wrote, “Every day, again and again, we mention Erasmus. Dear Erasmus, you often spend mornings with us, with you we eat dinner, with you we go for an afternoon walk….although we are divided by such a distance. Your presence is with us…”33 Erasmus responded two months later, accepting the praises of his distant disciples. Erasmian influence in


30 Maria Cytowska, Korespondencja Erazma z Rotterdamu z Polakami (Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1965), 6-7.

31 Segel, Renaissance Culture in Poland, 12.


33 Cytowska, Korespondencja Erazma, 60. Barycz noticed that Coxe’s letter was a copy of (or greatly inspired by) an earlier letter of Jakub Prison, a Hungarian humanist.
Poland manifested itself most powerfully in adopting a tolerant but overall cautious approach to Protestant ideas. Erasmus blamed Protestants for causing a schism which he found unacceptable, since in his view the church was *community of love* where peace and unity must be preserved at all costs—if necessary, even at the cost of the truth. This attitude was accepted by the Polish King Sigismund I and later by his son Sigismund Augustus II, who did not persecute Protestants but also were careful not to allow them to overthrow the Roman Church.

Erasmus’s irenic approach was not shared by one of his most famous Polish disciples, Jan Łaski. Łaski’s irenicism has often been presented as a departure from the rigid and inherently intolerant doctrines of the Reformed churches; as an anomaly in the scope of Calvinist history, it is attributed to his friendship with Erasmus. It is clear that Łaski treated Erasmus with great respect, and it became evident that both men shared a deep companionship when Łaski purchased Erasmus’ library after his death. But this did not prevent him from developing views of church unity that were different from those of Erasmus. Łaski’s decision to abandon Rome for the

---


Protestant cause must be understood as the ultimate refusal of the Erasmian community of love concept of the church.

Erasmus was well aware of Łaski’s interest in Protestantism and tried to stop him from leaving the Roman Church. On March 5, 1534, just a few years before his death, Erasmus encouraged Łaski to stay in the Catholic Church and to succeed his uncle in becoming the next primate of Poland, a position that would grant him power, a comfortable life, and the ability to help others. He wrote:

May you become worthy of your uncle. I praise your philosophical outlook on life, which make you despise honor and wealth, but times are such that it is better to be in a high position [in the Roman Catholic Church] so that we would not be scoffed at by those dogs and hogs [corrupted Roman Catholic clergy]. Above all other reasons, you should have the greatest control that would enable you to carry help to the greatest number of people.37

Łaski, however, did not believe that unity could be purchased at the price of truth. On September 29, 1541, Łaski wrote this compelling note to his friend, Bishop Łukasz Górka, reflecting the drama and sincerity of his conversion:

It is a hard time for me now, I must admit […], to leave the most precious land of the fathers, beloved friends, and everything that I have; it was hard to face all the dangers, poverty, and harm I have had to experience. But thanks be to God, who gave me bravery so that I could do it. So I am proud that I am the first from our people unto whom God showed his unspoken mercy, and that he counted me worthy of being despised, derided, stripped from all that I had for the sake of his name, the name of the One who was despised during his earthly life […], who was crucified but now rules victorious at the right hand of his Father in Heaven.38

37 Cytowska, Korespondencja Erazma, 271.
38 Bartel, Jan Łaski, 123.
Łaski’s later ecumenical work among Frisian, English, Czech, and Polish Protestants reflect this conviction. Finally, his irenic efforts among Polish Protestants centered around the fact that Melanchthon’s position on the Lord’s Supper was closer to Calvin’s conception than to Luther’s original view, hoping that Lutherans gradually would begin to see the similarities between the two positions.\(^{39}\)

The *Synod of Sandomierz* (1570) and the Reformed-Lutheran consensus that resulted from it was a direct fulfillment of Łaski’s irenic vision, and the first successful ecclesiastical alliance between Lutherans and Reformed in Europe. The basis of the consensus was Krzysztof Tracy’s\(^{40}\) interpretation of Bullinger’s *Second Helvetic Confession* with fragments from Melanchthon’s *Saxon Confession* (1551), as well as the excerpts from John Calvin and Theodore Beza which were attached.\(^{41}\) For the Reformed, the *Confession of Sandomierz* became the basic confessional expression. It not only sealed the irenic character of their church was also intended as the basis for the future establishment of a Polish national Evangelical church. The dedication to King Sigismund Augustus II (1548-1572) includes the following plea:

> We have approved both the Augsburg Confession and the Saxon Confession presented at the Council of Trent held in 1551 AD. As a further sign of our unity and love for each other, we adopted from it the article about the Lord’s Supper, and by that put to an end the

\(^{39}\) Kowalska, *Działalność Reformatorska Jana Łaskiego*, 128.

\(^{40}\) Krzysztof Tracy (Tretius, Tretko) was a scholar and educator. He traveled to Wittenberg, Strasbourg, and Padua and studied under John Calvin and Theodore Beza. For more information on Tracy and the *Confession of Sandomierz* see: Rafał Leszczyński, *Konfesja sandomierska: dzieje tekstu*. (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper, 1994), 9.

\(^{41}\) Polish Reformed were not the only ones who tried to show a basic compatibility between the Calvinist and Lutheran confessions. For a similar situation in Hungary see: Graeme Murdock, “Moderation under Duress? Calvinist Irenicism in Early Seventeenth-Century Royal Hungary,” in *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation*, ed. Alec Ryrie Luck Racaut (Burlington Ashgate, 2005), 178-195, 184-185.
disagreement concerning the sacrament of our Lord’s body; this article is also accepted by upright servants of God, such as John Calvin and Theodore Beza. Any godly person will know then that we love unity, although this will not be appreciated by those squabblers who love their own glory more than God’s.42

The king passed away soon after the Consensus of Sandomierz, and with this also the hope for the formation of a Polish national Evangelical church.

It has been argued that the Consensus laid a foundation for another important irenic document, published a year after the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre (1572), which demonstrated how differently Poles approached matters of religious pluralism. The Warsaw Confederation (1573), as it came to be called, was issued during the royal interim and became the first act of religious tolerance in Early Modern Europe. It granted the dissidents in faith (as non-Catholic Christians came to be called therein) tolerance within the borders of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, but it also peacefully prevented further expansion of the Protestants who were tolerated but not treated as equal in status with Roman Catholics.43

Neither the Consensus of Sandomierz nor the Warsaw Confederation proved to have a long-lasting effect. The consensus came to an end at the Synod of Toruń (Thorn) (1595) – the largest and last gathering of Polish Protestants. It attracted fifty-six Reformed, thirty Czech Brethren, and fourteen Lutherans. Contrary to expectations, The Synod of Toruń not only strengthened the union but also created greater distance between the churches in the face of the growing opposition from the


Gnesio-Lutheran party. The union was annulled shortly thereafter, leaving the Polish Reformed church weak and struggling at the end of the sixteenth century. Also, in 1658, the terminology of the confederation had been qualified so that the category of dissidents in faith no longer included Arians, who were ordered to return to Catholicism or leave Poland. Moreover, between 1669 and 1676, the interests of Trinitarian Protestants became marginalized so that they were forced to defend their religious heritage and presence in the state which only a century earlier had been tolerant if not open to the religious diversity.

4.4. Proximate Sources and Background (17th Century)

Polish Protestants entered the seventeenth century weak, divided, and unable to offset the forces of counterreformation. In light of the unsuccessful ecumenical relations with the Lutherans and the growth of intolerance, the irenic conversation began to shift from Lutheran-Reformed to Reformed-Socinian and, later, even to Reformed-Catholic relations. All were unsuccessful and served as an important and more proximate background to Kalaj’s irenic approach.

Our discussion of the more proximate sources begins with the work of Faustus Socinus, who became the main leader of the Polish Brethren Church by the end of the sixteenth century. In 1600, he published a work titled, Demonstration that these people, who in the Polish Kingdom and Great Duchy of Lithuania are commonly


called Evangelicals, who desire to be effective followers of godliness, should join those whom they have falsely been accusing before the nation of being Arian and Ebonite, in which he challenged Reformed doctrine based on the poor moral condition of Polish Reformed churches. Although the book was addressed to the Evangelical laity, the text seemed to be written more with the Reformed clergy in mind. This is evident in the abundant theological terms and concepts that most would likely be difficult for the average reader to grasp. The underlying argument of the work was that the Reformed needed to join the Polish Brethren so that they could more effectively practice prawdziwą pobożność (true godliness). In the introduction to his work, Socinarius wrote,

What then can Evangelicals do when they do not obey their own teaching and are unable to manage their congregations well? This is why I published this work, in which I demonstrate and admonish those who love true godliness, so that they would join the other church [Polish Brethren], especially because of the many reasons which will be easily understood by anyone who reads this book.

---

46 Faustus Socyn, Okaznie tego, iż ci ludzie którzy w Królestwie Polskim y Wilekim Litewskim pospolicie ewangelikami nazwany są, którzyby skutecznie pobożności naśladowcami być chcieli, powinniby się do zboru tych ludzi przyłączyć, którzy w że narodziech fałszywie y niesłusznie Ariany y Ebionitami nazywani bywają (Kraków, 1600). The work was translated from Latin and published in Polish. The translation was done by his close associate Piotr Statorius Stoński (Piotr Statorius, Jr. [1565-1605]). The original Latin text was published in 1641.


48 Socinus, Okazanie, A ii. “Co iż trudo bardzo Ewangelicy czynić mają, pokí niektórych nauk swoich sie trzymają y pokí sposób rządzenia swoich zborów nie odmienią: dla tego jest wydana ta książeczka, w której się pokazanie iż to tak jest; y z tey przyczyny jest wi niemy przydanie pilne napominienie do tych, którzy w ich zborze prawdziwie pobożność miłują, aby się do tego drugiego zboru przyłączyli: a zwłaszcza, iż y insze są przyczyny, czemu to czynić mają, których każdy, te książki czytając, łacno bedzie mógł obaczyć.”
The work of Socinus so powerfully impacted the Reformed community because it addressed a valid concern. The Reformed churches had struggled to preserve effective leadership for some time. This was most evident in the lack of discipline among parishioners, certainly, but also among the clergy. The poor state of ecclesiastical affairs among Polish Protestants was due, in part, to social causes. The wealthy and influential benefactors of the Reformed congregations were gentry who often looked down on the relatively small group of plebian Reformed ministers. As a natural consequence, it was difficult for the Reformed ministers to exercise church discipline over their elite benefactors. Socinian ministers, on the other hand, usually came from gentry. In effect, they received proper respect and thus were able to effectively supervise the moral condition of their relatively smaller congregations.  

This weakness within the Reformed churches served as a basis for the irenic proposal of Jan Licinius Namysłowski, who, in his *Brief and simple admonition to the Evangelical Brothers to accept agreement*, closely followed Socinus’s theological framework. Lech Szczucki, commenting on the similarities of these works, writes, “Where the two treatises converge is in their principal conviction that confessional differences, even in foundational articles, cannot overshadow the foundational goal of

---


50 Although this work was published a few years before Socinus’s *Demonstration*, Szczucki argues that it was strongly influenced by Socinus. See: Szczucki, “Jan Licinius Namysłowski,” 157. Namysłowski’s work was published in Latin with parallel Polish translation with the Latin title, *Ad frates ministros Evangelicos pro ineunda concordia brevis et simplex paraenesis* (1597) which seemed to be inspired by Andrzej Wolan’s treaties titled *Paraenesis ad omnes in Regno Poloniae, M.D.L. Samosateniaae vel Ebioniticae professores* (Spirae, 1582), see: Lech Szczucki, “Jan Licinius Namysłowski,” 149.
the ‘Church of Christ,’ this being the realization of the Church’s ethical postulates.”

Furthermore, Szczucki comments that Namysłowski adopted Socinius’ idea of *doskonałości chrześcijaństwa* (perfection of Christianity), assuming that the purification of the church from false doctrine needs to take place gradually, so that the smaller and easier dogmas are first “reformed” in order to facilitate more radical changes later on (for instance, abandonment of the doctrine of the trinity). Therefore, even if Namysłowski seemed to have a slightly more irenic approach to the Reformed by proposing that the Reformed and Socinians should enter into ecumenical union in order to help each other to practice discipline more effectively, stating that controversial doctrinal matters would be avoided (at least initially), his end goal was to influence Reformed doctrine. Even after the schism with the Reformed, the Anti-Trinitarian minority adopted two different ways of approaching the relationship with the Reformed. First, there was the more sectarian group, represented by Grzegorz Paweł z Brzezin, and then the second, more diplomatic way of Jerzy Blandrata, later adopted by Socinians.⁵²

These and other similar Socinian proposals were addressed and rejected at the Reformed synods in 1611 and 1612, as well as at Gorlice Colloquium (1617) and the

---


Synod in Bełżyce (1617).\textsuperscript{53} However, these decisions were not fully supported by the Reformed gentry, who had enjoyed friendly relationships with Socinian families for years, often even sending their children to the famous Racovian Academy for their education. For them, the irenic proposals of the Polish Brethren were worth considering: after all, they offered a practical solution to the lack of discipline within the Reformed Church. The idea of union gained momentum between 1611 and 1619 due to the influential and outspoken member of the Reformed gentry, Andrzej Chrząstowski.

Chrząstowski was not a theologian, nor did he claim to be one. In his brochure titled, \textit{The Dialogue of the Evangelical gentry-man with an Evangelical Minister}, he challenged the decisions of the Reformed synods’ rejection of union with the Polish Brethren. Furthermore, he confronted his own ministers with charges of immorality, acceptance of papist traditions, and the intolerance present in the Reformed churches.\textsuperscript{54} Naturally, Chrząstowski’s proposal galvanized an outrage among the Reformed ministers, soon to be followed by the formation of a special committee to deal with the issue at the Synod in Lublin (1618).\textsuperscript{55}


\textsuperscript{54} The work \textit{Rozmowa szlachica ewangelika z ministrem ewangelickim, przy tym też i list do panów ewangelików przez Andrzeja Chrząstowskiego olim dworzania, teraz ziemianina} (1618) has been lost. However, we are able to determine the general content of the work based on the reply titled, \textit{Na rozmowę ślachcica Ewangelika z ministrem ewangelicim}.

\textsuperscript{55} Stanisław Tworek, \textit{Zbór lubelski i jego rola w ruch ariańskim w Polsce w XVI-XVII w.} (Lublin: Wydawnictwo Lubelskie, 1966) 141-142.
Moreover, two anonymous brochures were published, most likely written by Jakub Zaborowski. In the first one, *In reference to the dialogue of the Evangelical gentry-man with Evangelical Minister and letter to the Evangelicals written by Mr. Andrzej Chrząstowski*, Jakub Zaborowski, was scorned for his poor writing skills and a lack of basic theological knowledge, “never being properly rooted in the Reformed doctrine.” Zaborowski’s second pamphlet, *Life of the Saints*, was addressed to the Reformed gentry. It mocked Socinian ministers and questioned the reputation of their schools. Overall, Zaborowski tried to write with a broad audience in mind. He defended the integrity of Reformed ministers, emphasizing their modesty and even poverty in contrast to the “luxurious” life of the Socinian ministers. However, he also addressed theological matters, explaining that sharing moral values with Socinians is not sufficient grounds for unity because the Reformed believe that salvation comes by faith and not by good works. Therefore, a moralistic approach to the gospel undermines the Evangelical understanding of substitutionary atonement.

---


58 The author of *Żywoty Świętych* (1619). The work, included in Górśka, *Cztery broszury polemiczne*, page citations are to the reprint edition. Extensively borrows material from the *In reference to the dialogue of the Evangelical gentry-man with Evangelical Minister* which demonstrates that both works were written by Zaborowski. For authorship discussion, see: Górśka, *Cztery broszury polemiczne z początku*, 15.


and salvation by grace alone; thus, uniting with the Socinians would be as the allegiance of Jehoshaphat with Ahab.\textsuperscript{61} He writes:

You, Sir, lead us to union with the Socinians. This union would be so fortunate as Jehoshaphat with Ahab, or perhaps even more dangerous. The church of God in our beloved fatherland will be better off if it walks alone. God alone is our defender, and before him, in the appropriate time, [the Socinians] will have to give their frightening account.\textsuperscript{62}

The skilled Socinian theologian Valentinus Smalcius quickly entered the controversy, as he was an object of multiple attacks in the previously mentioned brochures of Zaborowski. In his work, \textit{A reply to the two lampoons which have recently been published against those who uprightly have been called Arians by the Evangelicals},\textsuperscript{63} Smalcius tackled the theological matters addressed by Zaborowski. He argued that the Evangelical concept of substitutionary atonement is a misinterpretation of the parts of the Scripture that were addressed only to Jews. For Smalcius, Christ’s death on the cross was necessary so that Christians can learn how to put to death their bydlęce pożądliwości (fleshly desires). He also argued that the Reformed were foolish for forgetting the negative consequences of Lutheran opposition to their ecumenical proposals. He wrote: “A good thing Lutherans do,

\textsuperscript{61} Zaborowski, \textit{Na rozmowę szlachica Ewangelika}, 92.


\textsuperscript{63} Walenty Smalcius (Szmalc) , \textit{Odpis na dwa paskwiluse, które niedawno wyszły przeciwko tym, których niesłusznie ariany zową, od ewanjenilików. Napisany od jednego z starszych tego zboru, przeciwko którymi napisane są}. (Raków 1619). The work is included in Górsk, \textit{Cztery broszury polemiczne}, page citations are to the reprint edition. For discussion concerning authorship see: Górsk, \textit{Cztery broszury polemiczne}, 17-18.
condemning you, because they see you as you see us. It shows how little reason these [Reformed] ministers have when they carelessly speak what they wish."

Finally, Chrząstowski himself responded to the controversy by publishing The Defense of Andrzej Chrząstowski’s dialogue against Evangelical Ministers of the Lublin district. In it, he refused to be entangled in theological disputes and denied trying to compromise Evangelical doctrine. Instead, his only stated goal was to confront the lack of discipline and encourage the Reformed ministers to follow Christ more faithfully:

Because I did not speak a word against the Evangelical confession in my book and you will not show me otherwise...All I desire to see is discipline, for our ministers as well as for us, hearers in God’s congregation. Discipline is very useful, and we can use it now...as a stomach medicine for ministers who are lethargic, sluggish, and lazy to do the Lord’s work. If one wants his whole body to be healthy, first he needs to take care of his stomach. When the stomach gets healthy, right away the rest of the body becomes healthy as well.

---

64 Szmalc, Odpis na dwa paskwiluse, 118. “To rzeczą dobrze też postępują luterani, że was potępiają, bo o was tak rozumieją jako wy o nas. Pokazują zaiste wielki nierozum ci ministrowie, gdy tak beępiecznie i nierozmyślnie mówią, co się im podoba.”

65 Andrzej Chrząstowski, Obrona dyjalogu Andrzej Chrząstowskiego przeciko księży ministrom dyskrytu Lubelskiego i ich odpowiedzi, nieslusznie skoromną i prawdziwą nazwanej przez tegoż Andrzej Chrząstowskiego uczyniona i wydana ultima lulli, (1619). The work is included in Górksa, Cztery broszury polemiczne; page citations are to the reprint edition. The work was probably written between October and December of 1619. See: Górksa, Cztery broszury polemiczne z początku, 19.

66 “Bom ja w książce mojej i słówkiem przeciw wyzaniu ewangelickiemu nie pisał, ani mi tego pokażcie. W.M. to tak mnie braciej mojej udaje potwariwie....Wasz to rzecz: ja tylko pragnąłem dyscypliny, która tak ministrom jako i nam słuchaczom we zborze, Bożym barzo jest pożyteczna; a możemy onę (gdyby skuteczna była, nie pro forma, jako teraz) nazywać lekarstwem żołądkowym, to jest was, ministrów oszalonych, gnuśnych, w pracach, świętych leśniwych (do szkalowania jednak ludzi cnotliwych rącznych), potym nas, członków zboru Bożego; gdyż kto chce mieć wszystko ciało zdrowe, naPrzód żołądek naprawuje - ten gdy zdrow, snadnie i członki zdrowe będą; z czym się teraz nie szerzę, bo to będzie plac swój miało.” Chrząstowski, Obrona dyjalogu Andrzej Chrzastowskiego, 156-157.
Taking personal offense at the remarks relating to his poor knowledge of Reformed theology, he reminded readers of the plebian background of the Reformed ministers and continued to attack them by dragging out the most private aspects of their lives. Moreover, he refused to call Polish Brethren heretics, but said that they believed in the Bible and followed it with more zeal than the Reformed ministers. He wrote:

What kind of heretic is this, who believes in Jesus Christ and in him trusts for his salvation? You and the papists seek heretics but not Christ Jesus, who promises eternal life to the believers (John 6:47). Watch out, you ministers, fellowshipping and sharing a table with drunks who have no self-control in their drunkenness – but dare to rebuke me, that I sit with God-fearing people and listen to their teachings, which my soul and conscience needed.

Chrząstowski’s *Defense* did not change the stand of the Reformed churches in Poland. No doctrinal compromise or irenic union was established between the Reformed and Socinians. However, it did open a discussion of the possibility of a *collatio fraterna* between the two, later addressed by Bartłomiej Bythner (c.1560-1629). Chrząstowski’s writings could have also had some impact on Daniel Kałaj

---


68 Chrząstowski, *Obrona dyjalogu Andrzeja Chrząstowskiego*, 162-163. “Co mi za heretyk ten, co wierzy w Jezusa Chrystusa i w nim całą nadzieję zbawienia swego kładzie? U was takowi są heretycy, jako i u papieżników, ale nie u Chrystusa Pana, który wierzącym w się obiecuje pewnie żywot wieczny (o czym: Ioan 6:47) ... Patrzcie, jako wy, będąc ministrami, z pijanicami w pijaństwie niephamowanym i z innymi tym podobnymi siadacie, bywacie,jadacie etc. - a mnie strofujecie, żem z dobrymi ludźmi bojaźni Bożej pełnymi siadał i u nich na naukach, duszy mojej i sumieniu mamy potrzebnych bywał.”

who, being so closely associated, with the Chrzastowskis must have heard about the controversy.

The aforementioned Bartłomiej Bythner was one of the most outspoken proponents of the ecumenical compromise among Trinitarian Evangelical churches since Jan Łaski. His vision, however, went beyond the national boundaries of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, advocating a dialogue and union of all European Evangelicals. In his work, *A brotherly call for the unification of all the Evangelical Churches in all Europe*, he proposed that European states should follow the ancient examples in seeking unity, such as when Constantine called the Council in Nicea (325) to resolve the theological controversies of his day. He wrote:

> Next, the most powerful kings and princes, by mutual agreement, should call for a great universal council of the Evangelical nations. The council should be first announced in Frankfurt (by Main) a year or at least half a year before and then in other business centers of Europe where sellers from everywhere gather. This announcement should be in the form of an official decree in which the place of gathering and rules of order should be introduced.

---

70 Bartłomiej Bythner, *Fraterna et modesta ad omnes per universam Europam reformatas ecclesias earumque pios ac fideles moderatores et defensores, pro unanimi in toto religionis evangeliæ negotio consensus inter se constituendo exhortatio. A pio erudito theologo nomine Fratrum Evangelicae professionis in regno Poloniae existentium, ante aliquot annos scripta, nuncque in lucem edita.* (Frankfurt, 1618) [Section in Polish translation available “W jaki Sposób można w Europie doprowadzić do zgody między Ewangelikami i ja ją utrzymać” in *Filozofia i myśl społeczna XVII wieku. 700 lat myśli polskiej*, ed. Zbigniew Ogonowski (Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1979) 603-620 (page citations are to the reprint edition), 613.

71 “Sądzimy następnie, że wspólną decyzją i powagą tychże najpoteźniejszych królów i książąt powinien być zapowiedziany wielki powszechny sobór wszystkich narodów ewangelickich, i to przynajmniej na rok, co najmniej na pół roku przed datą jego rozpoczęcia. Zapowiedź ta ogłoszona być powinna we Frankfurcie nad Menem oraz wielu innych miastach, będących wielkimi ośrodkami handlowymi, w których zwykle gromadzi się kupcy z całej prawie Europy. A ogłoszona być powinna przy pomocy urzędowego pisma, w którym określone zostanie miejsce i dokładny czas zebrania się soboru, a także jeśli uzna się za słuszną, podany zostanie porządek dzieni oraz sposób obrad, jaki winien być przestrzegany.” Byther, “W jaki sposób można w Europie doprowadzić do zgody,” 613.
It has been pointed out that Bythner’s vision has been influenced and supported by David Pareus with whom he shared a close relationship, and thankfully to whom the work gained popularity, being published in Germany and Switzerland. However, despite its popularity, the universal synod never took place; but it continued to inspire other Reformed thinkers of the period, such as Jan Amos Komeński and John Dury, who even petitioned the Lithuanian Reformed Church to publish a new edition of Bythner’s *Brotherly Call* while trying to advance reconciliation between Polish and Prussian Evangelicals.

4.5. **OTHER SOURCES AND IMMEDIATE BACKGROUND (17TH CENTURY)**

In order to complete the picture of the irenic movement in the seventeenth century, a few other thinkers must be mentioned whose possible influence on Kalaj would have been less direct, but who still belong to the irenic landscape of the first half of the seventeenth century and contributed to irenic dialogue between Protestants and Roman Catholics in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

One such thinker was John Dury (1596-1680), who, before joining the Westminster Assembly of Divines, served in a congregation of Presbyterian Scottish

---


73 Pawelec, *Barłomiej Bythner*, 121; See also Anton Gindley *Über des Johan Amos Comenius Leben und Wirksamkeit* (Znaim: Fournier & Haberler, 1892).


75 J. Minton Batten, *John Dury, Advocate of Christian Reunion*. (Chicago: The
settlers in Elblag, a city in the Polish Province of Royal Prussia. While in Prussia, Dury had a chance to interact directly with the various religious minorities represented in Poland, and he became more familiar with the irenic character of Polish Protestantism. He was noted for his great efforts to bring reconciliation between Lutherans and Calvinists in Prussia. Later, when he promoted his irenic views outside of Poland through multiple European tours, Dury was perhaps the only religious leader who attempted to settle each of the eight major types of ecclesiastical controversies which prevailed at the time: Protestants against Roman Catholics, Lutherans who accepted the *Formula of Concord* against Lutherans who rejected it, Lutherans versus the Reformed, Arminians against the Reformed, Anglicans against Scottish Presbyterians, Puritans opposed to High Church Anglicans, Anglicans versus Separatists, and English Presbyterians against English Independents. Many of Dury’s universalist visions were shared by Jan Amos Komeński (1592-1670), whose adopted son (and later son-in-law) Peter Figulus accompanied Dury during his extensive European travels.

Jan Amos Komeński, renowned for laying the foundation of modern pedagogy, also greatly contributed to the cause of Evangelical unity. Komeński’s

University of Chicago Press, 1944).


views on unity among the Evangelicals were similar to those of the Polish Reformed. He argued for basic agreement between Lutherans and the Reformed and considered the differences between the two churches as *adiaphora*. He did, however, exclude Polish Brethren from his vision of a united Christian church. The Polish Brethren had hoped for Komeński’s support for their cause; however, over time this relationship began to irritate him, and he became openly opposed to them, as was the case with the Anti-Trinitarian Daniel Zwicker, who spread rumors about their agreement on the irenic vision for the Church.

Zwicker argued for the eclectic nature of irenic theology; that is, that one is free to accept only the most desired doctrinal elements from either orthodox or heretical confessions. For instance, Zwicker asserted that, while the Bohemian Brethren and Lutherans initiated the Reformation and Christian liberty, Calvinists should be appreciated for using reason in theology, Remonstrants for advancing in liberty of conscience, the Greek church for preserving the ancient truth

---


80 Spinka, “The Irenic Program,” 97-98.

81 This made some argue for the inconsistency and ultimate irrationality of Komeński’s irenic vision. See: Ludwik Chmaj, “Komeński a Bracia Polscy,” in *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce*, vol. III 133-144.

82 Cf. Peter Betenholz, Daniel Zwicker 1612-1678 in *Peace, Tolerance and God the One and Only*, (Firenze : L.S. Olschki, 1997).
itself) the Roman Church for underscoring the necessity of good works and preserving the Latin Fathers, the Socinians for felicitous use of judgment, and, finally, the Mennonites for a more a faithful manner of life. Naturally, Zwicker’s eclecticism was far from Komeński’s own views, and he openly cut himself off from Zwicker, expressing his faithfulness to the Reformed and Czech Confessions.\textsuperscript{83}

Furthermore, Komeński entered into a full-blown polemic with the Socinians, arguing that their elevation of reason was in a sense unreasonable because it made God’s revelation subservient to human rationalism. He also accused them of being the main cause behind the fall of the Polish Reformation. In a similar manner, Komeński opposed Roman Catholicism, evident through his correspondence with Valerian Magni. For Komeński, the dictatorial character of the Roman church was destructive and ultimately impossible to reform.\textsuperscript{84}

Komeński’s anti-Catholic views were not shared by Georg Calixt (Calixtus, 1586-1656), who welcomed a Roman Catholic presence in his irenic proposals.\textsuperscript{85} For Calixt, the key to church unity was in the patristic period, perhaps best expressed in the early creeds. The motto, “Only what has been believed always and everywhere” served him as the basis of understanding between divided churches. Thus, he argued that churches (including the Roman Catholic Church) must limit the essential doctrines they consider necessary for salvation and put aside later theological developments. Spinka furnishes a list of nine points that are essential for preserving

\textsuperscript{83} Spinka, “The Irenic program,” 88.

\textsuperscript{84} This was best portrayed in his correspondence with the Capuchin friar Valerian Magni (1586-1661). Spinka, “The Irenic Program,” 75-84.

\textsuperscript{85} Spinka, “The Irenic Program,” 51.
the peace and unity of the church that Calixt spelled out in *Desiderium et studium concordiae ecclesiasticae*:

1. Distinguishing issues necessary and not-necessary for salvation, and mutual toleration shall be exercised;
2. All mutual recrimination shall cease;
3. All questions which do not contribute to the up-building of piety or have no importance for sacraments, or the whole church should not be discussed before laity;
4. The differences between the churches should be explained in kind spirit;
5. Concerning the sacraments the *quod sit* shall be considered important, and an absolute unanimity in the *quomodo sit* shall not be required as necessary;
6. The simplest doctrinal formula shall be regarded as sufficient;
7. All propositions which were disapproved will be avoided and no man who had formerly held such shall be exposed to ignominy on that account;
8. All men should strive to practice newly adopted teachings;
9. The teachings of each confession shall be taken from their official creedal statements.  

Although Calixt did not openly seek external unity with Catholics or Calvinists, he contended that there was “a virtual fellowship” between the concrete Lutheran, Reformed, and Roman Catholic church congregations which ultimately could blunt the edge of all condemnations and thus create a form for external union. Calixt’s ideas faced the greatest opposition from some of his own, who quickly

---

branded him a “cryptopapist,” especially when he became an enthusiastic supporter of the irenic meeting of Catholics and Protestants in the city of Toruń in 1645 (Colloquium Charitativum). His views were challenged by the Gnesio-Lutheran theologian Abraham Calov (1612-1686), igniting the “Syncretistic Controversy.”

The aforementioned Colloquium Charitativum was the first and largest ecumenical conference held in Early Modern Europe. The meeting was initiated by Valerian Magni, who deserves to be noted as an example of an ecumenical thinker working in a Catholic-dominated country. Magni was born in Milan. He served as a confidant of Pope Urban VIII (1623-1644) and advisor to Emperor Ferdinand II (1619-1637), arranging the marriage of the Polish King Władysław IV (1632-1648) to the Catholic Archduchess Cecilia Renata of Austria and prevented his marriage to the Protestant Elizabeth of Bohemia. In theology and method, Magni was not a friend to Jesuits. He fervently opposed their neo-scholastic curriculum and philosophy. He argued that the Jesuit educational system was counterproductive to the promotion of unity with Protestants and alleged that its unnecessary elevation of the role of the Pope prevented constructive dialogue with Protestants and Eastern Orthodox. Furthermore, he supported a conciliar understanding of church authority and advocated gentleness when dealing with Protestants.


In his *Iudicium de acatholicorum et catholicorum regula credendi*, Magni argued that the conflict between Catholics and Protestants was philosophical rather than dogmatic in nature. Magni’s irenic outreach was based on the rather simple idea that Protestants were not *heretics* but simply mistaken, their central confusion consisting of a primitive *biblicism*, which he understood as the right of every individual to interpret the Bible on his own. This, according to Magni, prevented Protestants from reconciling not only with Rome but even with each other. As pointed out by Louthan, he showed ignorance and a lack of precision in his basic understanding of the differences between various Protestant doctrines, which became evident during the Colloquium Charitativum.

The colloquium was officially called by the Polish King Władysław IV (1632-1648) and opened on August 28, 1645, in the Prussian city of Toruń (Thorn). Europe was astonished that nearly eighty theologians attended and that many more wished to attend, such as Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), who excused his absence due to poor health. Pope Innocent X (1644-1655) also watched the conference closely; despite having approved it, he continued to be skeptical of Magni’s ecumenical experiment. The Lutheran delegation was the largest—perhaps because the conference took place in Prussian territory—consisting of twenty-eight theologians. Their team was presided over by the conservative professor from Wittenberg named Jan Hülsemann,

---

89 Louthan, “Mediating Confessions,” 683.

90 Louthan, “Mediating Confessions,” 685.


in addition to other defenders of Augsburg orthodoxy such as the aforementioned Abraham Calov. Initially, the representation also included Georg Calixt, but his postulates were quickly dismissed and he was excluded from the representation. Vexed at the direction the colloquium seemed to be taking, Calixt described it as the *irritativum* rather than *charitativum*. The Reformed churches and Czech Brethren delegated twenty-four theologians, including the castellan of Chełm Zbigniew Gorajski, and the anti-Catholic Comenius, as well as Johann Bergius (1587-1658). Fredrich Wilhelm (1620-1688), the irenic-minded Elector of Brandenburg and Duke of Prussia, delegated these theologians. Finally, the Catholics sent twenty-six persons, presided over by the Bishop of Samogitia, Jerzy Tyszkiewicz (1596-1656) and the Bishop of Poznań, Andrzej Szodrski, as well as some Dominicans. The Socinians also delegated Martin Ruar and Krzysztof Lubieniecki, but the men were not allowed to participate since Socinians were no longer considered protected by the *Warsaw Confederation*. After three months and thirty-six sessions, the theologians failed to reach a single doctrinal or political agreement. Annoyed delegates departed for home on 21 November with no new developments in Catholic-Protestant relations. One thing was

---

93 Louthan, “Mediating Confessions,” 693.


95 For a list of all the participants: Piszczyk, *Colloquium Charitativum*, 210-213.

evident to all: the churches could reach neither ecclesiastical nor doctrinal unity. Lutherans became concerned with preserving the purity of their teaching, protecting it from Roman or Reformed influences, Catholics, on the other hand, wanted unity under the Pope but often continued to ignore and disrespect Protestant ideas. Finally, the Reformed (including the Czech Brethren) reaffirmed their teachings in the *Declaratio Thoruniensis* and became even more concerned about their future. Their hopes for sustaining an ecclesiastical union with Lutherans were long gone. Also, the idea of some kind of ecclesiastical peace with Catholics was no longer realistic.

It has been argued that the fiasco of *Colloquium Charitativum* serves as the closing date of the irenic efforts of Polish Protestants. However, this conclusion was made without consideration of Kałaj’s contribution. In order to locate Kałaj’s position in the trajectory of irenic thought in seventeenth-century Poland, we now turn to a discussion of Kałaj’s doctrines pertaining to Scripture, justification, the sacraments, and the church as presented in the *A Friendly Dialogue between an Evangelical Minister and a Roman Catholic Priest*.

---


CHAPTER FIVE:
THE EVANGELICAL DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURES

5.1. INTRODUCTION

On April 8, 1546, the Council of Trent held its fourth session dealing with the canonical Scriptures, during which it recognized tradition (in addition to Scripture) as a source of revelation and the Roman magisterium as having the exclusive authority to authorize Scripture and interpret the Word of God. By contrast, the Reformed continued to argue that Scripture stands on its own and that its divine origin can be authorized by the author himself, the Holy Spirit: thus, the authority and tradition of the church had to become subservient it. So it was that, even though both Protestant and Catholic churches recognized that Scripture was foundational to the Christian faith, they disagreed as to its authority.¹

The Confession of Sandomierz (1570) followed the Second Helvetic Confe$$sion faithfully on this issue, recognizing no need for ecclesiastical authorization of the Bible. It argued that the church’s doctrine can be drawn only from Scripture and that tradition is to be accepted and valued as long as it agrees with the Bible. Lehmann points out that the Polish confession betrays strong anti-clerical

language (beyond the Second Helvetic Confession), which is attributable to the early Lutheran influence on Czech Bretheren and many Polish Reformed.  

5.2. Scripture is the Only Source of Revelation

In reaction to the Catholic view that the church authorized (or even produced) Scripture, the sixteenth-century Reformers often began the discussion on the Scripture with, for example, Bullinger and the aforementioned Second Helvetic Confession. By doing so, they were signaling that Scripture is the foundation of the church and not the reverse. In addition, John Calvin had included the discussion on Scripture in the beginning of the early editions of his Institutes. Later, in discussions with the Anabaptists, Calvin realized the need to expand, and in further editions of the Institutes he addressed the doctrine of Scripture in relation to other topics. In the post-Reformation period, Scripture consistently was treated as the doctrinal locus, usually after the prologomena.

Polish Reformed in the sixteenth century followed Bullinger and discussed Scripture in the opening two chapters of the Confession of Sandomierz, titled, “About Holy Writing, and The True Word of God,” and “About the Teaching of Holy Word, Teachers of the Church, Councils, and Traditions.” Both articles underscore the fact

---


4 Artykuł I, “O Piśmie Świętym, o prawdziwym Słowie Bożym,” Artykuł II “O wykładaniu Pisma Świętego, o dokotach kościołnych o koncyliach i o triadycjach.”
that Scripture alone is the source of our knowledge about God, and tradition, although important, must submit to the Word of God.

Kalaj discusses Scripture in the beginning of his theological section of the *Friendly Dialogue*; however, he also notes that he omits the discussion on the doctrine of God since there are no disagreements with Catholics on this topic. In effect, Kalaj shifts the locus of the discussion to render it secondary in comparison to the *Confession of Sandomierz*. This move might have been due to the aforementioned discussion on the place of the doctrine among Protestant scholastics. The article on Scripture opens with the following words:

The knowledge of God depends on the knowledge of God’s Word in which God revealed himself sufficiently for our salvation and what can be comprehended. However not everything that has been written can be perfectly understood with our mortal reason. As it is written: What love of God, so it is the love of his Word. If anyone loves me, he will keep my words, John 14:23.5

From the start, Kalaj establishes some fundamental convictions for his approach to the doctrine of revelation: (1) knowledge of God depends on knowledge of God’s Word, (2) everything we need to know about God for our salvation can be easily understood from Scripture, (3) not everything in Scripture can be easily understood, and (4) if we love God we will also love his Word. Kalaj establishes the view that, as opposed to the Catholic view of tradition and the spiritualist or mystical view of personal revelation (characteristic of some Anabaptists), our knowledge of God depends only on Scripture and not on tradition or ecstatic personal revelations.

---

Moreover, against the Socinians he signals the limits of reason in the task of Biblical exegesis. His view of the singularity of revelation and rejection of tradition as an additional or co-equal source of revelation becomes even more explicit when he writes:

Besides this Holy Scripture we do not know in God’s Church any other Word of God. We also deny that there might be somewhere else in God’s Church another Word of God, as they say unwritten, verbal, given by word of mouth from the Apostles to their successors.⁶

In Kalaj’s view, the fact that the Bible is the only Word of God justifies our love of Scripture simply because if we love God we will naturally love his Word.

5.3. THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE

In reference to the differences in the Catholic and Reformed Scriptural canons, the Reformed argued that the Council of Trent’s decision to accept the Apocrypha as a homogeneous part of the authoritative Scriptures had been questioned before and that Roman theologians ignored not only the ancient tradition of the Church Fathers, but also some medieval theologians who singled them out from the Bible.⁷

Kalaj supports the Protestant position on the canon directly with patristic sources. He states that the church does not have the authority to add to or detract from Scripture, but only to recognize and receive what already had been in use. Therefore,

---

⁶ Kalaj, PR, 20. “Oprocz tego Pisma S. żadnego inszego Słowa Bożego nie znamy indziey w kościele Bożym, abo żeby miało bydz jakie insze słowo Boże, jako mówią, niepisane, ustnie od Apostolow sucessorom podane nie wierzymy.”

the apocryphal books that have never achieved a status equal to the canonical works and were often questioned by the Church Fathers cannot now be included. He quotes from Jerome, who discussed the nature of the Apocrypha in his *Prologus Galaeatus*.  

Next, he lists all thirty-five canonical Old Testament books—counting II Samuel, II Kings, II Chronicles, Jeremiah, and Lamentations as three books—accepted by the church in all times and places. In order to avoid confusion, he explains that Jerome had listed only twenty-two books, but this was because he had counted them differently. Finally, he points out that his objection to the use of the Apocrypha as containing matters of doctrine does not disqualify them from being recommended as an informative source about the history of God’s people, a recommendation already present in the Confession of Sandomierz. Furthermore, Kalaj does not reject the use of additional sources that might prove helpful and enriching to the study of the Scriptures. Rather, he recommends the use of ancient sermons, disputations, commentaries, lectures, dialogues, and decisions of old synods, as they are valuable resources for facilitating a better understanding of Scripture and for deciding such practical matters as keeping proper government, discipline, and morality in the church.

Kalaj’s arguments for the exclusion of the Apocrypha differ from the Confession of Sandomierz but do resemble to some extent those proposed by John Calvin (1509-1564), who also used Jerome to question the council’s decision to

---

8 Kalaj, *PR*, 20. “Viginti duo Volumina, quibus quasi literis & exordiis, in Dei doctrina, tenera adhuc & lactans, viri justi exsuditur infantia … Ut scire valeamus, quicquid extra hos est inter Appocrypha ponendum esse.”

include the Apocrypha.\textsuperscript{10} Obviously, Calvin was not the only one to notice that no 
council in the history of the church had officially approved the Apocrypha as equal 
with the rest of Scripture. In his popular writing, \textit{A disputation on Holy Scripture 
against the papists especially Bellarmine and Stapleton}, William Whitaker (1547-
1595) quotes from Jerome’s \textit{Prologus Galaeatus}, almost exactly Kalaj later does:

I come now to Jerome, who most plainly of all rejects these books 
from the canon, and argues strenuously against their canonical 
authority, and shews himself a most vehement adversary of these 
books. It would be tedious to review all these testimonies.\textsuperscript{11}

This close resemblance with Whitaker’s work may mean that his \textit{A 
disputation on Holy Scripture} was one the few books which Kalaj read and 
perhaps even owned and took with him while escaping from Little Poland.

\textbf{5.4. The Proper Role of Reason in the Interpretation of the Bible}

In Kalaj’s time, the practice of drawing theological doctrines systematically 
upon correlations between various passages of Scripture—or so called common 
places—was foundational for the work of a theologian, whose goal was to clarify 
what might have seemed contradictory or obscure.\textsuperscript{12} Reformed churches inherited

\begin{footnotes}
\item[10] Calvin, \textit{Institutes} VI.ix.14, p. 1179. “They bring forward as evidence an ancient 
list, called ‘canon,’ which they say came from the judgment of the church. But I ask once 
more, in what council was that canon promulgated? Here they must remain mute ... And if 
what Jerome says ought to have weight, the books of Maccabees, Tobit, Ecclesiasticus, and 
the like are to be thrown back in the rank of Apocrypha. This the Romanists cannot bear to 
do.” See also: John Calvin, “Cannons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, with Antidote,” in 
For further discussion see: Muller, \textit{PRRD}, vol. 2, 378.

\item[11] William Whitaker, \textit{A Disputation on Holy Scripture against the papists especially 
Bellarmine and Stapleton} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1849), 60.

\item[12] In the Middle Ages, Lombard’s \textit{Sentences} served this purpose. Among early 
Protestant scholastics we find Philip Melanchthon, Peter Martyr Vermigli, and Wolfgang
\end{footnotes}
their method of theological study from medieval scholastic predecessors who studied during a time when philosophy was the handmaid of theology, a tool helpful in clarifying Scripture and never an alternative way to achieve or prove God’s existence or the validity of the Bible. So when Reformers spoke negatively of schoolmen, they referred specifically to the doctors of Sorbonne and not to the whole scholastic tradition. A similar notion is also found in Tertullian’s famous expression, “What has Jerusalem to do with Athens?” in which he emphasized the sufficiency and complete aspect of Scripture, not denying the need for the appropriate use of reason, but simply cautioning believers against using reason as a second source of truth about God.

Kalaj strongly advocates the use of reason in a proper interpretation of the Scripture. He finds a biblical basis for it in Christ’s ministry on the occasion of a dispute with the Sadducees (see Matt. 22:31). He explains that the Sadducees, who accepted only the Pentateuch as authoritative, argued that teachings about the resurrection could not be found in the Scriptures and that the Mosaic code was structured in a way that excluded resurrection. For example, they posited that if resurrection actually were to take place, then a remarried person would be confused Musculus producing their own *Loqui communes*.


as to whom he or she belonged; so Moses gave a right to remarry knowing that there would be no future resurrection to cause such disorientation. Christ, of course, refutes this reasoning and shows that although the Pentateuch nowhere explicitly teaches resurrection, the idea of it is still implicitly present. He proves his point by showing how God describes himself to Moses as the Father of the dead in the present tense, by saying, “I am the God of your father, the God of Abraham…” (see Ex. 3:6) and not in the past tense, “I was the God of your father, the God of Abraham…..” Jesus argued that God will raise Abraham from the dead; otherwise he would not describe himself to Moses as the God of those who are alive. Kałaj uses this biblical account to show that the truths of Scripture are not just words or syllables, but are in the overall message of the text, so that some doctrines might be present in the text only virtually and not always literally. He writes:

This is Christ’s teaching, which Evangelicals follow from the reading of the Holy Scripture. What we find in the Holy Scripture is not only what is explicitly stated but also what has been deduced through correct reasoning. In this way all our articles of faith are being grounded, and flow out of the Holy Scripture, in which they exist virtualiter and not always literaeiter, as seeds in sperm and fruit in its root.16

As is the case with other magisterial Reformers, Kałaj continues to affirm ancient catholic (meaning universal) doctrines, such as the Trinity, the pre-existence of Christ, the divinity of the Holy Spirit, infant baptism, and the celebration of Sunday as the Christian Sabbath, despite no explicit reference to them in Scripture.

16 Kałaj, PR, 21. “Oto nauka Chrystusowa, za tym nauka Ewangelicka, idzie z czytania Pisma S. a czytamy w Piśmie S. nie tylko to, co tam expresse napisano, ale y co ztamtąd słusznym wywodem bywa dowodzono. Tamże sposobem dowodu gruntownego pochodzą i płyną z Pisma S. insze wszystkie artykuły wiary, w nim zawarte będąc virtualiter, nie zawsze literaeiter jako ziareneczka w swoim nasieniu, jako owoc w swoim korzeniu.”
5.5. The Perspicuity of Scripture

The Holy See argued that the use of the Scriptures is allowed only by those adequately educated and authorized by the Holy See, and therefore any possession of unauthorized Bibles or other unapproved books was to be harshly punished. This censorship was based on the assumption that the Bible is an obscure book with a complex message, only to be read and understood by a few. For Roman theologians, the Holy Roman Magisterium owned and established the Scriptures and was therefore the sole interpreter of them. In effect, they saw no necessity for unauthorized access to the Scriptures, which could only lead to profanation or heresy by ignorant people.17

Protestants, on the other hand, were convinced that the Bible was perspicuous when it came to matters necessary for one’s salvation. Whitaker argued that Roman opponents labored in vain to demonstrate the obscurity of the Bible and falsely accused Protestants of a lack of scientific exegesis of the text.18 Also, in the second half of the seventeenth century Francis Turretin showed how the doctrine of perspicuity is rooted not only in Scripture itself but also in early church tradition.19 For Protestants, the gospel message was simple and clear and could have been understood by almost anybody without the necessity of specially trained clergymen. They also thought that accessing the Scriptures would enable people to grow in their understanding of faith. However, the Protestant stand concerning the clarity of

---

17 Schroeder, *Canon and Decrees*, 18-20, (Session IV)


Scripture in matters of faith and practice did not deny mysteries and obscurity altogether. The Reformers did not assume that everyone was equally qualified to practice scientific exegesis of the sacred Word of God, and they put extremely strong emphasis on the study of ancient languages and proper interpretative methods.

Polish Reformed Christians recognized the urgent need for the translation of Scripture, and in 1563, under the sponsorship of Prince Mikołaj Radziwiłł (1515-1556), produced the first Polish translation of the Bible from the original languages, called *Biblia Brzeska*. Naturally, Kąlaj continues to argue for the availability of God’s Word in the Polish language for all to read and study. He humbly recognizes the complexity of Scriptural teaching in general but at the same time is not intimidated by it, arguing for its simplicity when dealing with matters of salvation. He writes:

This Holy Scripture should not be available only for teachers…but also for all God’s people without prejudice against gender, status or age and recommended to be read and practiced for their own edification…and no pretext is sufficient to forbid reading it, neither imperfection, difficulty, lack of clearness and understanding, ignorance, or even the holiness of it.\(^{20}\)

5.6. A PAGAN THING: ASKING MAN TO AUTHORIZE GOD’S WORD

Henk van den Belt, in his book, *The Authority of Scripture in Reformed Theology*, traces the development of the Reformed concepts of Scripture as self-
convincing (*autopista*) through Reformation and Post-Reformation periods. In his analysis, he explains how the concept was related by various Reformed theologians to the authority of the church, the evidence for Scripture, and the witness of the Spirit.\(^{21}\) The Confession of Sandomierz speaks of the self-affirming character of Scripture in the opening sentence of the very first article, stating that the Scriptures have *poważność* (authority) and *pewność* (certainty) of themselves, not of men.\(^{22}\) And although it never uses the word *autopista*, the basic idea is present in it.

Kałaj continues to use the Polish confessional language, such as the words *poważność* (authority) and *pewność* (certainty), but he also adds *zacność* (respectable or trustworthy) and *świętoślubliwość* (holiness). He also forms the discussion as a response to a provocative question asked by his opponent, namely: “How do you know that Scripture is actually true?” Kałaj answers that questioning the authorization of God’s Word is blasphemous and could be posed only by a heathen. He writes:

> This Holy Scripture possesses such a divine reverence, holiness, and heavenly virtue that it cannot be judged even by the most virtuous church, but instead it is the church which is being founded, sustained, directed and judged by it. [All of this] is to such an extent that to doubt [God’s Word] asking, “How do you know that this Holy Word is God’s Word?” is a heathen thing to do.\(^{23}\)


\(^{22}\) Lehmann, *Konfesja Sadomierska*, 29.

\(^{23}\) Kałaj, *PR*, 22. “Że to Pismo S. ma w sobie powage Boską, pełne świętobliowsci y zacnoci, niebieskiej, sądowi Kościoła y nazacnięszego nie poddane, ale samo Kościół Boży fundujace, zatrzymające, pokazujace y sadzące. Tak dalece, że wątpić o jego pewności, pytając się wątpliwie ztąd wiesz ze to Pismo S. jest Słowem Bożym, jest rzecz pogańska.”
The idea that only a heathen could ask such a question once again resembles Calvin when he wrote of the “sacilegious men” who ask for the church’s authorization of Scripture. Calvin writes: “Who can convince us that these writings came from God? ... Thus these sacrilegious men, wishing to impose an unbridled tyranny under the cover of the church, do not care with what absurdities they ensnare themselves and others, provided they can force this idea upon the simple-minded: that the church has authority in all things.”

5.7. What Did Polish Jesuits Really Believe?

Kalaj concludes his brief expose of Reformed teaching on revelation and enters into a more dynamic conversation with the priest about the confusion of the teaching on revelation among the Polish Jesuits. The Roman Catholic priest begins by recommending to the Evangelical minister a book by one of Lublin’s famous Jesuits, Jan Zuchowicz (1604-1667), titled, *True reason about the foundations of faith.* The priest claims that all the arguments presented by the minister have been sufficiently handled by Zuchowicz, and therefore he sees no need to address them now. The minister replies that he has already read the book and found it sufficiently refuted in *Reason on reason or Evangelical response on Catholic discourse,* in which a Protestant theologian refutes the falsehood of the Catholic doctrine using reason, the

---

24 Calvin, *Institutes,* I.vii.1, 75.

25 Kalaj does not mention the title of the book in the text. I am thankful to Professor Szczucki for helping me to identify and locate this source. Jan Zuchowicz, *Rozsądek prawdziwy o fundamencie wiary i prawidłe w niej prawdy katolikom rzymskim i dysidentom abo heretykom jakiejkolwiek sekty zwyczajnych. Milujacym prawdę i zbawienie dusze* (Lublin, 1662).
Church Fathers, and the recent teachings of the Roman writers. Furthermore, the minister argues that the priest should read the work titled, *A discourse between a theologian with a dissident about honest and true use of the Scripture in the faith controversies*, written by Wojciech Wijuk Kojalowicz (1609-1677), a Jesuit from the city of Kalisz. The discourse strives to show that all Catholic doctrine finds its basis in the Bible, contradicting the generally-accepted view that revelation comes from the Bible and tradition, which is the view for which Zuchowicz argues. Kałaj’s point is that even the Roman Catholic theologians have not reached a consensus on the nature and character of revelation.

This confusion among the Jesuit theologians might have resulted from the controversy surrounding the acceptance of Trent’s article on revelation. The discussion took place just two weeks before the final draft of the article was approved. The earlier draft argued explicitly that tradition is equal with Scripture as a source of revelation, stating that “[Revelation is] contained partly in written books, partly in unwritten traditions.” The proposed shape of the article consisting of “partly … partly” was met with opposition, and the article had to be revised. After extended

---

26 Kałaj, *PR*, 22. Unfortunately, we were unable to locate this source. Perhaps Kałaj was using a handwritten reply to Zuchowicz written by some unidentified Protestant writer, or possibly he does not mention the name of the author out of fear for persecution. The title of the book is *Rozsądek na rozsądek abo Respons Ewangelicki, na Discurs Katolicki*.

27 Wojciech Wijuk Kojalowicz, *Rozmowa theologa z dissisentem o szczerym a prawdziwym Pisma Świętego używaniu w kontroversjach wiary* (Kalisz, 1667). See: Kałaj, *Przyjacielska Rozmowa*, 22. Kojalowicz was a well-known Polish Jesuit theologian. There are at least two editions of the mentioned work. Kałaj here refers to the first edition of the work. The second edition appears under the title “Trzecia część Rozmów o szczerym a niewykrętnym w dowodzeniu artykułów wiary...rozmowy teologa z dysydentem krótkie, proste, przyjacielskie,” found in the collection of writings titled, *O rzeczach do wiary należących* (Kraków, 1671). I am grateful to Professor Szczucki for identifying these sources.
discussion, the editors decided to substitute the Latin words *partim ... partim* with the simple conjunction *et*.\(^{28}\) In effect, the decree stated that the Gospel needed to be promulgated as a source contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions. Although the revised version of the article more ambiguously presented the relationship between Scripture and Revelation, its meaning still argued that extrabiblical tradition was part of divine revelation and had been faithfully preserved from the time of the apostles until the magisterium. Jedin argues:

> There can be no doubt that though the majority of the theologians of Trent may not have approved the formula *partim-partim* they approved the thing itself, that is, the statement that dogmatic tradition was a channel of revelation which supplemented the Scripture. \(^{29}\)

Heiko Oberman, in his books, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology* and *The Dawn of Reformation*,\(^{30}\) demonstrates that Trent was actually consistent in endorsing *partim ... partim*, despite the acceptance of the second draft, since the idea of two sources goes beyond the fourteenth century. Oberman argues that Basil the Great (329-379) in the East and later Augustine (354-430) in the West proposed a need for some extra-scriptural material to be regarded as equal to Scripture.\(^{31}\) However, their


\(^{31}\) Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology*, 361.
plea was for the sake of the preservation of church order in practical ecclesiastical matters, not theology. Their approach was later adopted by canon lawyers such as Ivo of Chartres (d. 1116) and Gratian of Bologna (c. 1158), whose writings became very influential in the fourteenth century, especially due to the ecclesiastical turmoil caused by the Great Schism (1378-1417). The popularity of canonical law and especially its procedures gained increasing influence upon the study of theology.

To this point, theology had been governed by its own rules, namely *regula fidei*, in which obscure passages of Scripture were to be explained by clear ones. Thus, as has been pointed out by Congar, a majority of theologians in the Middle Ages explained the Bible using the Bible. However, this changed when William of Ockham (1288-1348), Pierre d’Ailly (1350-1420), Jean Gerson (1363-1429), and Gabriel Biel (1420-1595) applied to the study of theology an approach which, until this time, had been used only to resolve practical matters of ecclesiastical order. Oberman calls this approach to theological study “Tradition II,” and defines it in the following words:

The second concept of tradition, Tradition II, refers to the written and unwritten part of the apostolic message as approved by the Church. Here it is not the function of the doctors of Holy Scripture but that of the bishops which is relatively more stressed. The hierarchy is seen to have its “own” oral tradition, to a certain undefined extent, independent, not of the Apostles, but of what is recorded in the canonical books. Ecclesiastical traditions, including cannon law, are invested with the same degree of authority as that of Holy Scripture.

---


34 Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology*, 373.

35 Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology*, 373.
In contrast to Tradition II, Oberman also examines “Tradition I,” a variant of which was adopted by Protestants and was perhaps was referred to by Wojciech Wijuk Kojalowicz, whom Kalaj mentioned. Tradition I describes the approach in which the Holy Scriptures carried the highest authority in matters of doctrine. Oberman observes that this approach was prevalent among the Church Fathers and the majority of the medieval theologians such as Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), Thomas Bradwardine (1290-1349), John Wycliffe (1320-1384), Jan Huss (1370-1415), Wessel Gansfort (1419-1489), and later Protestants and Protestant scholastics.\footnote{Oberman, \textit{The Harvest of Medieval Theology}, 372.} He defines it in the following way:

Tradition I, then represents the sufficiency of Holy Scripture as understood by the Fathers and doctors of the Church. In the case of disagreement between these interpreters, Holy Scripture has the final authority. The horizontal concept of Tradition is by no means denied here, but rather understood as the mode of reception of the \textit{fide} or \textit{veritas} contained in Holy Scripture. Since the appeal to extra-scriptural tradition is rejected, the validity of ecclesiastical traditions and \textit{consuetudines} is not regarded as “self-supporting” but depends on its relation to the faith handed down by God in Holy Scripture.\footnote{Oberman, \textit{The Harvest of Medieval Theology}, 372.}

This approach to Scripture and tradition was later expressed in the Protestant \textit{sola Scriptura} and may have been a source of controversy during Trent’s efforts to adopt the \textit{partim ... partim} formula. A majority of the post-Trentine theology interpreted revelation as consisting of two coexisting and independent sources, exemplified in the Roman Catechism (1566), published about twenty years after the council,\footnote{Oberman, \textit{The Dawn of the Reformation}, 288.} as well as in the writings of the leading Jesuits of the Counter-Reformation—Peter Canisius
Antonio Possevino (1533-1611), Edmund Campion (1540-1581), and Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621).  

Our preliminary examination of the Jesuit works referenced by Kałaj testifies that Kałaj seems to quote both Jesuits accurately. Zuchowicz argues that the foundation of faith consists not only of Scripture but also of powaga kosciola (church authority). In contrast, Kojałowicz argued that only the written and verbal Word of God can serve as the foundation of the church. He does not mention the authority of the church. Perhaps it is only a difference in formulation, exploited by Kałaj. However, it seems that Kałaj might have been observing correctly when he points out that for Zuchowicz the church has more authority than Scripture, while for Kojałowicz the two are equal. Only further study could determine if the points of difference between them resulted from the continual presence of Tradition I among a small number of Polish Catholic theologians.  

5.8. Conclusion  

Kałaj deals with the doctrine of revelation only briefly, most likely because the Reformed and Catholics actually shared very little on the issue of revelation. This is evident in his discussion of the canon, perspicuity, and the authority of Scripture. Kałaj’s recognition that, ultimately, it is the church that must be shaped by Scripture directly opposes the fourth session of the Council of Trent which affirms the self-
convincing character of Scripture in continuity with the *Confession of Sandomierz*. The basis for Kalaj’s  irenic strategy is to show the antiquity of the Reformed perspective, which he accomplishes by quoting ancient sources in support of his position, for example Jerome. Moreover, he argues that there is no clear consensus among the Polish Jesuits on the issue of revelation, and how Kojalowicz seems to agree with the Protestant approach without knowing it. He remains faithful to the language of the Confession of Sandomierz but also seems to add polemical material (perhaps from John Calvin or William Whitaker) and moves the *locus* of the doctrine. Furthermore, he defends using reason in the process of biblical exegesis and affirms doctrines not directly taught in Scripture, such as the Trinity, the pre-existence of Christ, the divinity of the Holy Spirit, infant baptism, and the celebration of Sunday as the Christian Sabbath and in all these things he remains faithful to the orthodox Reformed doctrine of the Scripture.
CHAPTER SIX: THE REFORMED DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION

6.1. INTRODUCTION

In many ways, the doctrine of justification was at the heart of the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century. For the Reformed, any church that compromised the doctrine of justification had ceased to fulfill its role and thus had to be either reformed or abandoned. Justification carried so much weight with Protestants that they in effect considered it the litmus test of a church’s authenticity, the standard that measured whether it ought to stand or fall.\(^1\) Early Polish Reformed believers recognized and valued the importance of the doctrine, but aside from dealing with Swiss and German influences, they had to reconcile their views with the Czech Brethren and struggle against the Socinians’ moralistic view of justification.\(^2\)

6.2. IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS

Kalaj begins his chapter Concerning Justification with the Protestant minister’s words of confession, writing: “We believe and confess according to the Scripture, the following three articles: Conscientiae, Mortis, Judicii ultimi.”\(^3\) The

---


\(^{3}\) Kalaj, PR, 24. “Wierzymy y wyznawamy według Pisma te trzy artykuły o Conscientiae, Mortis, Judicii ultimi.”
structure of this chapter will follow his threefold division. In Conscience is a three-page section which corresponds theologically to the concept of the imputation of alien (Christ’s) righteousness. Kalaj defines it when he writes that man cannot be saved by his own works, but only by faith, and that faith comes only through the imputation of Christ’s righteousness:

Man becomes justified because of the two aforementioned causes; the forgiveness of sins and [the imputation] of Christ’s righteousness. [Only then] a Christian man repents and through the power of the keys and by the service of a preacher he receives external assurance of pardon, and, by the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit residing in his heart and conscience, imputation of the living faith. This is when his faith is reckoned to him as righteousness, and this is how he is justified before God.

In this passage, Kalaj affirms the following Reformed doctrines: (1) imputation of Christ’s righteousness, (2) assurance of salvation, and (3) the regenerative work of the Spirit. Furthermore, he affirms the Reformed understanding of salvation when he writes, “Out of this per necessariam et irrefragabilem consequentiam our Evangelical teaching and confession comes: that Sola fide, only by faith, are we justified before God.”

---


5 Kalaj, PR, 23-24. “Te dwie rzeczy, grzechów odpuszczenie y sprawiedliwość Krystusowa, z owych dwu przyczyn namienionych pochodzące, mianowice, miłosierdzia Bożego, y zasługi Krystowsowej, gdy tobie człowiek krześcijański pokutujący, przez moc kluczyKrólestwa niebieskiego, za usługą Kaznodziejskiego rozgrzeszenia zewnątrz, a wewnątrz przez Świadectwo Ducha Ś. w sercu y sumieniu cieszącego, wiarą żywą przywłaszcza, tedy wiara jego bywa my przyczytana za sprawiedliwość, y tak bywa przwd Bogiem usprawiedliwiony.”

6 Kalaj, PR, 24. “Tedy stąd per necessariam et irrefragabilem consequentiam idzie nauka y konfesia nasza ewangelicka, że Sola fide samą wiarą bywamy usprawiedliwieni przed Bogiem.”
He continues with the common biblical imagery of being clothed with the righteousness of Christ. The first illustration compares salvation to the dressing of the high priest Joshua in a new garment by the Angel of the Lord. In the Zechariah passage that describes it, Kalaj says Joshua’s sins are being forgiven and that the new clothing symbolizes his new identity (see Zech. 3:3–5). The second illustration comes from the well-known parable of the prodigal son in which the father’s forgiveness is represented in dressing his son in a costly new garment (see Luke 15:22). The goal of both stories is to illustrate that the forgiveness of sins takes place when one is being clothed in righteousness. Kalaj’s imagery, while not unique, was very popular among the Reformers and found its expression in various Reformed confessions and catechisms.

Next, Kalaj concentrates on the role of good works—probably the most controversial aspect of the justification debate. Catholics argued that one is saved gradually, with one’s own merit triggering the work of grace. They asserted that Pauline teaching on grace needs to be understood in light of James’ teaching on works. Protestants and Kalaj argued that it was the other way around: James must be

---


9 Paul argues, “If, in fact, Abraham was justified by works, he had something to boast about—but not before God. What does the Scripture say? ‘Abraham believed God, and it was credited to him as righteousness’” (NIV, Romans 4:1–2). And James argues: “You see that his faith and his actions were working together, and his faith was made complete by what he did. And the Scripture was fulfilled that says, ‘Abraham believed God, and it was credited to him as righteousness,’ and he was called God’s friend. You see that a person is justified by what he does and not by faith alone” (NIV, James 2:22–25).
understood in the context of Pauline teaching. Besides using exegetical arguments, they supported their argument with Augustine, who had identified the idea of works-righteousness as Pelagian heresy. Initially, Luther marginalized James and even advocated excluding his book from the New Testament canon.¹⁰ Kalaj rejects this idea, however, since Paul and James cannot contradict each other, if, as the church holds, they both wrote under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.¹¹ He tries to resolve the tension between Paul and James by distinguishing between the different types of justification the two Apostles discuss.

For Kalaj, Paul talks about the act of being justified before God *actum formalem justificationis*, while James addresses the process of being justified before men *quoad actum formatum*. If the first justification is an act resulting in a peaceful conscience, salvation of the soul, forgiveness of sins, and the imputation of Christ’s righteousness, the latter justification comes as fruit of the first one, meant as validation or simply as confirmation of the first one. This proof is necessary not so much for the individual who experiences salvation but more for the benefit of those around him. Kalaj argues this is necessary because people do not know what is inside of human hearts and therefore need to see fruits to know that the Holy Spirit is present in the lives of other Christians. But the divine perspective is altogether

¹⁰ However, this was not the case with Luther later or with Lutheran theologians. For example Martin Chemnitz sounds very similar to Kalaj. He writes “James, therefore, is speaking of this, that the obedience and good works of Abraham declared and furnished proof that he had truly been justified by faith. For to James ‘to be justified’ meant to be declared righteous through external testimonies.” See: *Examination of the Council of Trent*, trans. Fred Kramer, vol. 1 (St. Louis, MO.: Concordia Publishing House, 1971), 539.

¹¹ Kalaj, *PR*, 24. Here Kalaj follows the Augustinian *Regula Fidei*; he does not believe different parts of Scripture can contradict one another. Rather, he says that where apparent contradictions exist, they ought to be clarified using less-obscure passages.
different: God is the ultimate *cardiognoster* who can see human hearts with perfect clarity, needing no confirmation of his own work in them. In other words, for Kalaj, the moral justification James discusses does not earn salvation with God but rather with people: it is a mere fruit of salvation confirming that justification before God has already taken place. So if Paul’s teachings in Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, and Philippians examine justification theologically, James deals with it pastorally, confuting the idea that faith is a license for moral laxity—a concept repulsive both to Paul and James.\(^\text{12}\)

Kalaj thinks it important to distinguish between kinds of righteousness, especially when it comes to dialoguing with Roman Catholics, for such distinctions allow both parties to see more precisely where they actually disagree. From the Protestant perspective, there is no argument about the necessity of doing good works, only about the way man is justified before God. Kalaj writes, “...our conflict with Catholics is about justification before God through faith alone…and not about justification before other men.”\(^\text{13}\) This fact helped both sides to narrow the discussion, allowing for more constructive dialogue as well as helping Catholics to see that Protestants did not fall into antinomianism.

In the course of this section, Daniel Kalaj concentrates precisely on assurance and comfort. He does this partially in reaction to the Council of Trent’s article, “Against the Vain Confidence of the Heretics,” but also somewhat in continuity with


\(^{13}\) Kalaj, *PR*, 20. “Isz tedy, miedzy nami a katolikami, spôr sie wiedzie o usprawiedliwieniu naszym przed Bogiem przez samu wiarę, co jest oni afirmują, drudzy negują; a nie o usprawiedliwieniu przed ludźmi przez dobre uczynki, co obie strony pozwalają.”
one of his great Polish predecessors, Jan Łaski, who greatly emphasized the idea of Christian comfort. Kalaj also addresses another controversial issue, the role of good works. Kalaj appeases Catholics by showing that Protestant teaching offends them only because they misunderstand it. In order to explain, Kalaj differentiates between salvific and moral righteousness.  

6.3. Inherent Righteousness

The In Death section consists only of one page and briefly discusses the controversial issue of inherent righteousness. In it, Kalaj returns to the original concept of this doctrine, which excludes the idea of salvation through one’s own merit but reintroduces the idea of sanctification. First, Kalaj points out areas in which Protestants and Catholics still agree, namely, on original sin and continual acts of the sinful nature. Furthermore, both camps agree that mankind is guilty before God on these two counts and is in desperate need of God’s assistance in some form. Here, following Augustinian Protestants, Kalaj argues that man was so depraved after the fall that he was no longer able to abstain from sin and was thus unable to have faith in God on his own. In order to be saved, he now needs special assistance from the Holy

---

14 The well-known first question and answer of the Heidelberg Catechism was inspired by Jan Łaski’s own catechism, written while he served as the superintendent of the Reformed churches in East Frisia. We find the question in Johannes a Lasco Opera, trans. and ed. Abraham Kuyper, vol. 2 (Amsterdam and Hagae-Committum: Frederic Muller and Martin Nijhoff, 1886); Jan Łaski and Marten Micronius, De Kleyne Catechismus Kinder Oft Berichtleere Der Duyscher Ghemeynte to Londen. Ghemaeckt Door Marten, Micron (Ghendruckt to Londen: by Ian Daye, 1566). This is also supported by Augustus Lang, Der Heidelberger Katechismus (Lepzig: Deichert, 1907) and James Good in Heidelberg Catechism in Its Newest Light (Philadelphia: Publication and Sunday School Board of the Reformed Church in the United States, 1914).

15 Kalaj, PR, 25.
Spirit through whom he can be regenerated, repent, and experience grace. The Spirit’s assistance is given unconditionally, based on the sovereign decree of God’s will, and only those who are actually elect can respond positively to the Gospel.\textsuperscript{16} In effect, once a man believes, he cannot boast because he knows he has not earned his salvation by his actions or will. His salvation from start to finish flows out of God’s love and mercy, and Christ’s righteousness has been imputed to him by grace alone through faith alone on the account of Christ’s death alone.

Catholics opposed this view because they desired to see greater participation of men in the act of their own salvation. From their perspective, Protestants not only stripped man of his free will but also arrogantly boasted assurance of their salvation. Catholics also argued that the doctrine of election rendered God unjust and vicious, since salvation was offered to some and Scripture teaches that God wills all men to be saved. In effect, Catholics argued that Protestants took too far the effects of sin in man’s life and that inherent righteousness, despite its corruption, was still capable of producing merit, which later triggered God’s grace and thus initiated the salvation process.\textsuperscript{17} In effect, the Catholic assertion was that Christ’s righteousness was gradually infused only after man’s initial decision to progress in producing salvific

\textsuperscript{16} Reformed scholastics often disputed whether the decree of predestination took place in the mind of God before the decree of the creation of the world (so-called supralapsarianism) or after the decree of creation (so-called infralapsarianism). It is not clear which view Kalaj held; both were accepted among Reformed scholastics. Polish theologian Jan Makowski, who was at Franeker before Kalaj, was a supralapsarian. See Jan Makowski, \textit{Iohannis Maccovii ... Distinctiones et regulae theologicae ac philosophicae}, edited by Nicolaus Arnoldi (Apud Ludovicum Elzevirium, 1656), 70-79.

\textsuperscript{17} Scotus advocated the idea of \textit{donum superadditum}, that a superadded gift lost at the fall left human nature still capable of faith. See: Richard A. Muller, \textit{Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology} (Grand Rapids, MI.: Baker Book House, 1985), s.v. “\textit{donum superadditum},” 96-97.
merits. No special preliminary work of grace was required, and salvation was initiated by men and completed thanks to God’s special assistance.18

At first it might seem rather surprising that Kalaj uses the concept of inherent righteousness when he writes, “We believe and confess that the Christian man is justified before God by grace through faith cum hac justitia imputata together with justitiam inhaerensem…”19 One might wonder why Kalaj would even mention inherent righteousness if it was rejected by the Protestants. Was Kalaj compromising Reformed theology in order to accommodate Catholics?

Understanding the historical context of disputes over justification will clarify that this is not at all what Kalaj did or tried to do. In his article, “A Tale of Two Imperial Cities,”20 Anthony Lane in discusses the little-known but, for the sake of our discussion, very important colloquy between Catholics and Protestants in the German city of Regensburg. This meeting took place in the spring of 1541, approximately five years before the Council of Trent. The participants included some leading representatives of the Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed churches. Johann Gropper, Julius Pflug, and Johann Eck (famous for his polemic debates with Luther)

18 “Can. 9. If anyone says that the sinner is justified by faith alone, meaning that nothing else is required to cooperate in order to obtain the grace of justification, and that it is not in any way necessary that he be prepared and disposed by the action of his own will, let him be anathema.” Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, edited: Henry Joseph Schroeder, (St. Louis, London: B. Herder, 1941), 43.

19 Kalaj, PR, 26. “Wierzymy y wyznawamy, że Krześcijański człowiek tak usprawiedliwiony przed Bogiem, przez wiare w Krystusa, bierze z łaski Bożej cum justitia imputata, przy tym y ztym, justitiam inhaerensem...”

20 Anthony N. S. Lane, “A Tale of Two Imperial Cities: Justification at Regensburg (1541) and Trent (1546-1547),” Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges, ed. in Bruce L. McCormack (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006), 267-77.
represented the Catholics, who also appointed Cardinal Gasparo Contarini to be the papal legate. The Lutherans sent Phillip Melanchthon, Luther’s own continuator, and the Reformed churches delegated Martin Bucer and Johann Pistorius the Elder as well as John Calvin and Albert Pighius, who participated only as silent observers. Along with a number of other dogmatic issues, the colloquy addressed the doctrine of justification. Interestingly, it reached temporary agreement. In Article Five of the Agreement, we read:

…the faithful soul depends not on this [inherent righteousness] but only on the righteousness of Christ given to us as a gift, without which there is and can be no righteousness at all. (2) And thus by faith in Christ we are justified or reckoned to be righteous, that is, we are accepted through his merits and not on account of our own worthiness or works (3). And on account of the righteousness inherent in us, we are said to be righteous because the works that we perform are righteous, according to the saying of John: “whoever does what is right is righteous” [I John 3:7].

Furthermore, taking a closer look at the theology the above statement expresses, we notice it mentions foreign (Christ’s) as well as inherent righteousness. The Regensburg ecumenical committee agreed that man is justified by the imputation of Christ’s righteousness. However, they also added that once man had been justified before God, the inherent righteousness continued gradually to restore him, guiding him in everyday holy living. This terminological – rather than doctrinal – adjustment on the Protestant side was a small price to pay, especially considering that some Reformed theologians, such as Bucer and Calvin, already used the word “righteousness” when referring to sanctification. Catholics, on the other hand, needed

---

21 For the full text of the agreement see the excursus attached to Lane, “A Tale of Two Imperial Cities,” 143-145. (Article 5).
to make much greater concessions by agreeing to the doctrine of imputed righteousness.\(^\text{22}\) Lane writes:

At Regensburg, Protestant and Roman Catholic theologians reached a temporary agreement on justification. This was based upon the acceptance of both inherent and imputed righteousness and on the recognition that because of the imperfection of our inherent righteousness, Christ’s righteousness needs to be imputed to us in order for us to be acceptable to God. The Catholic theologians most responsible for the agreement (Groppar and Contarini) shared the Reformers’ conviction about the imperfection of our inherent righteousness and so were willing to embrace the concept of imputed righteousness.\(^\text{23}\)

This irenic compromise was later rejected by the Council of Trent, but not without controversy, as some Roman theologians argued for the adoption of the Regensburg solution. In effect, the council became discontinuous with the Augustinian teaching on grace. As Lane put it, “The Tridentine Decree on justification is a vitally important document, but we must not fall into the mistake of simply equating it with the Catholic doctrine. Trent is what the Roman Catholic Church chose to say at that time in response to what it then understood the Reformers to be saying.”\(^\text{24}\) Although Kalaj never mentions the Regensburg Agreement, its theology seems to have influenced him, if not directly then indirectly through the teachings of Reformed scholastics.

Reformed theologians in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, such as Girolamo Zanchi (1516-1590) and Francis Turretin (1623-1687), continued to address the issue of inherent righteousness in the Protestant context. Zanchi, for example,

\(^{22}\) Lane, “A Tale of Two Imperial Cities,” 129.

\(^{23}\) Lane, “A Tale of Two Imperial Cities,” 142.

\(^{24}\) Lane, “A Tale of Two Imperial Cities,” 142.
discusses the close relationship between inherent righteousness (or, as he calls it, former justice) and imputed righteousness (or later justice) in his *Christiana fides* when he writes:

…we affirm that the later justice, the fruits whereof are made manifest to men, is so sure a testimony of the former (Phil. 1:11), that where the last is absent, there we hold (with all the apostles) that there is no place for the first. So far be we from letting loose the reigns to ungodly people, by the doctrine of justification by faith only apprehending the remission of sins and imputation of the justice of our Lord Jesus Christ (James 2:21).  

Zanchi argues that inherent grace plays a role in producing good works not unto salvation but as a confirmation that Christ’s righteousness already has been imputed. Zanchi also distances himself from anyone who holds that believing God’s law without obeying it results in salvation. In this next passage, Zanchi even more explicitly defines inherent righteousness and the role of good works:

And therefore, when we speak only of this inherent righteousness, we deny not but that a man is justified by good works, and not of faith only; that is, he is made more and more just … Neither do we allow of those which have taught that we are justified by no other justice than that inward and inherent justice; nor those which thought that the remission of sins can stand without the internal renewing and justice. We also condemn them which suppose they may be justified and saved by the historical faith concerning Christ, which James calleth a dead faith, that is not at all.

Here Zanchi writes against anybody who teaches that one can be saved by his own works, by a vain faith in an empty assurance of one’s salvation, or by a dead faith not followed by works.

Later, Francis Turretin, a contemporary of Kałaj, in his *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* (published after Kałaj’s *Friendly Dialogue*) dedicates a few paragraphs to

---

the discussion of inherent righteousness, proving that Kalaj was hardly alone in his approach. Turretin writes:

So in a twofold way Christ imparts his blessing to us, by a forensic imputation, and a moral and internal infusion. The former flows from Christ and surety and is the foundation of our justification. The latter depends upon him as head, and is the principle of sanctification. For on this account, God justifies us because the righteousness of our surety, Christ, is imputed to us. And on this account, we are renewed because we derive the Spirit from our head, Christ, who renews us after the image of Christ and bestows upon us inherent righteousness26… we hold these two benefits to be inseparable: that no one is justified by Christ who is not also sanctified and gifted with inherent righteousness (from which believers can truly be denominated holy and righteous although not perfect in this life).27

Turretin systematizes and incorporates the idea of inherent righteousness into the body of Reformed theology. In his work he even recalls the aforementioned Cardinal Contarini, whose presence at Regensburg and support for the imputation of Christ’s righteousness was well remembered in Protestant circles.28

All of this points us to the conclusion that Kalaj, in adopting the redefined idea of inherent righteousness, does not do anything unusual; instead he deals with the issue of justification and sanctification in a manner similar to Reformed theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the similarity of the theological language helps his irenic cause.

Just like the Regensburg Agreement (and later, Zanchi and Turretin), Kalaj develops his doctrine based on the idea of the twofold justice of God. First, he explains how both parties agree on the fact that man is lost and needs to be saved, and

26 Turretin, Institutes of Elenctic Theology, vol. 2, 647.


how out of his mercy and by his suffering God made the redemption possible. Kałaj calls these the *foundational causes* of salvation, which are shared equally by Catholics and Protestants. In support he quotes the Council of Trent, which for him expresses well what both parties can agree upon: “But, although it is necessary to believe that sins neither are remitted, nor ever were remitted save gratuitously by the mercy of God for Christ’s sake…”

After this basic recognition of the common *foundational causes*, he continues to deal with the controversy over what he calls the “two articles”: inherent righteousness and imputed righteousness. By denying that inherent righteousness plays a role in justification before God, Kałaj did not mean to argue sweepingly against the existence of inherent righteousness altogether, especially when it comes to sanctification. For Kałaj, the imputation of Christ’s righteousness, besides fully justifying man before God, also initiates further restoration of man, assisting his fallen nature in producing good works. In other words, once alien righteousness has been imputed to a man by grace alone through faith alone on account of Christ’s death alone, his inherent but corrupted righteousness is positively affected, causing him to produce good works. Drawing on II Timothy 2:19, Kałaj calls this “the double seal of salvation,” for according to Pauline theology, those who have been elected for salvation must depart from wickedness and produce good works. He writes: “Firm is God’s ground of our election and salvation because it is sealed not with one but two

---

seals. The Lord knows those who are his; may he who knows the name of Jesus depart from any wickedness.”

The second seal (good works) is precisely the basis on which Kalaj refutes Trent’s accusations of vain confidence. He writes:

Every thoughtful Catholic seeing the second article, will admit that the Council of Trent Session Six Article Nine, Against the Vain Confidence of the Heretics, does not describe or speak against our Evangelical Religion when it is correctly understood. Moreover, any of our Evangelical theologians well trained in the Scriptures would without a doubt say amen to the teaching, which has been described therein.

Later, Kalaj argues that, since the second seal is conditioned by the first one, and since the first one depends on the unconditional act of God’s grace, even our good works are done by God’s grace. As the second seal is a natural and necessary consequence of election, it provides assurance of salvation which rests not on the goodness of our own actions but rather on the sovereign act of God’s will. Contrary

---


32 Kalaj quotes article IX of the sixth session of the Council of Trent, Against the Vain Confidence of the Heretics: “But, although it is necessary to believe that sins neither are remitted, nor ever were remitted save gratuitously by the mercy of God for Christ’s sake; yet is it not to be said, that sins are forgiven, or have been forgiven, to any one who boasts of his confidence and certainty of the remission of his sins, and rests on that alone; seeing that it may exist, yea does in our day exist, amongst heretics and schismatics; and with great vehemence is this vain confidence, and one alien from all godliness, preached up in opposition to the Catholic Church. But neither is this to be asserted—that they who are truly justified must needs, without any doubting whatever, settle within themselves that they are justified, and that no one is absolved from sins and but he that believes for certain that he is absolved and justified; and that absolution and justification are effected by this faith alone: as
to Jesuit, Arminian, and Socinian views, neither good works nor men’s future decisions can be the causes of salvation but merely are effects thereof. Thus, Kalaj shows that the Council of Trent misrepresented Protestant teaching by accusing Protestants of vain confidence, as if salvation by faith alone meant that one can have assurance of his salvation despite a lack of good works.

6.4. Good Works

In the Last Judgment section, Kalaj spends an extensive amount of time on the issue of good works, because, as he points out, this topic needs more attention since it has most often been misunderstood. He discusses it in the following four articles: De necessitate, veritate, perfectione, merito bonorum operum, following the same order as Turretin will later do in his Institutes of Elenctic Theology.

Beginning with the argument from necessity (de necessitate), which is itself divided into three sub-points, Kalaj argues that works are a necessary fruit of salvation with reference (1) toward God, because God commanded them, (2) toward

though whoso has not this belief, doubts of the promises of God, and of the efficacy of the death and resurrection of Christ. For even as no pious person ought to doubt of the mercy of God, of the merit of Christ, and of the virtue and efficacy of the sacraments, even so each one, when he regards himself, and his own weakness and indisposition, may have fear and apprehension touching his own grace; seeing that no one can know with a certainty of faith, which cannot be subject to error, that he has obtained the grace of God.”

33 Scientia Media assumed that God’s foreknowledge plays a major role in God’s decree since God’s knowledge is conditioned by the contingents of men’s future actions. This was argued by Jacobus Arminius and the Jesuits. Eef Dekker, “Was Arminius a Molinist?” Sixteenth Century Journal 27, no. 2 (1996): 337-352. For more information on this concept in the context of the Arminian controversy see also: Richard A. Muller, Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, Ca. 1520 to Ca. 1725, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2003), 417-432.

others, because God has been good to us and therefore we should be good to others, and finally, (3) toward ourselves, because the testimony of our faith confirms our election. Catholics and Protestants share (1), the early Reformers embrace (2), and (3) became popular with Protestant scholastics. However, the point of this threefold distinction is to argue that good works must be motivated by our love and appreciation for God and what he has done for us, not by guilt or a desire to earn righteousness. Kalaj again stresses that good works simply confirm our salvation but fail to achieve it. He then gives the biblical example of the thief on the cross who, in his agony, confessed faith but did not own any merits, even that of baptism, and nevertheless was promised salvation. Therefore, according to Kalaj, it is possible for those to be saved who express faith but are prevented by death from evincing it through works. Kalaj concludes this section by showing that his approach is in line with medieval theology. He quotes Bernard, who, in *De gratia & libero arbitrio*, wrote, “Si proprie appellamus ea, quae dicimus, nostra merita, sunt, spei quaedam seminaria, charitatis incentiva, occultae praedestinations indicia, futurae

---

35 The assurance of salvation became somewhat controversial for later Calvinism and we are not sure on which side of the controversy Kalaj would stand. The early Reformers distinguished between faith and assurance but treated them as one. Thus, for example, they taught that someone who had been saved also enjoyed assurance of salvation. However, later Calvinism separated the two. As chapter 18, article 3 of the Westminster Confession puts it, “This infallible assurance doth not so belong to the essence of faith, but that a true believer may wait long, and conflict with many difficulties before he be partaker of it.” For more information on this controversy see: Anthony N. S. Lane, “Calvin’s Doctrine of Assurance,” *Vox Evangelica* 11 (1979); Joel R. Beeke, *The Quest for Full Assurance: The Legacy of Calvin and His Successors* (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1999); and Keith D. Stanglin, *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation: The Context, Roots, and Shape of the Leiden Debate, 1603-1609* (Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2007).
glorificationis praesagia.” Kałaj uses Bernard to prove that the Evangelical church, not the Roman church, retained pure catholic theology.

Kałaj’s reliance on Bernard was not unusual. Tony Lane shows how Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153) was also one of Calvin’s favorite medieval writers. He writes:

> Between the 1539 and the 1559 editions of the *Institutio*, Calvin referred to him forty-one times, quoting most of his greatest writings. Calvin used him polemically first and foremost, but he also grew to appreciate him for himself and later quoted him purely for illustrations.  

Calvin was not the only Reformer who appreciated Bernard. Paulsell notes,

> Martin Luther has a great fondness for Bernard of Clairvaux. In a sermonic exposition on John 16:23, he called Bernard “a fine man, one who had Christian thoughts.” Elsewhere he said, “I regard him as the most pious of all the monks and prefer him to all the others, even to St. Dominic.” He put Bernard in good company: “I believe that SS. Ambrose, Jerome and Bernard were holy and godly men.”

In the argument from truth (*de veritate*), Kałaj warns us against the “goodness” of good works, which are actually not good at all, because in reality they are in violation of God’s law. A good deed must be appropriately motivated because the Word of God is specific in what God expects from men; that is, to love God and our neighbor (see Matt. 22:34–40). Therefore, any acts motivated by shallow philanthropy or hypocrisy do not count. Kałaj recalls here the situation in which Jesus

---


confronted the Pharisees for their approval of temple offerings given at the expense of caring for the givers’ parents (see Matt. 15:6–9). This text shows that Christ considers misused money given to the temple to be a false offering. Only when one’s heart is in the right condition, filled with the truth of God’s love, is one able to perform works that are truly good.  

Turning now to the argument from perfection (*de perfectione*), Kalaj argues that man ought to do good works because he is required to be holy. God’s Word commands holiness; however, the state of holiness is extremely fragile, for even the smallest disobedience makes us guilty of thorough wickedness, just as a drop of acid affects the whole substance it touches. Kalaj does not believe one can attain perfection in the earthly pilgrimage. He lists here four causes of our imperfection: original sin, corruption of will and desires, proximity of evil, and lack of consistency in doing good works. Kalaj first addresses original sin, which infected the whole of humankind with *propter peccatum originis inhaerens* (inherent guilt, depraved nature). Here Kalaj briefly notes what he will further discuss in the section on sacraments, namely that the sinful nature of Adam remains while only the guilt of sin is removed when a Christian passes through the waters of baptism. Baptism, just like circumcision in the Old Testament, sets apart God’s covenental people—the visible church—from the rest of the world. However, baptism does not remove our sinful

---


40 Kalaj, *PR*, 27. See also Turretin’s treatment of the same issue in *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*. vol. 2, 693-702.
nature, since we continue to commit sins and fail to ever attain perfection. Kalaj supports this with quotes from Bernard and, later, Augustine.41

The second cause of our imperfection is the corruption of our will and desires. Kalaj rhetorically asks, “If our will and desires are corrupt how can our works be perfect?”42 He argues that emotions change on a daily, if not an hourly, basis: one day we want one thing, and another day we want something else entirely. And sometimes even when we want to do something good, we fail to actually do it.

The third cause of our imperfection is the proximity of evil, which taints even our best works. For Kalaj, sin contaminates every good work to some extent, because it is like a shadow which follows the body. He writes:

There are examples of sin next to every good work. Next to godliness there is often hypocrisy; next to devotion, superstition; on the outside humility, on the inside vanity; next to almsgiving, pride; next to trust, presumption; next to faith, faithlessness; next to prayers, indifference; next to hope, doubt; next to each virtue, high perception and favoritism of thyself.43

When performing good works we must remember that if there is any good in it, it belongs to God and that the evil part comes from us. Thus, if there is any glory in the work, it also belongs to God; if there is any shame, we bear responsibility for it. Kalaj

41 As had been well-expressed before Kalaj by Augustine and later by Bernard, “Avulsum quodammodo, non tamen expulsum; dejectum non prorsus ejectum. Raditur, sed non eradicatur. Remittitur nobis in baptismo, non ut non fit, sed ut non imputeur.” See: Kalaj, PR, 27-28.

42 Kalaj, PR, 28. “Nie mamy chcenia doskonałego, jakosz mogą być uczynki doksonałe?”

43 Kalaj, PR, 28. “Są przykłady grzechów, przy każdym dobrym uczynku. Znajduje się przy nabożeństwie obluba; przy pobożności zabobon, przy zewnętrznej pokorze, wewnętrzna pycha, przy jałumnizach chłuba, przy ufności praeusumptia; przy wierze niedowiarstwo, przy modlitwie oziebłość, przy nadziei powątpiewanie, przy każdej cnoci wysokomyślność y sobie się podobanie.”
concludes by quoting Augustine’s commentary on Psalm 142 (according to Vulgate). The fourth and final cause of our imperfection is our lack of consistency. Kalaj argues that humans are neither stable nor persistent in doing good works. So even if they manage to desire something good out of a pure motivation, they may easily change their mind or lose energy to do so. Scripture teaches that only those who remain faithful until the end will be saved (see Matt. 24:13).

All these reasons for why we continue to be imperfect—original sin, corruption of will and desires, proximity of evil, and lack of consistency in doing good—can be very discouraging for a Christian who is commanded to be perfect and holy. However, only from awareness of his own imperfection will he realize his need for Christ, who not only offers forgiveness but also perfects our works so that they are acceptable in God’s sight.

6.5. FROM MERIT

The issue of merit was a heavily-debated topic in late medieval theology. In comparison to the previous sections, Kalaj dedicates a large portion of his book to the issue of merit. His goal is to prove that only *meritum ex congruo* is acceptable and


46 *Meritum ex congruo*—also called merit of congruity, half-merit, or quasi-merit.
that the idea of *meritum de condigno* must be rejected. The types of merit and their respective roles were not solidified until the Council of Trent, during which Rome officially departed from the Augustinian-Thomistic line while Protestants continued to support it. For Aquinas, no merit was capable of earning salvation until grace had first been imparted. The Council of Trent ascribed salvific value to merit, making it possible for merit to precede grace. In the sixth session of the Council of Trent, we read:

Hence, to those who work well unto the end and trust in God, eternal life is to be offered, both as a grace mercifully promised to the sons of God through Christ Jesus, and as a reward promised by God himself, to be faithfully given to their good works and merits.

Although Kalaj rejects the council’s conclusion, he does not reject the existence of *meritum ex congruo* to those who have already experienced regeneration. Kalaj is clear: God enjoys our good works and even rewards them, but rather than rewarding out of compulsion, God does so on the basis of his divine generosity.

---

47 *Meritum de condigno*, also called merit of condignity or full merit. In Aquinas’s view, only after receiving grace through Christ one can also obtain *meritum de condigno*. For Scotus, grace could be acquired through the *meritum de condigno* since at the fall only the superadded gift of grace was lost, called *donum superadditum*.

48 Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, 1155: “…no created nature is a sufficient principle of an act meritorious of eternal life, unless there is added a supernatural gift, which we call grace … no one existing in a state of mortal sin can merit eternal life unless first he be reconciled to God, through his sin being forgiven, which is brought about by grace.” Furthermore, he continues to address specifically the issue of condignity and congruity, arguing that “no one can merit for himself restoration after a future fall, either condignly or congruously since they are dependable on the motion of God’s grace.” Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 1158. For more discussion on the issue of merit see: Oberman, *The Dawn of the Reformation*, 204-230; Joseph Peter Wawrykow, *God’s Grace and Human Action: Merit in the Theology of Thomas Aquinas* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995).

49 Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees*, 41.

words, Kałaj rejects the idea of deserved reward (*meritum de condigno*) but
acknowledges appropriated rewards (*meritum ex congruo*). He writes:

However, we do not believe that through our good works or merit we
can be saved *ex condigno*, deserving to be worthy of salvation but only
through God’s grace and Christ’s merit Luk. 17:10, Eph. 2:8–9. Thus,
we negate *meritum ex condigno* according to the sentence of the
Catholic theologians. And according to the Scriptures we confess

Since Kałaj’s teaching on merit follows the trajectory of pre-Trentine Catholic
doctrine, we should not be surprised when Kałaj finds a number of medieval
theologians who support his thesis, such as Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153) and
later Cardinal Thomas Cajetan (1469-1534), who was well known for his disputes
with Luther. Kałaj quotes Cajetan’s comment on Romans 6:23 in which he clearly
states that we do not achieve eternal life by our own merit but rather through God’s
love. It might seem somewhat ironic that next to Cajetan he quotes Calvin,

---

uczynków zasług, *ex condigno*, dla ich przez sie godności, mogli y mieli bydz zbawieni i
tylko z lasky y zaslugy Krystusoweys. Luc. 17:10, Eph. 2 v. 8,9. Jako tedy samo, *meritum ex
condigno*, według sentencycej Teologow Katolickich negujemy, tak przyznawamy według
20:10.”

52 Kałaj, *PR*, 29. Together with Bernard in Psalm 90, sermon 9, he says, “Fateor, non
sum dignus ego, nec possum, propriis meritis obtinere regnum caelorum. Caeterum, Dominus
meus, duplici jure illud possidens, haereditate Patris, & merito passionis, altero ipse
contentus, alterum mihi donat.…Praetendat alter meritum, sustinere se jacet pondus & aestum
Dei. Mihi ad haerere Deo, bonum est, & ponere in Domino spem meam.”

53 Kałaj, *PR*, 29. “Cardinal Cajetan is correct to write *cum possit dicere & recte
dicere, stipendum justitiae vita, muluit dicere, gratia Dei vita aeterna, ut hinc intelligeremus,
Deum nos ad vitam aeternam, non pronosiris meritis, sed pro sua misericordia perducere.”
For more information on Cajetan see: Tommaso de Vio Cajetan, *Cajetan Responds: A Reader in
Reformation Controversy*, ed. Jared Wicks (Washington: Catholic University of America
Press, 1978), 224-234. See also: Heiko Augustinus Oberman, *Forerunners of the
Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), 245-
affectionately calling him “ours.” However, Kałaj was attempting to show some continuity between Reformed and late medieval theology. In the quoted passage, Calvin writes:

Why does he not contrast righteousness with sin, as he contrasts life with death? Why does he not make righteousness the cause of life, as he does sin that of death? For thus an antithesis would duly have been set up that is somewhat broken by this variation. But the apostle intended by this comparison to express what was true: namely, that death is owing to men’s deserts but life rests solely upon God’s mercy.\footnote{Calvin, \textit{Institutes}, III.xiv. 21, 788.}

The passage from Calvin’s \textit{Institutes} is found in the section dealing with the benefits we receive from Christ’s grace. This is where Calvin argues for our ability to do good works and to be rewarded for them.

Based on the above arguments, Kałaj goes on to conclude that the proverb, “If sins gain damnation, good works salvation,” popular in his day, is ultimately wrong, and that any Catholic who is not yet convinced of the Protestant understanding of merit ought to read what Gregory the Great wrote on the subject.\footnote{Kalaj, \textit{PR}, 29. Kałaj quotes here from Gregory’s commentary on Psalms: “Si illa Sanctorum felicitas, non meritis acquiritur, ubi erit quod scriptum est? Et tu reddes cuilibet secundum opera redditur, quomodo misericodia aestimabitur? Sed aliud est, secundum opera reddere aliud propter opera. In eo, quod secundum opera dicitur, ipsa operum quilitatis intelligitur, ut cujus apparuerint bona opera, ejus fit & retributio Gloria.” See: see \textit{Patrologia Latina} v. 79.} Kałaj concludes the whole chapter with a brief return to the discourse between the Evangelical minister and Roman Catholic priest. The priest is thankful for the explanation of the

\footnote{On some continuities between late medieval theology and Calvin on the issue of merit, see: McGrath, \textit{Iustitia Dei}, 149-150.}
Protestant teachings on justification, inherent righteousness, and sanctification which produces good works. He acknowledges the continual necessity of good works even though he does not believe good works earn us salvation *ex condigno*. Moreover, he acknowledges that the Protestant understanding is not new, but that it was present before the Reformation. And even Bernard expresses this understanding in his *De gratia & libero* when he writes: “Sicut ad damnationem sussicit, non habere merita, ita suffcit ad salutem, non confidere in meritis. Proinde, cures habere merita, habita, dona esse agnoveris, structum exinde speres Dei misericordiam.”

The fact that Kalaj affectionately refers to Calvin in the discussion of justification is significant. Polish historiography often argued that early Polish Reformed Christians departed from or even denied Calvin’s teaching on justification (especially predestination). For example, see how Brückner thus describes the sixteenth-century Reformed author, Mikolaj Rej:

[Rej] never became a Calvinist; he did not accept predestination ... Rej remained holding to the Lutheran view for the rest of his life even though he accepted Calvinist terminology. He preached about predestination; however, he understood it differently. Predestination for him was when a man, being born under whatever planet or destiny, was still given a mind and God’s commandments to go about changing his bad fate—Calvin would be either outraged or amused by such a definition of predestination. Therefore, Rej divorced Calvin in this basic assumption (there were others who left Calvin for the same reason, for example, Remonstants in Holland). So the only honorable thing [we can ascribe to Rej was] that in the name of sect he did not get rid of his inborn sense of justice and thus was not completely consumed either by Lutheranism or Calvinism.  

---


This rejection of Calvin’s understanding was explained by others by the fact that Polish Reformed preferred Bullinger.\(^{59}\) It seems that there would be no problem with this approach if not for the tacit assumption made by some authors of potential differences between Calvin’s and Bullinger’s understanding of the doctrine.\(^{60}\) However, as has been shown by Venema, Calvin and Bullinger differed in the way they explained justification but ultimately agreed on the doctrine itself.\(^{61}\) Also, one has to consider that, although Calvin was one of the major early codifiers of Reformed tradition, it was at least as much rooted in many other thinkers, including Zwingli, Bullinger, Beza, Vermigli, Zanchi, and Łaski. Additionally, the doctrine was a broadly Reformed confessional and catechetical tradition framed by these writers and by Reformed teachers of the next several generations. It is under this broader European Reformed context that we ought to understand Kałaj’s thought.

### 6.6. Conclusion

In reference to the doctrine of justification we have not found any significant discontinuities with the Reformed orthodoxy. After the discourse on the church and

---


\(^{61}\) Cornelis P. Venema, *Heinrich Bullinger and the Doctrine of Predestination: Author of “The Other Reformed Tradition”?* Texts and Studies in Reformation and Post-Reformation Thought (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002), 118. “Though there is evidence that Bullinger formulated his doctrine of the predestination in a manner that was distinct from that of Calvin and other Reformed theologians of the period, the distinctiveness of his doctrine does not amount to a substantial divergence of theological position. On the main points of the historic Augustinian doctrine of predestination, Bullinger’s doctrine exhibits considerable continuity with the preceding and subsequent tradition of Augustinianism.”
sacraments, justification is the longest theological topic that Kałaj discusses. The heart of his expose is in clearing up Roman Catholic misunderstandings about the Reformed doctrine of justification as expressed in the Council of Trent. Kałaj hopes his friendly explanation will make his opponent understand that Reformed assurance of salvation is not vain, nor it does prevent one from performing good works. To accomplish it he uses theological language different from the *Confession of Sandomierz*. He refers to inherent righteousness as playing an important role in our salvation. This role, however, is not in earning it but rather in testifying before others that our faith is true. Furthermore, Kałaj emphasizes that the Reformed continued to see moral value in performing good works and righteous living, accepting *meritum ex congruo*.

In all his irenic effort, Kałaj does not go beyond the borders of Reformed theology, falling into synergism or Socinian moralism, but operates in the academic framework of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century discussions, identifying similarities and differences between the Reformed thought of those centuries and that of the Middle Ages. Kałaj also clearly affirms salvation by grace alone and rejects works-righteousness. In addition to Luther, Calvin, and the Council of Trent, he also refers to Augustine, Gregory the Great, Thomas Cajetan, and Bernard of Clairvaux. Finally, he affectionately refers to Calvin in the discussion of merit, which seems significant since some have argued that Kałaj elevated morality above doctrine and that the Polish Reformed, in general, rejected Calvin’s view of justification.
CHAPTER SEVEN:
THE CALVINIST DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS

7.1. INTRODUCTION

Next to the Trinity, the sacraments were the most debated issue among sixteenth-century Polish Protestants. In addition to their many disagreements with Catholics and Anabaptists, the Reformed Churches in Poland had to wrestle with and reconcile the teachings of the Lutherans and the Czech Brethren, with whom they wished to be united. Lehmann argues that Krzysztof Tracy (Tretius) (c.1530-1591), author of the Confession of Sandomierz (1570), had implemented some substantial changes to his translation of Bullinger’s Second Helvetic Confession, on which the Polish confession was based. Tracy strove not only to distance his work from Zwingli but also to find a middle ground between the Lutheran, Reformed, and Czech Brethren positions that could provide a basis for unity between the various Protestant churches.¹ Kałaj’s own exposition of the Reformed understanding of the sacraments comes nearly half a century after the 1595 Synod of Toruń (Thorn), when Lutherans rejected the Confession of Sandomierz and thus ended all hope for unity.

7.2. CONFIRMATION

Throughout church history, the accepted number of sacraments was often debated, and various, even random, rites were considered sacraments. Scholars speculate that the number reached at least fifteen and at one point even approached thirty, and that it was not until the twelfth century that the number seven became

more common. The sixteenth century brought further limitations: Catholics firmly
limited the number of sacraments to seven, while Protestants, despite Luther’s initial
doubts about penance, listed two. Naturally, the other five practices were not rejected
altogether—for, as Kalaj put it, “to despise them is to despise God’s Word”—and
Protestants continued to perform marriages, ordinations, and confirmatio, but not
extreme unction, which was substituted with simple prayer for the sick. Also,
confirmation practices continued to cause controversy. Most sixteenth-century
Reformers addressed the issue of the so-called five sacraments with harsh polemics,
sometimes giving the impression that they despised not only the Catholic
categorization of confirmatio but also the practice itself. Seventeenth-century
Protestant literature continued to address the issue—if in less rhetorical language,
then certainly in more academic terms—such as is found in Francis Turretin.

The Reformers rejected confirmation as a sacrament and instead proposed a
simple confession of faith. Their denial was based on the assumption that the Roman
Sacrament of Confirmation derogated baptism because it required confirmation to
complete it. In response to the Council of Trent, which had condemned all those who
denied confirmation or saw it as an empty or idle ceremony, Calvin cynically writes:

---

2 George Reymond, “The Number of the Sacraments,” *Scottish Journal of Theology*
4, no. 2 (1951): 157-172.


4 For insight on Sacraments in the early stages of the English Reformation see:
*Christian Initiation: The Reformation Period* (London: Society of Promoting Christian

I am certainly not of the number of those who think that Confirmation, as observed under the Roman Papacy, is an idle ceremony, inasmuch as I regard it as one of the most deadly wiles of Satan. Let us remember that this pretended Sacrament is nowhere recommended in Scripture, either under this name or with this ritual or this signification.6

The Reformed child—who had been baptized at infancy and had since reached an age of discretion—upon being instructed on the Bible and doctrine would present himself to the church to declare his confession of faith. Only then, and after being examined as to godliness of life and knowledge of theology, could the young person participate in the Lord’s Table.7

Polish Reformed Christians rejected the term confirmation and they stopped using the Polish word for it, bierzmowanie.8 Kalaj also omits it, using instead the Latin confirmatio, which, he argues, is not understood as an authorization of baptism but is an acceptable term only when referring to a confession of faith. For him, baptism did not need to be authenticated because the seal of a covenant can stand on its own. Thus, when talking of the Evangelical confirmatio, he simply means a potwierdzenie (an affirmation) of one’s faith upon which one is allowed to participate in the Eucharist and use his spiritual gifts in the service of the church. He also points out that Evangelical confirmation is available only for adults who received baptism in

6 Calvin, Institutes, IV.xix.8, p. 1456, “Cannons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, with Antidote,” in Calvin’s Selected Works, ed. Henry Beveridge, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1983), 183. “But let us investigate still more closely how many monsters this grease feeds and nourishes. These anointers say that the Holy Spirit is given in baptism for innocence; in confirmation, for the increase of grace; that in baptism we are regenerated unto life; shameless as to deny that baptism can be dully completed without confirmation! What wickedness!”. For further discussion see Donald R. Kocher, “Calvinism and Confirmation,” The Princeton Seminary Bulletin 54 (1960): 28-31; and see also Turretin, Institutes of Elenctic Theology, vol. 3, 549.

7 Calvin, Institutes, IV.xix.12-13, p. 1460-1461; IV.xix.5, p.1453.

8 Konfesja Sandomierska, Art. 19, 174.
infancy, since those baptized as adults already affirmed their faith at baptism. Also, along with Calvin, Kalaj makes provision for those who desire to lay hands on those being confirmed, since both Peter and John (see Acts 8:14–17) practiced this.⁹

7.3. Penance

The doctrine of penance developed in the Middle Ages, influenced by the Celtic system of penitentials and rooted in the need for the priestly authority called “the power of the keys,” is an idea found in the writings of Jerome, Aquinas, and Peter Lombard. The power of the keys was recognized by Innocent III as a rule of auricular confession absolute (Fourth Lateran Council, 1215) and was later confirmed at the Council of Trent as a proper sacrament.ⁱ⁰ Although Luther accepted penance as a sacrament in his Babylonian Captivity of the Church, he later changed his opinion, but continued to encourage private (but not compulsory) confession as a consolation for the troubled soul.ⁱ¹ John Calvin also rejected the sacramental aspect of penance and continued to see, in some cases, private confession of sins before the Consistory to insure the proper counsel of repenting Christians. For Calvin, church discipline was essential to the proper functioning of a loving and caring congregation, and thus was

---

⁹ Kalaj, PR, 31-32; compare with Calvin, Institutes, IV.xix. 4, p. 1452.


treated as the third sign of the visible church.\textsuperscript{12} The later English Reformers placed greater emphasis upon personal piety and were more casuistic in nature, as evidenced in William Perkins’s \textit{The whole treatise of the conscience} (1904) as well as in Richard Baxter’s \textit{The Christian directory}, or in the writings of William Ames.\textsuperscript{13}

The early Polish Reformers strongly emphasized the difference between the Roman concept of \textit{pokuta (poenitentia)} and their own understanding of it, in which they often added the Polish term \textit{nawrócenie (resipiscentia, conversio)} to properly capture the meaning of the Greek word \textit{metanoeite}, which suggests transformation of the heart.\textsuperscript{14} The Confession of Sandomierz combines the two terms in article XIV, namely, \textit{pokuta i nawrócenie} (penance and conversion), which is a faithful translation of Bullinger’s \textit{De poenitentia et conversione hominis}. It also uses words such as \textit{skruszone i pokorne serce} (contrite and humble heart), \textit{żalować} (regretting), etc. to communicate that true repentance is an ongoing process in the life of a Christian.\textsuperscript{15}

Many sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Polish Protestants retained the word “penance” \textit{(poenitentia, penitence)} but defined it as repentance.\textsuperscript{16}

\begin{itemize}
  
  
  \item\textsuperscript{14} Lehmann, \textit{Konfesja sandomierska na tle innych konfesji w Polsce XVI wieku}, 193-200.
  
  \item\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Konfesja Sandomierska}, art. 14, p. 102.
  
  \item\textsuperscript{16} Calvin continues just like Bullinger to use the word penance. See: Calvin, \textit{Institutes}, IV.xix.15-17, pp. 1463-1465; III.iii, pp. 592-621. Zanchi and Baxter prefer to use
\end{itemize}
In continuity with sixteenth-century Polish confessional language, Kalaj carries here the usage of the term *pokuta* (penitence), adding *skrucha serca* (contrite heart)\(^\text{17}\) and linking it to biblical passages, such as when Christ’s future disciples left behind everything to follow him (Mark 1:16–20), or when Christ urged young Nicodemus to be born again (John 3:3). Kalaj writes, “Although we do not have the penance (*pokuta*) as it is practiced in the Roman Church, we still practice it in the way it has been prescribed to us in God’s Word, that is: in contrite heart, with faith in Christ, in new life, being reconciled with God as well as with people.”\(^\text{18}\) Kalaj also continues to advocate private and public confessions of sins, and he acknowledges the power of the keys, which he says give spiritual authority to the Evangelical minister. However, this authority is not to absolve the sins of others, but rather to discipline or admonish.\(^\text{19}\)

In contrast to Polish confessional language, Kalaj avoids altogether the term *nawrócenie* (*resipiscentia*, *conversio*), which was used by Protestants. This is also noticeable when Kalaj reminds his readers that both churches agree on the necessity of *pokuta* for salvation and admission to the Lord’s Table, but he omits the term

---

\(^\text{17}\) Konfesja Sandomierska, art. 14, p.103.

\(^\text{18}\) Kalaj, *PR*, 32. “[pokute]…taką jednak mamy jak w Słowie Bożym opisana, gdy do skruchy serca, wiary Chrystusa, nowości żywota, jednania się z Bogiem i z ludźmi.”

\(^\text{19}\) Kalaj, *PR*, 32. C.f. Kalaj, *PR*, 103; Kalaj deals with the issue again in the third section of the book, when he states that Protestants enjoy freedom (but not compulsion) of actively performed penance via individual confession to their ministers. This is to show that penance continues to be taken seriously by Protestants even if it is not treated as a sacrament.
nawrócenie. Although Kałaj avoids the term, he still uses the concept of conversion; thus his decision not to use it was linguistic rather than a dogmatic compromise.

7.4. ORDIINATION TO PRIESTHOOD

In article XXII, the Council of Trent accuses Protestants of “deranging” the existing order and hierarchy of the church, disqualifying Protestant ordinations, and rejecting the concept of the priesthood of all believers. Ever since Protestant ordinations had ceased to be recognized by Rome, many irritated Evangelical ministers responded with various polemics to justify their ordinations as well as their ecclesiastical orders.

The ecclesiastical structure of the Polish Reformed Church was complex because of the size and ethnic diversity of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. These circumstances called for Polish Reformed Evangelicals to divide into three territorial Federations or Unities (so-called Jednota): Jednota Wielkopolska (Unity

20 Schroder, Cannons and Decrees, 161. (Session XXIII, chapter IV “The Ecclesiastical hierarchy and ordination.”)

21 Calvin devotes much time to discussing the absurdity of the sacrament of ordination being complicated by the seven ranks of clergy, the questionable ceremonies, etc. See Calvin, Institutes, IV.xix.22-33, pp. 1469-1480, 4.3 Zanchi, Confession of Christian, chap. 25; For Secondary material see: Cyril Eastwood, The Priesthood Of All Believers. An Examination of the Doctrine from the Reformation to the Present Day (London: The Epworth Press, 1960), 66-90 (on John Calvin) and 131-182 (on Puritan tradition).

22 The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1502 covered the area of 815 000 km² (314,673 sq. mi.) and in 1618 expanded to 990,000 km² (382,241 sq. mi.), including present day Poland, Belarus, Lithuania, Latvia, and parts of Ukraine, Estonia, and Russia (Smolensk and Kaliningrad oblasts).

of Great Poland, consisting mostly of Czech Brethren), *Jednota Malopolska* (Unity of Little Poland, where Kalaj was baptized and ordained), and finally, *Jednota Litewska* (Unity of Lithuania, consisting mostly of Poles living in the territory of the Great Duchy of Lithuania, where Kalaj was called to minister and where he died). These three church bodies would occasionally consult each other at the *Synod Generalny* (General Synod) to discuss the most urgent matters while regular matters were considered at local synods, which gathered more systematically.24 Although the operations of each federation differed slightly, all three churches tended to decrease the importance of the lay elders and synods while elevating the role of individual ministers and congregations.25 *Jednota Malopolska*, thanks to the reforms introduced by Jan Łaski (debated at the Synods in Książ 1560 and Włodzisław 1561), began to restore the high position of lay elders and deacons.26 Despite this, the *Confession of Sandomierz* continued to express some anti-hierarchical sentiments which Lehmann credits to the Lutheran influence on Polish Reformed ecclesiology.27 Overall, though,

---


the Polish Reformed movement lacked some important aspects of Presbyterian polity because of the strong position of the ruling elders and General Synod, and thus never managed to unite and establish a national church.

Kalaj, who was born and baptized in Jednota Małopolska, was most likely aware of the diverse ecclesiological landscape of the Polish-speaking Evangelicals in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Perhaps this is why, in his defense of Protestant ordination, he actually admits that the Evangelical church polity might have caused some confusion. At the same time, he argues that this confusion is a small price to pay for knowing that in freedom people can grow and develop instead of being blind and enslaved to the pope. He refutes the accusation of disorder among the Polish Reformed churches and explains that they are governed through various church offices, such as superintendents, elders, co-elders, ministers, deacons, and readers. He also lists various ecclesiastical activities—synods, convocation, visitations, introductions, consistory, examinations, ordinations, dedications, even excommunications—that assist in the proper rule of the churches. Finally, he names basic church ceremonies: weddings, sacraments, funerals, prayer meetings, and so on. These listings indicate that Polish Catholics might have doubted Protestants’ observance of these basic church practices.

7.5. Marriage

In connection with their view of ordination, Reformed Christians dismissed the obligation for clerical celibacy and the monastic life in general. As Steinmetz

---


points out, this position, to some extent, is a continuation of the larger medieval
discussion between Thomas Aquinas (d.1274), Jean Gerson (d.1429), and John
Pupper of Goch (d.1475) about the nature of one’s spiritual perfection in which the
Reformers argued against the idea that perfection is reserved for monks, nuns, and
bishops (by *virtus animarum perpetua*, which did not extend to regular priests) alone.
Rather, the Reformers posited the view that spiritual purity is also for regular priests
and believers, and not exclusively for those called to vocational ministry.30 On a
practical level, the Reformers expressed a general public consensus in rebuking the
corruption and immorality that was so widespread among the Roman clergy,
especially in the monasteries.31 They continued to uplift the virtue of married life,
arguing for its covenantal rather than sacramental value, as it vividly portrays the
relationship between Christ and the church.32 Furthermore, Protestants saw marriage
as part of a natural order by which all people could honor God: as Calvin put it,

30 David Steinmetz, “Calvin and the Monastic Ideal,” in *Anticlericalism*, eds. Peter
Dykema and Heiko Oberman (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 605-616; Roger Van Allen, “John Calvin
on Clerical Celibacy” *American Benedictine Review* 22 (1971): 232-244; Christopher
Elwood, “Calvin, Beza and the Defense of Marriage in the Sixteenth Century” in *Calvin,
Beza, and Later Calvinism: Papers presented at the 15th colloquium of the Calvin Studies*
(Grand Rapids, MI: CRC Product Services, 2006), 11-37; Garry J. Quinn “On Celibacy:
Calvin and the Catholics,” *American Ecclesiastical Review* 167 (1973): 302-312; and
Michael Parsons, *Reformation Marriage: The Husband and Wife Relationship in the
Theology of Luther and Calvin* (Edinburg: Rutherford House, 2005).

31 Calvin, *Institutes*, IV.xiii.15, 1269-1270. “This is clear: that no order of men is
more polluted by all sorts of foul vices; nowhere do factions, hatreds, party zeal, and intrigue
burn more fiercely. Indeed, in a few monasteries men live chastely, if one must call it chastity
where lust is suppressed to the point of not being openly infamous. Yet you will scarcely find
one in ten which is not a brothel rather than a sanctuary of chastity.”

32 John Witte, *From Sacrament to Contract, Marriage, Religion and Law in Western
Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 74-95, *Sex, Marriage and Family in
John Calvin’s Geneva* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), “Between Sacrament and
Contract Marriage as Covenant in John’s Calvin’s Geneva,” *Calvin Theological Journal* 33
marriage serves the function of “keeping us from plunging into unbridled lust.” The Reformers recognized the spiritual aspect of the marital covenant and preached that Christian marriage must be conducted in a special way, and thus forbade their congregants to divorce spouses who were Catholics or unbelievers. 

Polish Reformed confessions of the sixteenth century echoed the Reformation’s general disgust with the immorality of Roman clergy and the unbiblical practice of celibacy: the Bohemian Brethren alone continued to recommend celibacy for their ministers. Kalaj’s perspective on marriage and celibacy stand in confessional continuity with the sentiments expressed in the Confession of Sandomierz. He recommends that each lifestyle correspond to one’s individual calling. His polemic against compulsory celibacy seems especially bold when he names it the catalyst of “much evil” among the Roman clergy. Kalaj proceeds to concentrate on the spiritual dimension of marriage—that it resembles the union between Christ and the church—touching on themes present in the work of other Reformers. He calls it, after Paul, mysterium magnum (Song of Sol. 1:15; John

33 Calvin, Institutes, Il.viii.41, pp. 405-406.


36 Darowski notes that Kalaj was married, however we were not able to verify this as fact. See Darowski, Szczepanowice nad Dunajcem, dzieje wsi, parafii katolickiej i gminy kalwińskiej (Kraków: Ignatianum, 2004), 111.

37 Kalaj, PR, 33. “…coz za dziw ze sie tam bardzo źle dziać musi.”
16:21; II Cor. 11:2; Eph. 5:25, 32; Rev 11:1), arguing that matrimony is beneficial for those members of the clergy who desire it so that they might better understand Christ’s relationship with his church.

Moreover, Kalaj also recognizes the practical aspect of marriage: its assistance in overcoming lust and avoiding sexual immorality. Finally, Kalaj says marriage and celibacy are to be treated equally and with the understanding that God has given each Christian a different calling, since it is better to live purely within marriage than immorally while single, or to be happy and unwed rather than married out of compulsion. In support of this opinion, he writes:

What tyranny it is to put to men’s consciences under a yoke of celibacy, making the Priests of the Lord take an oath under law and placing their lives under the pretext of purity; or [what] cruelty [it is] to go into marriage against oneself, and to condemn someone who could have served God and Church without marrying under the pretext of God’s Word. 38

7.6. EXTREME UNCTION

Until the Council of Trent, the Roman practice of extreme unction had been administered only under the condition of imminent death. However, as Palmer points out, Trent’s final draft of the doctrine shifted slightly in its character, allowing anointment for those seriously ill but not necessarily for the dying. He writes, “The Council introduces its teaching on the sacrament in the context of a dying Christian, but it does not limit the administration of the sacrament to those who are at the point

---

38 Kalaj, PR, 81-82.”Bo jako to iest tyranstwo na sumienia ludzkie, pod praetextem czystości pańskiej, kłasz na wszystkie bez exceptiey Kapłany Boże, jarzmo bezzenstwa, ślubem y prawem obowiązanyym pod gardłem; tak by y to było okrucieństwo z drugiej strony, y niesłużne przewodzenie, do Małżeństwa tylo bied y rozerwania zasobą pociągającego, przymuszać kogo, praetextem Słowa Bożego woli jego, abo potępiać kogo, któryby mógł wbezżeństwie czystym Bogu y Kościołowi iego służyć.”
of death." 39 Protestants, however, saw no Scriptural basis for the practice in either case, as John Ziegler concludes:

Luther, Melanchthon, and Calvin were the only Continental Reformers who in any systematic way addressed themselves to the sacrament of extreme unction….Their reasoning followed two paths: first, since no evidence could be found for the direct institution of this anointing by Christ, they concluded that this ritual could only be of human invention. Second, granting the ritual described by James, they attempted to illustrate from the contemporary practice of the Church that it had failed to remain faithful to the words of James 5:14-15, the very words that the Church accepted as the authority for the promulgation of this sacrament. 40

The Confession of Sandomierz rejected extreme unction, allowing only prayer for the sick, and Kalaj’s discussion here seems to resemble Calvin in reference to content but not tone. 41 Both Kalaj and Calvin argue that they do not see a Scriptural basis for it and posit that the anointing with oil for the sick and dying recommended by James (James 5:14) has little to do with the Roman sacrament. Furthermore, both argue that James was speaking during the time when God performed a number of miracles to establish the credibility of the apostles. Kalaj and Calvin also reference events described in the Bible that did not produce a sacrament or even a normative tradition. Calvin mentions bathing at the pool of Siloam (John 9:7) and lying upon dead children to resurrect them (Acts 20:10). Kalaj recalls the promise from the

---


Gospel of Mark in which the disciples had been told that they might drink poison and handle snakes without any harm to their health (Mark 16:18). In Kalaj’s opinion, neither the anointing mentioned by James nor the extraordinary immunity from poison described by Mark are available to Christians.⁴²

In the same fashion as Calvin, Kalaj adds that even if Christians could continue to perform miracles like the apostles, the practice recommended by James is still far from the Roman sacrament of last rites, since Christ and the disciples were anointing the individuals for complete healing, while the Roman priest does it as a preparation for death, calling it *extrema* and suggesting that death is imminent. Therefore, if the apostolic practice was more for healing and joy, then the Catholic sacrament is an “envoy of death.”⁴³ Calvin writes, “However, even if they should win their point, as they are very far from doing … James wishes all sick persons to be anointed (James 5:14); these fellows smear with their grease not the sick but half-dead corpses when they are already drawing their last breath or (as they say) *in extremis.*”⁴⁴

Finally, Kalaj speculates that *unctio extrema* looks more like the anointing of Jesus in Bethany by the woman; however, even in this situation, there is no sacramental significance since the woman was acting out of love for her teacher, not realizing the nearness of Christ’s death (see Matt. 26:6–13). Kalaj concludes here by stating that Evangelicals do not forbid anointing in general, but that they approve it

⁴² Kalaj, PR, 33; Calvin, *Institutes*, IV.xix.21, p. 1468.

⁴³ Kalaj, PR, 33.

only when understood as a symbol of our healing from sin unto salvation, not as a sacrament necessary for salvation (see I John 2:27). 45

7.7. Baptism

The Reformed position on baptism has already been discussed through a variety of sources. 46 Thus we might simply recall here that, in addition to the polemics with Catholics, the Reformed concept of baptism also had been shaped largely by debates with the Anabaptists. 47 The Reformed came to see baptism as the sign and seal of a covenant that replaced circumcision. As was the case with circumcision, baptism did not guarantee or necessarily contribute directly to salvation, but simply signified one’s membership in the visible church, as was the case with King Saul, for example, who did not follow the Lord’s commands despite being circumcised.

The formulation and adoption of the Reformed understanding of baptism by Polish Reformed Christians was surrounded by two major controversies. First was the practice of multiple baptisms by the Czech Brethren, whose somewhat bureaucratic

45 Kalaj, PR, 33.


47 John W. Riggs, Baptism in the Reformed Tradition: A Historical and Practical Theology (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 21-25, 34. Although some Reformers, such as Huldrych Zwingli, were even open to the idea of believer’s baptism only, later they rejected it for the sake of covenantal theology, which became an important Reformed theological locus.
treatment of the sacrament led them to practice second baptism for those joining their church. This unorthodox practice was quickly condemned by the Reformed and the Czech Brethren abandoned it in 1556 at the Synod of Pinczów.\textsuperscript{48} The second controversy, which had a much greater impact on Polish religious dissidents, was anti-pedobaptism, where only adult baptism was treated as valid. This teaching was introduced by Marcin Czechowic (c.1532-1613) as early as 1564, as Szczucki points out.\textsuperscript{49} This Anabaptist view later was advanced by the Anti-Trinitarian theologians (former members of the Reformed Church), namely, Piotr of Goniądz (1525-1573), and Szymon Budny (1550-1593).\textsuperscript{50} The practice of adult-only baptism spread quickly


\textsuperscript{49} Lech Szczucki, “The Beginnings of Antitrinitarian Anabaptism in Poland in the Light of a So-far Unknown Source.” Edited by Jean-Georges Rott, Simon L. Verheus, 343-358, \textit{Anabaptistes et dissidents au XVI siecle} (Baden-Baden & Bouxwiller: Editions Valentin Koerner, 1987), 357. Szczucki reviews here previous scholarship on the issue origins of the Anti-Trinitarianism anabaptism based on the discovery of some previously unknown sources, when he writes, “Secondly, the opinion had been fixed in the literature of the subject that the said ideology was fully worked out only in the second half of the 1560s, and the role of Czechowic himself in that process and in that period was treated rather as secondary. Now it has turned out that Czechowic formulated these basic doctrinal principles as early as in 1564; they came to be adopted by the whole Polish Church and, if we disregard the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ—were later not basically modified but simply completed and made more precise. Let us note that those principles led the Minor Church toward sectarian Utopianism. It is true that they were in practice moderated to a considerable extent, but survived officially—with all their pacifist, egalitarian, and politics-shunning elements—until the reforms instituted by Fausto Sozzini.” In addition see also Lech Szczucki and Marcin Czechowic, \textit{Studium z dziejów antytrinitanizmu polskiego XVI w} (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo, 1964).

among the Polish Brethren, who officially adopted it during one of their early synods in Brzeziny on 10 June 1565 and continued to faithfully confess it even when facing opposition from Faustus Socinus, who refused to be re-baptized upon his arrival in Poland. In 1580, Socinus argued his opinion in *De baptismo aquae disputatio*.\(^{51}\)

Naturally, Polish Reformed Christians were alarmed by the development of anti-pedobaptist teaching and responded during the synods held between 1564 and 1565, even writing to Zurich to seek Bullinger’s advice.\(^{52}\) The Confession of Sandomierz stayed faithful to the Bullingerian perspective and, as Lehmann argues, put an even stronger emphasis on the fact that baptism granted membership in the covenantal community but did not guarantee salvation.\(^{53}\)

Kalaj deals with baptism by posing several hypothetical questions:\(^{54}\) Who is to receive baptism? What does baptism accomplish? And what happens to the unbaptized infants of believing parents? His answers are brief and practical. He argues that baptism is to be administered only upon genuine repentance, along with an honest and sincere confession of faith, and never out of compulsion. It can be

---


\(^{52}\) Lehmann quotes the letters of Krzystof Trece (Polish translator of the Second Helvetic Confession) complaining about Bullinger in 1565. See Lehmann, *KS*, 241.

\(^{53}\) Lehmann, *Konfesja Sadomierska*, 243; Compare with Heidelberg Catechism Q&A 69-74, which uses similar language.

administered to those converting from paganism, Islam, Judaism, and Socinianism, as well as to the infants of Christian parents.

Furthermore, he argues that through baptism we get rid of original sin but do not shed the sinful nature or guilt for sins consciously committed. So, for Kałaj, baptism serves as the sign of a new birth, a renewal of conscience, and the gate of entrance to the church. It is important here to note that many early Reformers fervently opposed the idea that baptism had the capacity to remove original sin. Calvin wrote, “Now, it is clear how false is the teaching, long propagated by some and still persisted in by others, that through baptism we are released and made exempt from original sin, and from the corruption that descended from Adam into all his posterity.” Such a concept also is absent from the Confession of Sandomierz. However, this potential conflict can be explained by the fact that Kałaj operates with a different definition of original sin than Calvin, Bullinger, or Tracy (the translator of the Confession of Sandomierz).

Francis Turretin, in his Institutes of Elenctic Theology, observes that not all the early Reformers operated with identical definitions of original sin. He writes:

Original sin is sometimes used more broadly to embrace imputed and inherent sin, into which as two parts it is said to be resolvable (this it is taken by Ursinus, Zanchius and others). Sometimes, it is used more strictly to denote inherent alone; the imputed, as the cause and foundation not being excluded but supposed (in which way Bucer, Calvin and Bullinger speak of it). In this sense, it is now being used by us.\(^5\)

---

\(^5\) Comare Kałaj, *PR*, 34-35 with Calvin, *Institutes*, IV.xiv.10, p.1311 and II.i.6, p. 248, who argues that baptism does not remove the original sin.

\(^6\) Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* vol.1, 629-630.
The differences in the technical understanding of original sin that Turretin points out help us to resolve the dilemma. All Reformed rejected the Roman idea of the sacrament working *ex opere operato* or *ex opere operantis*. Instead they argued that the recipient accepts the sacrament by faith, responding to the promise. They also rejected the idea that was able to purify one from inherent sin. For them, only the imputed sin was removed once one entered into a covenant with God. We see this when Kałaj says baptism does not remove sinful nature.\(^{57}\) Ursinus expresses this in the following way: “The godly are indeed delivered from original sin as it respects the guilt thereof, which is remitted unto them through Christ; but in as far as it represents its formal character and essence, this is as an evil opposing itself to the law of God—it remains. And although those to whom sin is remitted are at the same time regenerated by the Holy Ghost, yet this renewal of their nature is not perfect in this life; therefore they transmit the corrupt nature which they themselves have to their posterity.”\(^{58}\) We also find a similar approach taken by Johannes Maccovius, whom Kałaj most likely read while in Franeker.\(^{59}\) It is, then, not surprising that Kałaj operates with this understanding of the original sin.

Next, Kałaj moves to another controversial topic: the necessity of baptism for salvation. He argues that baptism is mandatory and thus necessary for salvation and that anyone who denies it is disobedient and despises God’s command as given in

\(^{57}\) Kałaj, *PR*, 34.


Mark 16:16. Well aware of the potential problems this could create, he quickly qualifies this statement. He argues that salvation is possible without baptism because the necessity of baptism is dependent upon the command and not the sacrament itself. For Kalaj, the unbaptized can be saved as long as there are extraordinary circumstances present to justify the absence of the sacrament, such as an unexpected death or negligent parents. The Scripture states that children shall not be judged according to the sins committed by their fathers (see Jer. 31:29; Ezek. 18:4).  

Furthermore, in order to explain how baptism is necessary for salvation and how someone still can be saved without it, Kalaj makes a fairly standard Reformed distinction between God’s covenant (Foedus Dei) and the Seal of the Covenant (Signum Foederis). Normatively, he argues, these two work together, so that through baptism God seals his agreement with humans. However, in extraordinary circumstances, such as the death of an unbaptized infant (of Christian parents), the two are separated but not nullified; so, just as it is possible to be saved by the covenant without its sign and seal, it is also possible to be damned with its sign and seal. He goes on to show how the latter case has often been presented in Scripture, when circumcision or baptism were administered to those who later turned to their wicked ways and were unrepentant.  

Kalaj proceeds to explain that this distinction helps us to comprehend that baptism is for the sake of man and not God, and that God will save those whom he has elected. This is also one more reason why Scripture does not mention baptism.

---

60 Kalaj, PR, 35.

61 Kalaj, PR, 35.
when it speaks about the condemnation of those who do not believe when it says, “ Whoever believes and is baptized will be saved, but whoever does not believe will be condemned” (Mark 16:16). These provisions made for the unbaptized infants (of Christian parents) and believers are, for Kałaj, to be understood as an intervention of God’s special mercy when the harsh realities of life, with our sinful nature and our sinful world, often prevent us from fully obeying God. Kałaj recalls the story of Jonah, whose disobedience did not prevent God from showing mercy to Nineveh.62

Later, in the third section of his work, Kałaj once again addresses the issue of baptism, this time directly linking it with circumcision:

God has a covenant with his people in the New Testament just as he did in the Old Testament, except in a better way. Just as God gave to the Israelites and their children the sign of Holy Circumcision, in the New Testament God gave to Christians and their children the Holy Baptism as a sign of the covenant. Aren’t the children a part of the covenant together with their parents? Is not baptism given in place of circumcision? Are not Christian children equally loved or even more loved by God than the Jewish children used to be?63

In comparison with the theology of the Reformation and post-Reformation eras, Kałaj does not depart from the general orthodoxy established by the Reformed consensus. Like Zanchi, he structures his explanation in the form of questions and answers, arguing that baptism has a salvific effect only upon God’s elect.64 And like

62 Kałaj, PR, 35-36.

63 Kałaj, PR, 80. “Przymierze ma Bóg z ludem swoim jako wstarym, tak w Nowym Testamencie, daleko lepsze. Jako tedy Izraelitom w przymierzu swoim będącym, dał Bog znak, im y dziatkom ich, obrzezka Świętą; tak mówiąc in simili, w Nowym Testamencie, krześcianom dał Bog, krzest Święty, jako znak przymierza swego znimi, u z ich dziećmi. A za bowiem dzieci nie są w przymierzu Bozym, jako y rodzicy? A za nie jest krzest S na miejescu obrzezki? A za nie tak mile jeśli nie milsze są dziatki Krześcijańskie Bogu niżeli żydowskie były?”

64 See for example: Zanchi, H. Zanchius: His Confession of Christian, 116-117.
Ursinus, Kalaj discusses the conditional necessity of baptism for salvation as distinguishing the institutional sign of God’s grace from the subjective appropriation of grace signified by the sign, thus distancing himself from the ex opere operato.  

Like Beza, Bullinger, and later the Westminster Confession, he sees the neglecting of baptism as sinful, yet not prohibitive to the salvation of the unbaptized individual.

Finally, together with the Confession of Sandomierz and all other Reformers, he rejects Anabaptist teachings, instead seeing baptism as the sign of the covenant that replaces circumcision. On the other hand, he omits mentioning controversies with the Czech Brethren about multiple baptisms, neither discussing such questionable rites as exorcisms or the rights of midwives to baptize in case of emergency and other 

---

65 Kalaj, *PR*, 35: c.f., “Not to be baptized does not condemn, if there be no contempt of this sacrament; for not the want, but the contempt of the sacrament condemns ... Christ makes this distinction, because there is not the same necessity for faith and baptism to salvation. Faith is absolutely necessary to salvation, so that no one can be saved without it: for ‘without faith it is impossible to please God’ (Heb. 11:16.) But the sacraments are necessary when they may be observed according to divine appointment. Contempt of the sacraments under such circumstances, is inconsistent with faith. This is the reason why Christ promises salvation to those that believe and are baptized, keeping in view the distinction such is here made. Yet he does not deny salvation to those who are deprived of his sacrament.” Ursinus, *The Commentary of Dr. Zacharius Ursinus on the Heidelberg Catechism*, 364 (Q. 71). For another discussion see: Lucas L. Trelctius, *A Brief Institution*, 331-334; See also Riggs, *Baptism in the Reformed Tradition*, 34.

66 Kalaj, *PR*, 35 c.f. Westminster Confession, chap. 27, art. 5-6. “Although it is a great sin to condemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated, or saved, without it: or, that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated. The efficacy of Baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered; yet, notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited, and conferred, by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongs unto, according to the counsel of God’s own will, in His appointed time.” See also: Theodore Beza, *A briefe and pithie summe of Christian faith made in fore of a Confession, with a confutation of al such superstitious, as are contrarie there unto* (London: Roger Ward, 1589), 273; Heinrich Bullinger, *The Decades of Henry Bullinger*, ed. Thomas Harding, George Melvyn Ella, and Joel R. Beeke, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2004), 351-401 (Decade VIII, Sermon 5).

controversial issues which would make the Reformed understanding of baptism overtly controversial in the ears of his Catholic opponent.68

7.8. The Lord’s Supper

Despite the lack of agreement between Lutherans and the Reformed, Calvin and Bullinger agreed on the doctrine regardless of their different emphases upon the theological issues at play, as expressed in the 1549 (but published in 1551) Consensus Tigurinus.69 The sacramental disputes between the Reformed and Lutherans on the issue of the Lord’s Supper had a negative impact upon the already unstable situation of Polish Protestants, who were torn by the Arian and Anabaptist controversies.70 A difference in the understanding of communion prevented Jan Łaski’s ecumenical efforts to unify the various branches of Polish Protestantism in the hope of a national

68 For example, fine distinctions of Makowski or anti-Jesuit polemics of Trelcatius. See: Johannes Maccovius, Iohannis Maccovii, 141-143; Lucas Trelcatius, A Brief institution of the common places od Sacred Divinite wherein the truth of every place is proved and the sophismes of Bellarmine are reproved (London, 1610), 330-360.


70 Darius Petkūnas, “Holy Communion Rites in the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed Agendas of the 16th and Early 17th Centuries” (PhD diss., University of Helsinki, 2004), 31-34.
church by imposing the Reformed view upon Lutherans.\(^{71}\) Article XXI of the Sandomierz Confession, published ten years after Łaski’s death, tried to overcome the disagreement by creating a new definition. It departed significantly from Bullinger’s original idea and described the sacrament as prawdziwy (true or real), duchowy (spiritual), and sakramentalny (sacramental).\(^{72}\)

The origin of this definition continues to cause some disagreement among Polish scholars. Lehmann argued for its Lutheran character and saw the two fragments from Calvin and Beza (besides the article from Saxon Confession) attached at the end of the Confession as not doctrinally justifiable.\(^{73}\) Gmiterek, on the other hand, rooted the confession’s view on the Lord’s Supper in the Czech Brethren tradition; it accented the real presence of Christ but was otherwise broad enough to include a different understanding of the communication of the proper qualities of Christ’s natures (comunicatio idiomatum). For Tworek, the perspective of Calvin and Beza was thus compatible with the somewhat-Lutheran character of the article.\(^{74}\)

---


\(^{73}\) Lehmann, Konfesja Sandomierska, 301.

\(^{74}\) Lehmann, Konfesja Sandomierska, 299-305; Gmiterek, Bracia Czescy a Kalwini, 88-92. Gmiterek also suggests that the Czech Brethren formulation did not even create an opposition from the Lithuanian Church, which in 1626 published a fragment of Calvin’s Institutes (still the only fragment of the Institutes published in Polish) dealing with sacraments. See Gmiterek, Bracia Czescy a Kalwini, 92.
Where Lehmann and Tworek do agree is that the main goal of the confession was to exclude Zwingli’s memorial view. Finally, Petkūnas argues for basic continuity with Bullinger:

Although terminology is often used which is characteristic of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord’s Supper rather than that of the Reformed or Calvinists, it can be said that this Confession displays at most superficial evidences of Lutheran influence. In general the text follows the Second Helvetic Confession of Heinrich Bullinger in both structure and contents with only minor omissions or emendations. This is especially evident when the subject matter approximates the Lutheran doctrine, such with reference to the nature of Christ’s presence in the sacrament and the consecration.

Overall, the confessional standards established by the Confession of Sandomierz proved to be neither politically compelling nor doctrinally binding. The union was discussed at the synods in Kraków (1570), Piotrków (1578), Włodzisław (1583), and finally in 1595 at the General Synod of Toruń (Thorn), which was the largest (and the last) gathering of Polish Protestants of this magnitude. And if the agreement concerning communion remained between the Reformed and Czech Brethren, the theological differences with Lutherans became more apparent, ending any ecumenical hope for a united Polish Evangelical Church.

In his Friendly Dialogue, Kalaj continues to use language adopted from the Sandomierz Confession, employing the aforementioned terms duchowy, sakramentalny, and prawdziwy. He explains that the duchowy (spiritual) aspect of

---

75 Gmiterek, Bracia Czescy a Kalwini, 88; and Lehmann, KS, 301-305.

76 Petkūnas, Holy Communion Rites, 92.

77 Gmiterek, Bracia Czescy a Kalwini, 91; Wojciech Sławiński, Toruński Synod Generalny 1595 (Warszawa: Semper, 2002), 194-301.

78 Lehmann, Konfesja Sandomierska, 236.
the Lord’s Table was exemplified in the Passover lamb and manna given to the Jews in the desert. Furthermore, he recalls the priest Melchizedek (Gen 14:18) bringing out bread and wine from the temple to feed Abraham and his army, foreshadowing the Church’s later “participation” in the body and blood of Christ (I Cor. 10:16). Christ, as our High Priest, brought us spiritual food to strengthen us in our battle against the world, Satan, and the sinful nature. Furthermore, Kałaj holds that through the celebration of the Lord’s Table we are united with Christ in the spiritual sense, when he lives in us and we live in him (John 6:50–51; Col. 3:3).

He explains the prawdziwy aspect of communion by the exposition according to gradations of importance (graditim) of essences (quidditates): (1) remembrance of Christ’s sacrifice (positivus), (2) nourishment for the soul and drink of salvation for the soul (comperativus), and the highest spiritual degree, (3) assurance of eternal life and the presence of Christ in us (superlativus). For Kałaj, all three essences serve to clarify our reason, sanctify our heart, strengthen our conscience, confirm our faith, and seal our hope so that we have everything in abundance, and so that our “cup overflows” (Ps. 23).

In the final section of the chapter, Kałaj turns to the discussion about the Roman Catholic and Lutheran views. His rejection of transubstantiation was based on opposition to the idea that a substance could be annihilated from its accidents, because that would call into question the basic fundamental principles upon which

---

79 Kałaj, PR, 38

80 Kałaj, PR, 38.
God created the world and continues to operate in it. When it comes to the Lutheran idea of consubstantiation, he admits that it is closer to the Reformed view, but objects to the physical presence of Christ in the Eucharist, since the bodily Christ is present at the right of hand of the Father, where he has gone to prepare a place for his elect. Next, Kalaj confronts the charge that the Reformed doubt or cheapen Christ’s words, believing that he could say the same thing of Catholics and Lutherans who deny the Reformed understanding of the sacrament, and highlights that the Reformed receive the body and blood of Christ in simplicity of heart and conscience, never negating God’s omniscience or promises.

Furthermore, Kalaj takes offense here at being called a “Calvinist,” and his reaction echoed that of many of his contemporaries, such as Pierre Du Muoulin (1568-1658), Jean Claude (1619-1687), and Pierre Jurieu (1637-1713), who, while not disagreeing with Calvin, found it inappropriate to treat him as some sort of heresiarch of Reformed theology. Also, Kalaj’s offense here is not on account of any particular disagreement with Calvin’s views, but rather disapproval of the

---

81 Kalaj, PR, 38.

82 This view stood in opposition to the Lutheran position, which argued for the ubiquity (omnipresence) of Christ’s human body and nature. The Reformed argued that Christ’s human body-and-soul is not infinite or omnipresent, so that the finite human nature of Christ is not capable of containing His infinite divine nature in its entirety. Calvin’s views on the Lord’s Supper found its expression in Heidelberg Catechism Q&A 75, 76; See also Steinmetz, “Scripture and the Lord’s Supper,” 260.

83 Kalaj, PR, 85-87. In the third section of the book, Kalaj discusses the manner in which Evangelicals accept the Lord’s Supper. He explains that, despite the fact that they kneel to accept it, they do not condemn those who do not because the matter belongs to the adiaphora, since it is not commanded in the Scriptures.

nickname—he prefers to be called simply an Evangelical, one for whom the Gospel (and not Calvin) has the highest authority.

When confronting Lutherans, Kałaj’s tone betrays some bitterness inherited from the unsuccessful ecumenical dialogue of the previous century. He accuses them of ignorance and malice, sounding here much less irenic than when addressing Catholics. He asks why they continue to falsely accuse the Reformed of things for which they themselves do not wish to be accused by Rome. At the same time, he explains to his Catholic partner that their disagreement is somewhat natural, due to the fact that they do not both live under the tyranny of the Pope, and that absolute agreement on every point of doctrine in this fallen world is simply impossible. He then encourages Catholics at least to celebrate communion under both elements (bread and wine) even if they cannot agree with the Reformed about the essence of it.

In the third section of the book Kałaj addresses the particular accusations made against him by Anonim (Czarnecki). He names two inappropriate ways in which the Lord’s Supper might be consummated: (1) spiritual but not sacramental (which occurs when one accepts the elements in faith but without the sacramental understanding, most likely an allusion to Zwingli) and (2) non-spiritual but sacramental (when one takes the elements as sacrament but without repentance or faith in Christ (for example Judas), an allusion to Catholics). He reaffirms that proper partaking of the bread and wine must be done in faith with the proper spiritual (not physical) understanding of the sacrament when he wrote: “... all repentant believers

---

85 Kałaj, PR, 40.
86 Kałaj, PR, 79.
who approach the Lord’s Body and Blood with faith, being well-rooted in Christ’s Word, are partaking in it as it is (although spiritually and not physically)\textsuperscript{87} which concurs with the basic Reformed approach expressed in \textit{Consensus Tigurinus}.

7.9. \textsc{Conclusion}

We have identified that the discussion about the five questionable sacraments, as well as the nature of baptism and communion, were highly controversial topics in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Kalaj’s exposition stands in basic continuity with his Reformed predecessors. He refuses to recognize confirmation, penance, ordination, marriage, and extreme unction as sacraments. His justification for this position resembles Calvin (such as in the discussion of extreme unction) and also later Reformed scholastics (such as in the discussion of original sin). In the discussion regarding the Lord’s Supper, Kalaj remains faithful to the Confession of Sandomierz and sees it as compatible with Calvin’s view. In his discussion about baptism he endorses infant baptism and refuses to recognize baptism of the Socinians.

However, Kalaj also adopts an irenic tone in his exposition and makes a number of rhetorical accommodations in order to make his teaching sound more acceptable in the ears of his Roman Catholic opponents. He explains that the five Roman sacraments, although not understood as sacraments, are still practiced in Polish Reformed churches. In respect to confession of faith, Kalaj continues to use the Latin term \textit{confirmatio} (but not Polish \textit{bierzmowanie}) and avoids using terms such

\textsuperscript{87} Kalaj, \textit{PR}, 78…wszyscy wierzący y pokutujący ciała y krwie Pańskiej, gdy przystępując, z wiarą na słowie Krystusowym ugruntowaną, same rzeczy przy tym S Sacramencie sobie (duchownym jednak nie cielsesnym sposobem) daną, biorą.
as nawrócenie (resipiscentia, conversio). He does, however, define it as simple affirmation of one’s faith according to the Evangelical understanding. Regarding the discussion of ordination and church order, Kalaj humbly recognizes that Polish Reformed churches experienced some organizational struggles but justifies these as a healthy sign of freedom of speech. On the issue of priesthood he states that the Reformed continued to recognize the value of celibate living. In reference to extreme unction he accepts anointing with oil (of a sick person) as long as no sacramental (or supernatural) value is attributed. When discussing baptism he adopts a definition of original sin that is rarely used among the Reformed but not unheard of. Regarding the discussion of the Lord’s Supper, Kalaj refuses to be called a Calvinist even though he agrees with Calvin on the issue. He also seems no longer to hope for reconciliation with Lutherans; nor does he see their view as compatible with his own. Finally, in the course of the whole chapter, he uses patristic references to show his respect for the Church Fathers and common heritage, but this is nothing unusual for a Protestant who continued to see himself as a member of the universal church.
CHAPTER EIGHT:
THE IRENIC DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

8.1. INTRODUCTION

Next to justification, the doctrine of the church was one of the most debated doctrines of the Reformation—a rather unsurprising result of the medieval controversies that escalated in light of the Great Schism (1378-1417).\(^1\) The Protestant ecclesiology was based on the refusal to acknowledge the bishop of Rome as the head of the whole universal church and the belief that one’s salvation could be conditioned by submitting to him. Throughout the Reformation, conflicting parties asked numerous questions about the nature, character, and “marks” of the true church.\(^2\)

In contrast to major parts of Western Europe, ecclesiastical plurality was hardly new in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth of the early modern period. The religiously diverse Polish state included Catholics, Jews, Eastern-Orthodox, Hussites, and Muslims living in relative peace and stability long before the Reformation. This peace was in continuity with the medieval view of tolerance understood as “enduring” or “putting up with.”\(^3\)

---


\(^3\) See for example Aquinas’s usage of the word *tolerance* in reference to the toleration of the Jews: Hans Oberdiek, *Tolerance: Between Forbearance and Acceptance* (Rowman &
religious persecution on a large scale, the country was well-known for being an 
*asylum of heretics.*

This tolerant approach became evident in rare irenic theological treatises and legal documents of the Reformed, Socinian, Catholic and Lutheran believers (discussed in chapter four). As a rule, the Polish Reformed stayed faithful to the Reformed orthodoxy of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, except with regard to ecclesiology, for which they often adopted a much more generous approach in their relations with Lutherans. Overall, the Polish Reformed were less aggressive than most of their Helvetic and German neighbors.

Darius Petkūnas notes that with the *Confession of Sandomierz* in 1570 the Polish Reformed Church began to develop an independent self-consciousness and self-definition, giving it more ecumenical character in comparison with its Western coreligionists. He writes of the Confession:

> Its significance in the life of Polish and Lithuanian Churches extends far beyond the time and place of its formulation. It marks the particular doctrinal usages of the Reformed Churches in these lands over against other Reformed Churches in Switzerland and Germany, and other Christian confessions. At the end of the sixteenth century, the Reformed in these lands looked upon the *Sandomierz Confession* as an ecumenical document and served as the basis of their discussions with the Lutherans and the Bohemian Brethren and with the Orthodox Eastern Churches as well. The *Sandomierz Consensus* and *Sandomierz Confession* established the Eucharistic doctrine upon which liturgy and practice in the congregations was to be based. This doctrine moved beyond the doctrine articulated by Heinrich Bullinger in *Second


---

Helvetic Confession mainly in its terminology, which is meant to assuage the Lutheran clergy and their congregations and serve as a point of possible reconciliation between the churches. Thus the Confession of Sandomierz, a binding confessional document for the Polish Reformed, was broader and more inclusive than other Reformed Confessions of the day, such as the Second Helvetic Confession or the Belgic Confession. It assumed that the doctrinal differences between Lutherans and Reformed were non-essential to salvation and did not disqualify either church as the true church of God.

8.2. *Nulla Salus Extra Ecclesiam*

Protestants rejected institutional catholicity as the Roman Church had defined it. Instead, they argued that the catholic church transcends time and place and consists only of those elected by God. Thus, since only God knows whom he elected to salvation, the true catholic church was invisible to the human eye and transcended time and place. As the Westminster Confession states in chapter twenty-five, article one, “The catholic or universal church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the Head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all.” The Confession of Sandomierz generally followed the language of Bullinger’s Second Helvetic Confession and defined the church as an assembly of the faithful.

---

5 Darius Petkūnas, "Holy Communion Rites in the Polish and Lithuanian Reformed Agendas of the 16th and Early 17th Centuries" (Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 2004), 93.
called out of the world; all those who truly know and rightly worship and serve the true God in Christ the Savior, by the Word and holy Spirit.  

In doctrinal continuity with those statements, Kalaj first recalls the ancient phrase, “I believe in … the holy catholic Church; the communion of saints” from the Apostolic Confession of Faith and then identifies the holy catholic church as truly universal, not located in one place. He uses the metaphor of the bride and body of Christ to describe it. He also uses the term “mother,” which is absent from the Polish confessional language but is often used by the Reformers, such as Calvin. Kalaj also goes beyond the Confession of Sandomierz when he expands upon the idea of the church as the mother and references Cyprian’s saying, “Those who do not have the church as mother on Earth do not have God as Father in Heaven.”

For Kalaj, the truly catholic church outside of which one cannot be saved concerns people of all nations, places, and times. It exists from the beginning to the end of the world, consists of all elected and called to salvation, and is not visible to men but known only to God. He writes:

The Church is holy, catholic meaning universal, and generally understood as consisting of all people, from all times and places. It existed from the beginning of the world and it will be there until the end of it. This we confess in the Credo or the Apostolic Confession of Faith, held by all Christians. The church consists only of those who have been elected and called, seen not by people but only by God.

---


7 However, Calvin used the term mother when referring to the visible church. See: Calvin, Institutes, IV.i.4, p. 1016 and IV.i.1, p. 1012.

8 Kalaj, “O Kościele Bożym,” 716 [the section on the Church of Kalaj’s Friendly Dialogue can be found in Filozofia i myśl społeczna XVII wieku. 700 lat myśli polskiej, Zbigniew Ogornowski, ed. (Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1979), 715-734; thus, our references will point to this modern edition of the text]. “Że jest kościół święty katolicki, to
Again, Kałaj remains here largely consistent with the Polish confessional language and Reformed orthodoxy in general, with the exception of referring to the church as a “mother”—a term which, though, absent from the Second Helvetic Confession, was commonly used by the Reformers.

8.3. THE MILITANT CHURCH

The Reformed, in opposition to the Anabaptists and Libertines, argued for the inseparability of the Word and Spirit so that the church was visibly identified on earth. For the Reformed, the visible church (sometimes called particular or militant) in contrast with the invisible (catholic, triumphant), was a mix of the elect and non-elect, those who truly believed and followed Christ and those who only pretended to do so. Since it was possible that in some visible churches the number of hypocrites outnumbered the true believers, it was possible for a church to stop being a church. Thus the Reformed distinguished between the true and false visible church. A church was considered false if the teaching of the Scriptures, proper administration of the sacraments, and church discipline were no longer practiced. Many, including Calvin, argued that these false churches were not to be considered churches in any sense, and the Westminster Confession referred to them as “synagogues of Satan.” At the same time, the Reformed still believed that not all members of the Catholic Church were condemned. Calvin admitted that under the Pope’s tyranny there were groups of true
believers who constituted a true church. However, he called them churches only to the extent that the Lord wonderfully preserved in them a remnant of his people.\(^9\)

Kalaj follows the Reformed tradition in his definition of the visible church but not in the true-false church distinction. First, he points out that the universal church can be divided into the *bojujący* (militant church), which is still on earth, and the church triumphant, which already enjoys Christ’s presence. Furthermore, he explains that the militant church is *widzialny* (visible) and should not be considered equal with the universal church because it includes non-elect individuals. To portray this aspect of the militant church, Kalaj uses a variety of biblical parables, such as the wheat and the tares (see Matt. 13:25), the good and the bad fish (Matt. 13:47), noble and ignoble instruments (II Tim. 2:20), the wedding banquet (Matt. 22:10), the ten virgins (Matt. 25:1), and the good and bad sheep (Ezek. 34; 21), as well as the image of Christ with a winnowing fork clearing the threshing floor (Matt. 3:12). All these illustrations share a common concept: not all members of the militant church will become part of the church triumphant. Furthermore, Kalaj explains how the proximity of evil and wicked people in the militant church might partially or temporarily deceive the rest, but God’s elect will ultimately repent, embrace true doctrine, and persevere. The elect remain within the militant church and can be more or less visible, but they are always present because the “gates of hell” will not overcome them (Matt 16:18).\(^{10}\)

\(^9\) Calvin, *Institutes*, IV.iii.12, pp.1052-1053.

\(^{10}\) Kalaj addresses the issue of the visibility of the visible church in the third part of the book. He rejects here Anomin’s accusations that Evangelicals believe that the visible church might at times completely disappear. See: Kalaj, *PR*, 83.
Kałaj goes on to distinguish within the militant church the *kościół prawdziwy* (true church) and *kościół faszywy* (false church). However, in contrast to the typical Reformed stand, he opposes the idea of a false church in reference to Rome. Interestingly, his objection is based not on the signs of the visible church but on morality, resembling here the arguments made earlier by Chrząstowski and the Socinian irenists (chapter four). He argues that the main difference between the true church and the false church is that in the true church “there is not much evil but in a false church we find only some good.”\(^{11}\) He then identifies “evil” and “good” as moral and ethical in nature.\(^{12}\) He omits the discussion on the signs of the true church, instead proposing that since all militant churches are mixed, it is nearly impossible to distinguish which one is true and which one is false. His biblical justification for this view comes from the prophet Jeremiah, who saw Judah and Israel as a basket with good and bad figs mixed together (Jer. 24:3) as well as the seven churches from the book of Revelation which, despite their numerous problems, were still considered to be churches of God (Rev. 2; 3). Kałaj must have been aware of his unorthodox approach here, since he goes on to refute suspicion of heresy by claiming that his views are paradoxical but not in conflict with the Reformed tradition. He writes, “herein lies the *paradoxa* but not *heterodoxa* of this teaching.”\(^{13}\)

---

\(^{11}\) Kałaj, “O Kościele Bożym,” 718. “Że w Kościele bożym prawdziwym siła się znajduje złego, a w zawiedzionym i fałszywym nieco się może znajdować dobrego, a to względem żywota, obyczajów, dyscypliny i rządu pozwirzchnego.”


\(^{13}\) Kałaj, “O Kościele Bożym,” 718.
8.4. HAVE SALT IN YOURSELVES

Kalaj’s explanation of the paradoxes characterizing his irenic ecclesiology begins with two statements: “It is better to be a good Catholic than a bad Evangelical,” and, “A great number of bad Evangelicals will be condemned, and a great number of good Catholics will be saved.”

He then expands upon the first one by explaining that a Catholic who, despite being polluted by man’s teachings, in simplicity of heart has faith and fears God will more likely receive salvation than a Protestant who is well aware of the true teachings of Scripture and God’s will but continues to live in sin and offend God. He then compares this nominal Protestant to Judas, who listened to the Lord but did not apply Jesus’ words to his life. Next he posits that a good Protestant will defeat a good Catholic in this divine competition because proper faith is always more important than good works. Here Kałaj uses Jesus’ conversation with the righteous scribe to depict the spiritual condition of a good Catholic who has a chance to receive salvation but is not certain of it, as spoken by Christ: “You are not far from the Kingdom of God” (Mark 12:34).

Against the general Reformed consensus of his time, Kałaj argues that Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed churches are neither true nor false churches. Rather, they are all true churches, but some simply consist of a greater number of false believers than the others. In his view, the three churches continue because they are based on one foundation of faith: Christ and the Apostolic Confession of Faith.

---


Here Kałaj’s ideas resemble the irenicism of Calixt. He recognizes that some churches are more and some less faithful to this foundation, but as long as they hold to it, they continue to be prawdziwe kościoły Boże (true churches of God).  

Kałaj illustrates his point by referring to an insane person who for some time might look or act crazy, but whose disturbing behavior does not stop this person from being a human. Therefore, for Kałaj, any church that continues to have Christ as its foundation (even to a slight extent) continues to maintain its ecclesiastical identity as the true church of God. He writes:

If the church holds to this foundation more faithfully, it becomes a purer and more perfect church. And even though some of these churches fall out of this perfection it does not stop them being the true church. Just as a man who is sick or for some time mad, or possessing another defect, does not stop being a true man, so it is with a church that contains some errors or immorality. This church is a sick member of the Body of Christ, and as long as it remains founded on Christ [the foundation] it does not lose his Christian last name, that of a true Church.  

For Kałaj, this attitude is a practical application of Christ’s words from the Gospel of Luke: “He who is not with me is against me, and he who does not gather with me, scatters” (Luke 11:23).  

---


Next, Kalaj justifies how all the churches need to be considered true churches of God, using the arguments, *in Scriptura, in Ratione*, and *in Partium Confessione*. The multiple examples of how the spiritual unity of God’s people had been sustained despite their physical separation serve as biblical justification. For example, the Old Testament church was divided into the northern kingdom of Israel, which practiced idolatry, and the smaller southern kingdom of Judah, which remained faithful to the Lord. Kalaj explains that although the two kingdoms furiously fought with each other, God still treated them as one (see Jer. 2:13; 8:7; Ezek. 16:45). Next, Kalaj uses the priestly prayer of Jesus in which Christ prayed for the same kind of unity among his people as that which exists between him and his heavenly Father. He urges Christians to love one another so that the world can see that becoming a Christian has more to do with love toward God rather than love toward a particular church leader. He also compares the three churches to the Holy Trinity, where each confession is like a different person of the Godhead but together they are one because they are made of the same substance. He provides a final biblical example, the ancient Tower of Babel. Here Kalaj compares Christians from various churches to the builders of the tower—unable to communicate effectively with each other but still able to worship one God (see Gen. 11:1–9).  

Kalaj’s second series of arguments come from reason, which itself is divided into three subcategories: (1) *principia*, (2) *media*, and (3) *finis*. For Kalaj, (1) the common principles are the desire to be called Christian, faith in Christ, and baptism in

---


the name of the Holy Trinity, which signals initiation into the Christian faith. Next, the common means shared by the churches are God’s Word and the sacraments. Kalaj is well aware that the definition of the sacraments had been greatly disputed; however, even here he sees how all parties agree on *communem sensum*, that none will be saved without accepting the body and blood of Christ. Kalaj ignores the discussion on the five additional sacraments since he discussed them in prior sections of the *Friendly Dialogue*. In correspondence to the third point, he states that all three churches strive toward the same goal—salvation of the soul preceded by repentance.\(^\text{21}\)

Next, Kalaj addresses the differences between the churches and determines whether they are substantial enough to stop calling one of the churches the true church of Christ. First, he addresses the diversity of worship and variety of ceremonies in each tradition. However, he quickly dismisses them as not as crucial to the existence of the church because their absence or presence does not stop the church from being a church, since they are only external characteristics.\(^\text{22}\) Next, he deals with the differences in the articles of faith or doctrine. He notes that the Scriptures show that sometimes even the elect are deceived by false teaching and often need to wait until greater clarity of God’s revelation becomes available. Therefore, the differences between doctrines depend on the progression in our understanding of revelation, and that even during the time of the apostles there were false teachings concerning justification, the Lord’s Supper, resurrection, the person of Christ, and even the Last Judgment. However, Paul still addresses the somewhat deceived congregations in


Rome, Galatia, Corinth, and Thessalonica as brothers and sisters in the Lord. The false doctrine these churches confessed did not stop them from being called true churches of God. He writes:

Different opinions about important articles of faith were drawn, and confessed for some time by the elect. These were not cleared until later when a better understanding became available. Also, in the time of the Apostles, different churches, different errors were confessed, concerning justification by works, the Lord’s Table, resurrections, the person of Christ, and the Last Judgment. And this was described in the Epistles to Romans, Galatians, Corinthians, Thessalonians, and Hebrews. Read about it in Revelation 2, verses 6, 9, 13, 14, and 20.²³

Next, Kałaj goes on to argue that in matters of serious doctrinal differences such as the ones dividing the three churches, Christians are allowed to be divided and separated. Quoting Jesus’ words from Mark 9:50, Kałaj says, “Salt is good, but if it loses its saltiness, how can you make it salty again?” Therefore, he urges the Christians “to have salt in themselves, but also to be at peace with each other.” However, this speaking of truth must be done in love and respect, forgiving the harm done to each other and thus resisting the temptation toward revenge.²⁴

Therefore, Kałaj stresses that each church needs to continue to express its doctrinal convictions and condemn false teaching, but in a proper manner. He recalls the congregation from Ephesus in the book of Revelation, which was reprimanded for


losing its “first love.” For Kałaj, whenever Christians forget about their “first love” to Christ and each other, they become instruments of the devil. This happens when: (1) like the Midianites, Christians are worn out by their conflicts, and fall and devour one another (see Luke 11:18; Gal. 5:15); (2) Jews and Muslims do not willfully convert to Christianity because Christians are unable to give a testimony of their love of God; and (3) military pacts between Turks and Christians work against other Christians, causing abomination.25

The third and final argument for the preservation of the peace and love of the church comes from patristic sources. Kałaj discusses the example of how Cyprian, Optatus, and Augustine confronted the schismatic teachings of Donatists and Novatianists in firmly rejecting their teaching but also endured their presence to preserve the peace of the church. This stance came to be described as tacitus consensus patrum, wherein the Church Fathers not only tolerated those who compromised the faith under Roman persecution but also patiently endured the Donatists and Novatianists who opposed it. 26

Drawing on Scripture, reason, and church history, Kałaj confronts Catholics for not treating Protestants as the true church of Christ. He urges Roman Catholics to renounce the idea of the Catholic Church being Roman, calling it contradicto in adiecto. He explains it is impossible to hold that the church is universal (or catholic) but then narrow it at the same time to one geographical location like Rome. Furthermore, he warns that there is no biblical or confessional basis for the idea that

---


the presence of a Pope will guarantee the unity of the church, and that Paul omits the need for a visible head of the church when he writes: “One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one body, one Spirit, one hope, one God.”

However, he also confronts the ecclesiastical arrogance of his own fellow Protestants, who pride themselves so much on their evangelical heritage that in a practical sense they also become guilty of Donatist error. Kałaj is outraged by Protestants who believe that Catholics might not be saved simply because they are not Protestant. He writes:

Evangelicals, on the other side, must allow for this, and they do. [Otherwise] how could they rebuke Catholics for considering only the Roman Church as the true one while simultaneously condemning other churches? This they cannot do. For if they see no salvation outside of their own church, then they are like a physician who brings sickness instead of healing.

Kałaj expands upon the fact that God would not condemn God-fearing Catholics just because they did not fully confess the true doctrine, if they faithfully continued to subscribe to the Apostolic Confession of Faith. He then joins the Apostle Paul in the rhetorical question: “How can one teach others when he first needs to teach himself” (Rom. 2:21)?” Kałaj exhorts Protestants to see their own imperfections and lack of agreement on doctrines such as the person of Christ, the definition of the sacraments,

---


and eternal predestination before they go on to denounce Catholics from the Christian faith.  

Kałaj concludes this part of his discourse by reminding Christians to trust God’s sovereign plan of salvation. The fact that there are conflicts in the church does not mean that God has lost control over anything. God can turn any evil into greater good. Just as Christians could not have come into existence without the Jews, in the same way Protestants could not exist if it were not for Catholics. Consequently, together we become better and achieve salvation. In the words of the author of Hebrews, “God had planned something better for us so that only together with us would they be made perfect” (Heb. 11:40). As he sees it, Protestants did not try to abolish Catholicism but rather to restore it—just as the early Christians did not want to abolish Jewish law but to fulfill it—since, for Kałaj, the Reformed faith is not a new religion but holy, catholic, and apostolic.  

8.5. The Truest Church

In the countries where Protestants were the minority, theologians faced persecution whenever they decided to convert and officially abandon the Roman Catholic Church. In many countries, such as France, converting to Calvinism was synonymous with martyrdom or exile. In light of this difficult situation, some retained membership in the Roman Catholic Church while secretly confessing Evangelical faith. Calvin called those who adopted this view Nicodemites because, like the


biblical Nicodemus, they knew the right path but were afraid to take it. Both Calvin and Łaski opposed Nicodemism, arguing that one must be open about his faith and trust God for the security of his life.\(^{31}\)

In the course of the treatise, Kalaj does not deal directly with Nicodemism but essentially agrees with Calvin’s approach to the issue. As previously mentioned, Kalaj himself chose exile from Little Poland over doctrinal compromise or conversion to Catholicism. His opposition to Nicodemism is also apparent when he further qualifies his irenic ecclesiology by anticipating two hypothetical questions. The first is, “As a consequence of admitting that the Roman Church is also God’s church, do we also need to agree that they have the true faith, proper worship, and a certain and undoubted way to salvation?”\(^{32}\) Kalaj denies that this was case. He argues that the Roman Church is erroneous in its doctrine and worship, has inappropriate church government, and lacks church discipline. He then explains that the current state of Catholicism should not surprise anyone, since Scripture foretold that the Antichrist would seat himself in God’s church and claim to be God (see II Thess. 2:4). This is a reference, of course, to the Pope. He writes:

Since you admitted that Roman Church is godly, you naturally are saying that it also possesses true faith, good worship and an undoubted


path to salvation. Response: This is not the case, because the Roman Church has many errors in its teaching, deception in worship, lack of proper government and church discipline; however, this does not stop it from still being the true church of God, even the presence of the Antichrist – this son of sin and perdition, acting and pretending to be God in the Holy Church, whom the world follows in deception – was appointed by the Holy Spirit. Why would he stop the Church of God from being the Church of God? 33

The second hypothetical question posed by Kałaj is, “If we continue to consider Catholics as the church, then it does not really matter if a person remains in it or perhaps relapses back into it?” Kałaj responds, “By no means. What I have said is out of iudicium charitatis and not regula veritatis. We need to see those matters from the perspective of Christian love remembering also the admonition of God’s Spirit.” 34

These admonitions refer to the passages of Scripture that warn against departing from the truth (Phil. 3:15–16; I Thess. 5:12; Rev. 2:25; 3:11).

---

33 Kałaj, “O Kościele Bożym,” 728. “Ponieważ Kościół rzymski przyznawasz boży, to też przynamać consequenter trzeba, że tam prawdziwa wiara, dobre nabożeństwo i pewna a niewątpliwa do zbawienia droga.” R. Nie idzie za tym, bo daj to, że tam w nim jest niemaloo błędow naukach abo zwiedzenia w służbie bożej, abo niesłusznosci w rządzid i dyscypline kościelnej, przecie przez to samo Kościołem bożym być, choć nie ze wszystkim prawdziwym, nie przestawa. Wszak samemu Antykrystusowi, człowiecowi grzechu i synowi zatracenia, który miał świat za sobą pociągnąć skutkiem swego oszukania, tedy miejsce naznacza Duch Święty w Kościele bożym, w którym jako Bóg miał siedzieć, udawając się za Boga (2. Tess. 2, v.4). Azaż przez tego Antykrysta siedzenia Kościół boży przestannie być takim, żeby dla niego nie miał być Kościołem bożym?”

Next, Kalaj addresses the position of the Reformed Church in relation to the other churches. He writes:

I had argued for the one common foundation for these three churches and accordingly argued for the unity of the true Christian church before God. However, I believe and confess that our Evangelical [or Reformed] church is the truest because it is rooted only in Christ and the teaching of the prophets and the apostles, purified from men’s traditions which are opposite to the teaching of the Scripture. [Our church] serves God in spirit and in truth, holding to the teaching of the word and administration of the sacraments according to God’s commands. It also holds to the government and the discipline of the apostolic church, making it the truest, most loved by God, offering the most certain and the shortest path to salvation.35

It becomes clear here that Kalaj does not consider the Reformed Church equal to the other two churches despite the fact that he considers Catholics and Lutherans to be true churches of God. The Reformed Church is truest because it passes the test of the three signs of the true visible church, which Kalaj ignores earlier but now clearly states.36

At this point, we can better grasp the paradox mentioned earlier. Kalaj refuses to consider the Roman Catholic Church as false not because of the moral failures of the Polish Reformed Churches; rather, the main reason for avoiding the true-false church distinction is irenic nature. Kalaj does not want to call the Catholic Church

35 Kalaj “O Kościele Bożym,” 729. “Ze aczkolwiek tych trzech Kościołów położyłem jeden sóplny fundament i względem niego jedność prawdziwego Kościoła krześcijańskiego przed Bogiem, jednak wierzmy i wyznawamy, że Kościół nasz ewangelicki, ponieważ jest na samym fundamentecie Krzystusowym, na nauce prorpckiej i apostolskiej ugruntowany, od tradycji ludzkich słowa bożemu przeciwnych oczyściłony, Bogu w duchu i prawdzie służący, słowo boże szczyre i sakramenta święte według ustawy Pańskiej trzymający, więc rząd i dyscyplina Kościoła apostolskiego mający, tedy jest najprawdziwszym, Bogu najmilszym i drogę do zbawienia napewniejszą i najbliższą pokazującym Kościołem; o którym te cztery rzeczy do wiadomości podam.”

false because this would put an end to his friendly dialogue with the Catholic priest. His initial references to morality are for rhetorical reasons. The signs of the visible church are present and used to determine the superior status of the Reformed Church. Kalaj’s irenic ecclesiology does not stop him from calling the Roman pontiff the Antichrist or taking a hard stand against Nicodemism.

8.6. The Catholicity of Protestantism

The fact that Kalaj continued to see the Reformed Church as superior becomes more visible in the remaining pages of the section where he expounds the nature and character of his own church. Here Kalaj concentrates more specifically on the catholic aspects of the Protestant tradition. He, once again, reminds his fellow Protestants that Evangelical doctrine is not new or something the Reformers made up, but rather is rooted in Scripture and the teachings of the church throughout the ages.37 The importance of doctrinal continuity with the ancient faith cannot be underestimated. Protestants must understand that their faith remains consistent with the holy, universal faith and that Rome is the one who left the teaching of the Fathers. Kalaj argues that Rome had to fall because of its pride and desire to rule the whole world. Protestants were able to separate from Rome because they knew that the apostolicity of the church is not sustained through institutional bonds and apostolic succession but rather through the correct doctrine and invisible unity with Christ. Kalaj is convinced that only spiritual unity and true catholicity will result in tolerance.

and brotherly love. For Kalaj, love needs to give birth to tolerance, not to acceptance of the godless ways of others.\textsuperscript{38}

Kalaj continues by equipping his Reformed readers with apologetic tools to respond to a potential attack, such as, “Where was your Church before Luther and Calvin?”\textsuperscript{39} Kalaj responds by saying that the invisible church of God has always existed because it consists of proper teachings and the God-fearing people who confess them. The only difference is that this group decided to separate because it was no longer able to follow Christ within the Roman Catholic Church. For Kalaj, Protestants are what Roman Catholics used to be before they fell into pride and deception; they most faithfully confess the ancient teachings and, therefore, existed before the Reformation. Kalaj recognizes that a Catholic may not be pleased with this answer and may continue the attack by asking, “Show me exactly with your finger where is that church that you are talking about?”\textsuperscript{40} Kalaj responds simply that one cannot point to it directly because it is invisible, just as it is with the condition of man’s heart. This church is recognizable only by God because it consists of those whom God elected. Kalaj expands this idea by saying that the existence of God’s elect is evident because of the reality of persecution, first at the hand of the pagans, later by the Arians, and most recently by the bishop of Rome, which happened to be the most severe because it lasted for more than a thousand years. Kalaj largely equates the Evangelical church of his day with the invisible church, which had always

\textsuperscript{38} Kalaj, “O Kościele Bożym,” 728-729.

\textsuperscript{39} Kalaj, “O Kościele Bożym,” 730.

\textsuperscript{40} Kalaj, “O Kościele Bożym,” 731.
existed, even as part of the Roman Church. The decision of God’s elect finally to separate from Rome was not frivolous but was done for three reasons: (1) "causa necessitas" (the cause of necessity), (2) "causa veritatis" (the cause of truth), and (3) "causa libertatis" (the cause of freedom).  

The cause of necessity became evident when the Pope abused his power against God’s elect to the point that they could no longer worship him with pure consciences. Kalaj compares this situation to early Christians who left the synagogue not because they wanted to start a new religion but because the Jews no longer tolerated those who obeyed God. For Kalaj, God’s people at the time of the Reformation had no choice, since the bishop of Rome rejected their prophetic voice against the perversion of the Word and sacrament.  

Concerning the cause of truth, Kalaj cites Paul, who warned Christians not to be unequally yoked with unbelievers (see II Cor. 6:14); the story of Elijah and Jehu, who were commanded to speak against the idolatry of Israel (see I Kings 16; 18); and King Jehu, who purified worship by killing all the false prophets (see II Kings 10). With the last illustration, Kalaj adds that he disapproves of killing Roman Catholic priests, but the idea of the spiritual death of false prophets still applies. He believes Christ’s nonviolent example in his dealings with Samaritans (see Luke 9:51–56) revised the Old Testament methods.

---

In the final method, the cause of freedom, Kalaj argues that Evangelicals were justified in leaving Rome because they had no freedom to worship properly. Kalaj gives here two examples from the Old Testament. First when the captive nation of Israel was unable to worship God in Egypt, and later in Babylon, Israel was unable to keep the Sabbath holy or to worship Yahweh properly. In both cases, God commanded his people to leave.  

Kalaj’s trajectory of the truest church before the Reformation is not out of the ordinary. The Reformers saw themselves as agents of renewal and never as schismatic. Thus, they freely quoted from the Church Fathers and medieval theologians in recognition of their heritage. This becomes evident when we see how the Reformers and later Reformed scholastics continued to use the word *catholic*—some of them, such as William Perkins, even calling himself a *Reformed Catholic*.  

8.7. **Evangelical Adiaphora**

Reformers have used the term *adiaphora* (things indifferent) to refer to a rather narrow field of issues, which Scripture neither commanded nor forbade. These issues usually concerned matters not related to doctrine or conscience, and it was assumed that members would resolve matters of *adiaphora* by mutual agreement.  

---


46 Thomas Watson Street, “John Calvin and Adiaphora: An exposition and appraisal
However, later Protestants extended the discussion of things indifferent to the co-existence of various churches comunions in one state. This issue was raised by John Owen, who, politically, found himself in a similar situation to Kalaj.\textsuperscript{47} Also, the question of fundamentals that had a potential of uniting fragmented churches was discussed by the aforementioned Georg Calixt, Jan Amos Comenius, John Dury, Faustus Socinus and others.\textsuperscript{48} As already noted, the early Polish Reformed had adopted a relatively inclusive attitude toward the Lutherans, as expressed in the \textit{Confession of Sandomierz} (1570). However, term \textit{adiaphora} in reference to Lutherans was used for the first time by Krzysztof Krański (1556-1618), Reformed minister and educator. For Krański, \textit{adiaphora} covered a much broader spectrum of issues, which he addressed in his book, \textit{Order of the Service}.\textsuperscript{49} Petkunas notes:

\begin{quote}
In his introduction to the work [\textit{Porządek Nabożeństwa}] Krański notes that his church continued to tolerate diversity in the liturgical usages as had been approved by earlier synods, beginning with Sandomierz in 1570. He remarks that the Lutherans and Bohemian Brethren have a common theological understanding of the Eucharist. If there are any differences, they are not differences in faith, but only in such outward matters which may be termed \textit{adiaphora}, such as in ceremonies and words.\textsuperscript{50}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{47} Lee, “All Subjects of the Kingdom of Christ: John Owen’s Conception of Christian Unity and Schism,” 108-160.

\textsuperscript{48} See: chapter 4, “Potential Sources of Kalaj’s Irenic Thought.”

\textsuperscript{49} Krzysztof Krański, \textit{Porządek nabożeństwa}, 45.

\textsuperscript{50} Petkunas, \textit{Holy Communion Rites}, 99. For further discussion see also the following pages: 118, 123, 136, 139, 313.
Kalaj defines *adiaphora* after Krański in answer to the question of why the Reformed and the Lutherans disagree about various matters. Kalaj downplays the division and theological differences. Then he explains that some diversity and controversy will always exist where freedom of worship is present and that differences between the Lutherans and the Reformed are to be expected, as no visible church has perfect knowledge of the truth. He identifies these differences as *circa adiaphora* since, for him, they are not essential to salvation, he writes:

> Because the Evangelical church, although separated from Rome, still has its disagreements among the teachers; but they are as *circa adiaphora*, which do not belong the essential foundation of the salvation. Those disagreements do not stop the Evangelicals from being the true church of God with the guarantee of salvation.  

Furthermore, Kalaj held that the inter-Protestant discussions only help Christians to better understand the faith and contribute to the edification of the body of Christ, *vexatio dat intellectum*. At the same time, as was the case with Catholic-Protestant relations, he recommends specific guidelines. First, there was to be no attacking the common foundation of faith or denying the name of the true church to the opposing party; second, everyone was to continue enduring differences with love according to Christ’s command, “Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace with each other” (Mark 9:50). This previously mentioned formula best summarizes Kalaj’s irenic ecclesiology and perhaps the tolerant yet fully orthodox ecclesiology of the Polish Reformed Churches in the seventeenth century.

---

51 Kalaj, “O Kościele Bożym,” 733-734. “Ze ten Kościół ewangelicki od rzymskiego odłączony, ażkowlić ma w sobie różne niezgody nauczycieli jednej i drugiej strony tak *circa adiaphora*, jako i w inszych opinijach do gruntu zbawienia nie należących, przez to jednak nie przestawa być prawdziwym Kościołem bożym i pewność zbawienia nie traci.”
8.8 Conclusion

Two main issues are at hand when discussing Kalaj’s irenic ecclesiology in the context of Reformed orthodoxy. First is Kalaj’s recognition of the Roman Catholic Church as the true church of God (based on the similarities of some doctrines and the immorality present in both churches); second is the issue of *adiphora* in reference to the Lutherans. On both accounts, Kalaj stands in discontinuity with the broader and international Reformed tradition. However, when one considers the peculiar context of Kalaj’s irenic statements and the differences between the confessional standards of the Polish and western Reformed confessions, some important continuities begin to emerge.

These continuities can be observed in the fact that, despite Kalaj’s controversial recognition of Rome as a true church, he also distinguishes between the “true” and “truest churches” of Christ. Kalaj’s “truest” churches are recognizable by three signs: the preaching of the Word, appropriate distribution of the Sacraments, and church discipline—all of which are present in Reformed orthodoxy as the signs of the true visible church. In effect, Kalaj simply exchanged the “true-false” distinction for a “true-truest” gradation, which might seem like a strange case of early modern political correctness, but from a political perspective was one way in which he could have expressed the Reformed view of the church in an irenic manner without directly insulting the Roman church. Further, Kalaj nowhere advocates ecclesiastical union on the basis of common morality, as the Socinians did, but only “borrows” the moralistic arguments for rhetorical reasons, in order to avoid the accusation of hypocrisy which Chrząstowski and the Socinians had raised (and which most likely
still lingered). Also, Kalaj’s emphasis on Scripture and the creed as the basis for establishing the status of a Christian church seems reminiscent of the irenic postulates of the era, but nowhere do we find formulation of foundational articles (as was the case with Calixt or Komeński); nor are the differences between Catholics and Protestants termed as an *adiaphora*. Furthermore, aware of the potential for accusations of heterodoxy, Kalaj clearly argues for the superiority of Reformed over Roman Catholic doctrine, sees the pope as an antichrist, condemns Nicodemism, and does not strive for physical unity with Rome.

Based on this, it becomes evident that the aforementioned discontinuity with Reformed orthodoxy seems to be motivated by political and diplomatic rather than purely doctrinal discomfort with the Reformed orthodoxy. The apparent differences between Kalaj and the Reformed of his day are rhetorical rather than doctrinal in nature. Also, the issue of the Protestants’ *adiaphora*, although in discontinuity with the broader Reformed community, stays within the borders of the Polish Reformed Churches, who were more tolerant on this point than their western neighbors.
CHAPTER NINE: 
EPilogue

This project set out to fill the gap in the English historiography on the life and work of Daniel Kalaj, and to demonstrate that Reformed orthodoxy had a longer-lasting impact on the Polish Reformed Church than has often been recognized. To this end we presented Kalaj’s biography, including details about his education, the works he wrote in Franeker, his later affairs with the Chrząstowski family, his trial, and, finally, his further work with and for the Reformed churches outside of Małopolska (Little Poland), in Gdańsk and Samagotia. Furthermore, we analyzed the four loci of Kalaj’s theology – Scripture, justification, sacraments, and the church – placing them against the background of the remote and proximate sources of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century irenic thought in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

As noted at the end of each theological chapter, Kalaj stands in continuity with the Reformed tradition of the Reformation and Post-Reformation periods, with some qualifications regarding the doctrine of the church: on this point, he argues for less-offensive terminology but remains doctrinally faithful to the Reformed stand on the issue. In contrast to what has been suggested by previous scholarship, Kalaj does not argue for ecclesial unity rooted in common Christian morality. Kalaj seeks moderate tolerance, advocating peaceful coexistence between the various churches, but not at the expense of doctrinal convictions. In this sense, he falls in line with Łaski and Bythner of the Polish Evangelical tradition. In continuity with this trajectory of thought, he argues that Catholics and Socinians spread false teaching and that the doctrinal differences dividing Reformed and Lutherans are mere adiaphora, not essential to salvation. In addition, we noted that Kalaj formulates his irenic
approach to Protestant-Catholic relations by calling for greater respect toward Catholics in comparison to what previous Polish irenic thinkers had advocated. This irenic gesture is perhaps best exemplified when he openly acknowledges Rome as a true church of Christ, but only in reference to the basic catholicity of its recognition of Christ, Scripture, and the Creed (chapter 8).

In Kałaj’s ecclesiology, the invisible bond of Christian catholicity carries greatest significance, and as a Reformed minister and theologian he applies it to relations not only with Lutherans but also with Catholics. This invisible unity ought to translate into a peaceful coexistence between the various churches—a unity in which Christians are free to argue, dispute, and remain ecclesiastically separated from one another, yet not permitted to deny each other’s basic Christian identity. In other words, they are not to exclude each other from membership in the catholic church. This perspective is perhaps best captured by the words of Christ, quoted by Kałaj, when he wrote, “Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace with each other”—a simple plea and practical instruction on how to speak the truth with love and respect, yet without doctrinal compromise (chapter 8).

Consequently, he strives to present the Reformed doctrine in an inoffensive and gentle manner. He tries to accomplish this by steering away from offensive language whenever possible, avoiding such disparaging terms as false church (kościół falszywy), papist (papieżnik), or heretic (heretyk), and by shunning the use of ad hominem arguments. Kałaj initiates his discussion of each theological locus by closely examining the places at which Evangelical and Roman Catholic doctrines converge, using these common places as a springboard for the presentation of more
controversial material. This becomes visible in his discussion of the five sacraments rejected by the Protestants. Kałaj also often refers to patristic (Augustine, Cyprian) and medieval (Gregory the Great, Bernard of Clairvaux) sources, demonstrating his appreciation for the way tradition has influenced Reformed theology while simultaneously proving the antiquity of Reformed teaching. He also puts forth evidence that some Evangelical doctrine coincides with views espoused by Dominicans (Cardinal Cajetan, chapter 6) and Jesuits (Woyciech Wijuk Kojalowicz chapter 5). Finally, Kalaj’s scholastic training in Franeker shows some irenic potential when he operates comfortably within the theological method and vocabulary familiar to his opponent. This is visible in his frequent use of fine distinctions, inductive reasoning, and diplomatic terminology. Kałaj’s rhetorical approach enables him to sidestep terms and definitions of a more reactionary or provocative nature in the discussions of merit, original sin, and penance (chapters 6, 7).

Our above analysis confirms the initial thesis of this project. Reformed orthodoxy had a longer-lasting impact on the Polish Reformed Church than has often been recognized, extending beyond 1645. In the years that followed, Kalaj continued to preach Reformed doctrine and seek peaceful coexistence between the various churches, rooting his aspiration for unity not in morality but in irenic rhetoric and a broad understanding of the catholicity of the church, thus extending the activity of the Polish Reformed to 1671.
THESES

I. Reformed orthodoxy had a longer-lasting impact on the Polish Reformed Church than has often been recognized; it continued into in the second half of the seventeenth century.

II. The “twilight of Polish irenicism” extends to 1671.

III. Daniel Kałaj did not advocate a union between confessing Christian churches on the basis of common morality.

IV. Reformed Christians, especially in the sixteenth century, were often accused of Arianism; in seventeenth-century Poland, however, they were actually tried for it.

V. Despite the fact that some Polish Jesuits in the seventeenth century recognized the general orthodoxy of Reformed teaching on the Trinity, the stereotype of the “Anti-Trinitarian Protestants” persisted even until now. This was largely due to the friendly relationships of some Reformed families with Socinians, as well as to the popularity of the sixteenth-century sermons of the Polish Jesuit Piotr Skarga.

VI. Calvinoarianism was a legal term invented in Poland in order to extend and apply the Anti-Arian laws to Daniel Kałaj despite his faithfulness to Trinitarian doctrine.

VII. Polish Reformed Churches of the sixteenth century were more irenic than their coreligionists in Western Europe.

VIII. Tolerance understood as endurance of or forbearance with those confessing opposing religious beliefs fits within the borders of Reformed orthodoxy as articulated in the early modern period.

IX. Presenting Reformed doctrine in an irenic manner can be a difficult, if not confusing, task because it was initially formulated in controversy.

X. Ecumenism based on downplaying important doctrinal differences shows disrespect both toward one’s own views and toward those of one’s opponent.

XI. Tolerance understood as acceptance of opposite views is indifferent and amoral.

XII. It is better to be a God-fearing Catholic than a world-fearing Protestant.

XIII. A sense of spiritual comfort is an essential part of the gospel message.
XIV. Modern-day Evangelicalism has a low view of the visible church because it fails to grasp the covenantal aspects of Reformed theology.

XV. Polish Protestantism desperately needs Reformed literature to be translated into the Polish language.

XVI. Graduate studies in historical theology can help one to find a good wife.
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