

Introduction

Calvin and Tradition – A Window on the Western Mind

Tradition stands as an unexplored and misunderstood segment of humanity's memory, a moment of déjà vu for the collective unconscious that the twenty-first century strains to escape or resolve. Tradition remains so foreign to the modern mind that explorations of it are only taken up by philosophers, theologians, and cultural critics – in other words, by those members of society who do not seem to contribute to a kinetically and technologically driven world. Tradition is so outré that most cannot define it. Is tradition the ground and context that is the precondition for all thought and discourse? Is it instead the set of chains that precludes the possibility of true rationality? Even if a thinker manages to define what tradition is, the next step may be even more fraught with difficulty: determining its function within a society or institution.

But tradition did not always prove so elusive or fractured. For the medieval imagination, tradition provided the unquestioned assurance of the stability of the mental worlds of the three orders of medieval Europe, the clerical, knightly, and laboring orders.¹ During this time even significant innovations were understood through the spectacles of tradition.² It was assumed to provide a framework which could answer particular questions, and support what was, in retrospect, a narrow range of worldviews

¹ Georges Duby, *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined*, translated by Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

² Jo Ann McNamara, "Canossa and the Ungendering of the Public Man," in *Medieval Religion: New Approaches*, edited by Constance Huffman Berman (New York: Routledge, 2005), 92–110, argues that the reforms of the investiture that engendered the conflict between Gregory VII and Henry IV were always defended as being deeply rooted in the church's tradition.

that might be organized into a sociocultural synthesis.³ There were always outliers to the Christian tradition – the Jews and Muslims were known to exist – though their presence could be seen to serve as particular examples of alterity or otherness that demonstrated the vastness of the reach of the hegemonic culture.⁴ The general notion that tradition or custom provided a basic structure to society allowed many to appreciate and respect the weight or authority of tradition wherever they found it.

- ³ See McNamara, “Canossa and the Ungendering of Man,” in which she wrote, “Christian religion gave the emerging European civilization its unifying conceptual framework. The Church-state conflict that so long divided the European conscience tends to distract our attention from the basic harmony of their goals” (93).
- ⁴ See David Nirenberg, *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996); Mark R. Cohen, *Under Crescent and Cross: The Jews in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994); M. Lindsay Kaplan, “Jessica’s Mother: Medieval Constructions of Jewish Race and Gender in ‘The Merchant of Venice,’” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 58 (2007): 1–30; David Nirenberg, “Conversion, Sex, and Segregation: Jews and Christians in Medieval Spain,” *The American Historical Review*, 107(2002): 1065–93; Geraldine Heng, “England’s Dead Boys: Telling Tales of Christian-Jewish Relations Before and After the First European Expulsion of the Jews,” *MLN* 127, *Comparative Literature Issue: De Theoria: Early Modern Essays in Memory of Eugene Vance* (2012): 554–585; Francesca Matteoni, “The Jew, the Blood and the Body in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe,” *Folklore* 119 (2008): 182–200; Deanna Klepper, “Historicizing Allegory: The Jew as Hagar in Medieval Christian Text and Image,” *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture* 84 (2015): 308–44; Jeremy Cohen, ed., *From Witness to Witchcraft: Jews and Judaism in Medieval Christian Thought* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1996); Marina Torres Arce, “Swimming Against the Tide: The Entry of Jews in Spain. Religious Mobility, Social Control and Integration at the End of the Ancien Régime,” in *Religious Diaspora in Early Modern Europe: Strategies of Exile*, edited by Timothy G. Fehler, Greta Grace Kroeker, Charles H. Parker, and Jonathan Ray (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2014), 19–29; Jonathan Ray, “Chaos and Community: 1492 and the Foundation of the Sephardic Diaspora,” in *Religious Diaspora in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Fehler, Kroeker, Parker, and Ray, 153–66; Benjamin Braude, “The Sons of Noah and the Construction of Ethnic and Geographical Identities in the Medieval and Early Modern Periods” *William and Mary Quarterly* 54 (1997): 103–42; Josiah Blackmore, “Imaging the Moor in Medieval Portugal,” *Diacritics* 36 (2006): 27–43; Stephen F. Kruger, “Medieval Christian (Dis)Identifications: Muslims and Jews in Guibert of Nogent,” *New Literary History* 28 (1997): 185–203; Mark D. Meyerson, “The Survival of a Muslim Minority in the Christian Kingdom of Valencia (Fifteenth-Sixteenth Centuries),” in *Conversion and Continuity: Indigenous Christian Communities in Islamic Lands Eighth to Eighteenth Centuries*, edited by Michael Gervers and Jibran Bikhazi (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1990), 365–80; Kevin Ingram, ed., *The Conversos and Moriscos in Late Medieval Spain and Beyond, vol. 1, Departures and Change* (Leiden: Brill, 2009); Ronald E. Surtz, “Morisco Women, Written Texts, and the Valencia Inquisition,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 32 (2001): 421–433; Mark D. Meyerson, *A Jewish Renaissance in Fifteenth-Century Spain* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004); L. P. Harvey, *Muslims in Spain, 1500–1614* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005); James S. Amelang, *Parallel Histories: Muslims and Jews in Inquisitorial Spain* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2013).

While the theologian or ecclesiastical figure might speak of tradition as if it were settled and easily available, the historian recognizes that tradition has never been as solid as its protectors imagined, nor so amorphous as its detractors claimed. Tradition has both a constructed character and a received nature. The Christian tradition had gone through many arguments about what orthodox belief and practice was; the early modern period was only one of a number of times across Christian history during which the certainty of the tradition was either questioned or challenged. The early church's arguments over the Trinity and Christology are two such instances, as was the medieval iconoclastic struggle. Yet priests, laypeople of high and low estate, and theologians have all acted, both explicitly and implicitly, as if the tradition was a firm foundation for religious and theological practice.

However, the early modern world is frequently viewed as a time when the question of tradition arose. The fractures which mark tradition as a matter of debate in the modern world begin in the late medieval period when confidence in the seamlessness of the cultural and ecclesiastical traditions began to fray.⁵ Whether it was through political theory, with the criticisms of Dante (1314) and Marsilius of Padua (1324); ecclesiastical power struggles, in the threats to papal power represented by the Avignon Papacy (1309–76) and conciliarism (fourteenth–fifteenth centuries); or even theological discussion with the growth of late medieval threats to orthodox teaching by Ockham (d. 1347), Wycliffe (d. 1384), and Hus (d. 1415); the mentality of assumed confidence in a monolithic synthesis was gradually replaced by one that sought confidence in a variety of areas.⁶

⁵ Mark Lotito claims that the process of setting historical foundations for validation of an empire or claim to power are at least as old as the Ottonian empire in the tenth century. He examines the use of the model of the Four Monarchies from Daniel as a guide to considering the tension between decline and permanence. See Lotito, *The Reformation of Historical Thought* (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 37–50.

⁶ Dante Alighieri's *De Monarchia* (ca. 1314) argued for the necessity of a world ruler to ensure peace, as did Marsilius of Padua's *Defensor Pacis* (1324). The Avignon Papacy (1309–76) moved the papal court to Avignon, and weakened the claims of Rome as the heart of Christianity, and led straight into the Western Schism or Papal Schism, that lasted from 1378 to 1417, with two, and eventually three, different claimants to the papal throne. Conciliarism – authority by councils – was in part an answer to this situation, and the Council of Constance in 1417 ended the schism. John Wycliffe argued that only scripture was the true foundation of theology. Jan Hus argued for reforms, some following Wycliffe, and others in sacramental life – the Council of Constance lured him to the Council in order that he might speak with guarantee of safe passage, then reneged and executed him in 1417. William of Ockham, in considering whether the scripture or the pope was right in a disputed question about the Franciscan right to own property, argued that the pope was a heretic. All of these seriously undercut the power of the church, or the theological doctrines upon which it was built.

Actually, that makes the process seem too organic. Instead, there was a sometimes frantic search for the one true tradition.⁷ This search both exposed the various differing foundations upon which the mental world had been built and created new foundations in the search for univocity. The crumbling of confidence only accelerated in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Various evangelical theologians certainly took part in that attack, raising up a tension between the purity of the scriptures and the debased nature of human traditions. But the variety of cultural and political changes that swept across Europe over the long duration of the era of the Reformations tore at those foundations as well. When the Enlightenment's attack on heteronomy in the eighteenth century pressed hard against the bulwarks of tradition, the end seemed nigh.⁸

But the end did not come. The modern world has both received and constructed a rich and fractured inheritance of tradition. The gamut runs between two poles: The positive argues that tradition provides the basic necessities for rational undertakings – a position adopted by many philosophers of the interpretation of texts; the negative asserts that tradition prevents the possibility of truly free inquiry and knowledge that is worthy of the title – a position staked out by Enlightenment thinkers who argued that rationality must be totally free. Figures as different as Jesus of Nazareth, Tertullian, Augustine, Boethius, Peter Lombard, Martin Luther, John Calvin, Robert Bellarmine, Immanuel Kant, Friedrich Schleiermacher, Yves Congar, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Paul Ricoeur, and John Milbank have weighed in on the topic over the last two thousand years. But at the end of two millennia of the Christian era, in what frequently is called the Western post-Christian era, the answer to the question of the essence of tradition and its epistemological power remains uncertain.⁹

⁷ Paul Tillich argued that the Reformation was an effort to find the true tradition, arguing that “There is no reformation without tradition.” Tillich, *Systematic Theology III: Life and the Spirit, History and the Kingdom of God* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), 182.

⁸ Dating the Enlightenment is as controverted in scholarship as many other topics. For my purposes, the Enlightenment stretched from the early 1700s to 1789, the French Revolution, that for historians marks the beginning of modernity. Kant's essay, “Was Ist Aufklärung?” was published in 1784.

⁹ This includes the doctrinal statements of the Roman Catholic Church. In the Dogmatic Constitution on Revelation, commonly known as *Dei Verbum*, the Church promulgated two sources of authority but then argued that functionally they were one. (10) *Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, Dei Verbum, Solemnly Promulgated by his Holiness Pope Paul VI, November 18, 1965*. While confessionally neat, this approach does not answer questions of what to do when scripture and tradition seem to exist in tension or contradiction.

Because of this fractured inheritance, and because of the fractious reception of it, the modern Western mind faces two problems. The first of these is a nebulous turn to tradition by a variety of thinkers that cannot always define what the tradition is or what its effect in political, religious, cultural, or philosophical speech should be. The second problem is that in the turn away from tradition – ostensibly supported by the reformers – communities of discourse create a variety of traditions to help interpret texts, to highlight what is important in life, and to argue against their opponents, all while denying that they use tradition at all. A deeper understanding of tradition would aid both problems.

In the following study, I wish to investigate tradition through a deep consideration of Calvin's engagement with and construction of a useful past, and its constitutive function in his thought. I have chosen Calvin because he is frequently taken as the representative par excellence of a strand of thought that denies the role of tradition in clear and biblically-based theology. Calvin is the Protestant's Protestant.¹⁰ But that picture of Calvin actually tells us as much or more about the modern analytical mind than it does about Calvin's actual practices.¹¹ As late as the last decade of the twentieth century, a prominent Calvin scholar preparing an edition of one of Calvin's commentaries failed to consider the history of the period and confined his attention to Calvin's comments upon the scriptures without context, thereby signaling that Calvin's model of biblical interpretation was simply to follow the Word of God.¹² A more general investigation of the Reformation's interpretation of scripture, published in 2011, satisfied itself with the facile model of the Protestant

¹⁰ An example comes from Marjorie O'Rourke Boyle's recent work, *The Human Spirit: Beginnings from Genesis to Science* (University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2018), in which Boyle takes up the question of what is meant by the human spirit. After finding Augustine and Aquinas more interested in dialectic than in the rhetoric of the scriptures, Boyle proceeds to treat Calvin, depending upon his scriptural prescription for those who would know God (204ff).

¹¹ Calvin himself has regularly suffered from both hagiographical accounts of his life and work, as well as vicious fables that were fabricated merely to besmirch his name. See J. R. Armogathe, "Les vies de Calvin au XVI^e et XVII^e siècle," in *Historiographie de la Réforme*, edited by Philippe Joutard (Paris: Delachaux et Niestle: 1977), 45–59; and Jennifer Powell McNutt, "Calvin Legends: Hagiography and Demonology," in *John Calvin in Context*, edited by R. Ward Holder (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 383–392.

¹² *Ioannis Calvinii Opera Exegetica, Commentarius in Epistolam ad Hebraeos*. Edited by T. H. L. Parker (Geneva: Droz, 1996), ix–xxxiv.

Reformation's foundation on the pure scriptures.¹³ Casual views of Calvin by both the scholarly community and those who merely come across his name in an essay in the *New York Times Review of Books* consider him a proponent of *sola scriptura*.¹⁴

Calvin himself believed that he was leaving tradition behind for the firm foundation of the scriptures. He could wax eloquent about the manner that his Roman opponents had twisted the tradition for their own benefit. But his clear sense that his theological work was different from theirs caused him to believe that the relative difference between his work and theirs was actually absolute. That sometimes inaccurate sense of the foundations of his own thought would influence generations, and echo down to the present day in the way that moderns think about their heritage from the Reformation.

At heart, there is a paradoxical tension in Calvin's thought. John Calvin sought to ground his reforms and truth claims in the simple and uncluttered words of scripture, accepting it as a divine source. But John Calvin was a theological conservative who tried to maintain the true essence of medieval European Christianity as it had been passed down to him in liturgy, doctrine, and piety. Both of these statements capture the truth. In his first published exposition of scripture in 1540, Calvin could not escape the first page of the commentary without discussing both Augustine and Origen, two ancient authorities.¹⁵ He depended upon the patristic witness both for conversation partners and authorities to help settle disputes in his commentaries, in the *Institutes*, and in his treatises. He accepted the ground of tradition on which to engage his opponents, and produced a number of arguments drawn from tradition in

¹³ Timothy George, *Reading Scripture with the Reformers* (Grand Rapids: IVP Academic, 2011), 17–18.

¹⁴ Cf., for example, Brad Gregory, who in his *The Unintended Reformation: How a Religious Revolution Secularized Society* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012), spends a significant number of pages on Luther and Calvin's efforts to establish a society on the pure dictates of scripture. "From the very outset of the Reformation, the shared commitment to *sola scriptura* entailed a hermeneutical heterogeneity that proved doctrinally contentious, socially divisive, and sometimes ... politically subversive." (92) Gregory finds that impulse corrosive to society in both the early modern and modern ages but does not see any particular reason to doubt the truth of that conception of what Luther and Calvin were attempting.

¹⁵ T. H. L. Parker, ed., *Iohannis Calvini Commentarius in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos* (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 11. "Quod Augustino placuisse hoc tantum nomine puto, ut argute philosophandi occasionem arriperet. Probabilior Origenis sententia, qui binominum fuisse indicat."

his positive constructive theological efforts and his negative polemics. In great part, Calvin's theology depended upon and arose from engagement with the tradition.

Another reason to choose Calvin is that the significance of Calvin's relationship with tradition transcends a mere exercise in Reformed dogmatics or early modern theological history. While understanding Calvin's thought for its own sake is a worthwhile exercise, the Genevan reformer's importance extends far beyond those bounds. First, Calvin stands as one of the symbolic figures of the beginning of modernity. Beside Martin Luther, Calvin's example continues to be used as a demonstration of the character of the age. Thanks to a superficial reading of Max Weber, the number of people who believe that Calvin is the author of capitalism and Puritanism is legion. Further demonstrating Calvin's permanent residence in the Western imagination, Bruce Gordon's biography of Calvin, timed to appear in bookstores on the five hundredth anniversary year of Calvin's birth in 1509, climbed bestseller charts.¹⁶ Calvin continues to live in the Western imagination, and understanding his role in the arrangement of the mental furniture of the Western mind is an enticing goal.¹⁷ Calvin has stood, much like the stone statue commemorating him in Geneva, as a figure demanding a choice between scripture and tradition for Christian faith. But the actual Calvin can be proven to depend upon tradition in greater and more profound manners than even he recognized.

This is true for a number of reasons. First, Calvin's field of battle for his chosen polemics and theological pronouncements was frequently set long before he prepared for conquest.¹⁸ Such is the case, for instance, in the struggles over the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper. Calvin was moved to intervene in that argument by a conflict between the Swiss and German evangelicals – which had been highlighted at the abortive Marburg Colloquy in 1529, an event that occurred while Calvin was still a Catholic. But the issue was hardly new in the early modern era: Paschasius Radbertus, Ratramnus, and Berengar of Tours had explored

¹⁶ Bruce Gordon, *Calvin* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

¹⁷ See, for instance, Bruce Gordon's *John Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion: A Biography* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016). Gordon states that "The *Institutes* and its author have inspired and horrified men and women from the 1530s until our day for Calvin's book is immensely powerful" (xv–xvi).

¹⁸ On the topic of the purpose of early modern polemic, see Amanda Eurich, "Polemic's Purpose," in *John Calvin in Context*, edited by R. Ward Holder.

the manner of the real presence much earlier – Radbertus and Ratramnus as early as the ninth century.¹⁹ This pattern could be demonstrated for any number of theological topics the Genevan reformer took up. Calvin was not famed for his inventive mind that generated a variety of truly new concepts.

Second, Calvin accepted the true religion that he received from the church's tradition.²⁰ He made this clear in a variety of ways. Calvin rejected the idea that an uninstructed believer could approach the scriptures and simply find true doctrine. He even went so far as to suggest that the teaching of the true religion was separable from the interpretation of scripture.²¹ Calvin was not a proto-Alexander Campbell, the cofounder of the Restoration Movement in American Christianity beginning in 1809, who sought to define Christianity by its dependence upon the scriptures.²² In great part, Calvin sought to reform the church that the centuries of tradition had delivered to him. He did not attempt to take Christianity back to the first generation, nor did he start with a clean slate. His effort at reform of the church involved him in identifying an orthodoxy that

¹⁹ Owen M. Phelan, "Horizontal and Vertical Theologies: 'Sacraments' in the Works of Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie," *Harvard Theological Review* 103 (2010): 271–89; Charles M. Radding and Francis Newton, *Theology, Rhetoric and Politics in the Eucharistic Controversy, 1078–1079: Alberic of Monte Cassino against Berengar of Tours* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003); Pascaline Turpin, "'Ceci est mon corps, ceci est mon sang': comment le haut Moyen Âge lit-il la Cène?," *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* 71 (2014): 41–51.

²⁰ Calvin believed he had found this summary of Christianity he called "the true religion" in the writings of the fathers, and was shepherding it forward to his audiences. He does not seem to have recognized his own creative influence, through choosing which sources would be authoritative, and navigating those instances when the patristic witness offered no consensus. He used the term in the commentary on Romans.

²¹ Calvin, *Commentary on Romans*, 4. Parker, *Ad Romanos*, 4.

²² Nathan Hatch has argued that the democratic tendencies of the new country affected the polity of the Second Great Awakening churches. See his *The Democratization of Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989). Peter Verkruse has maintained that the rhetoric of Alexander Campbell was significant in his career and sets out the different roles that allowed him to respond to the changing needs of the Stone-Campbell churches. See *Prophet, Pastor, and Patriarch: The Rhetorical Leadership of Alexander Campbell* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2005). J. Caleb Clanton considers Campbell's religious philosophy, especially his rejection of natural theological arguments for the existence of God, and his answer in revealed religion. See *The Philosophy of Alexander Campbell* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2013). For more on Campbell's exegesis, see Thomas H. Olbricht, "Exegetical and Theological Presuppositions in Nineteenth-Century American Commentaries on Acts," in *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay*, edited by Patrick Gray and Gail R. O'Day (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 359–86.

he believed the church had allowed to fall into disuse, and defending it through recourse to history and authorities as well as scripture.

While presenting an exercise in understanding Calvin, this project seeks to offer a significant contribution to the investigation of tradition and its function in the mentality of the Western mind. Moreover, the investigation could well begin to uncover the roots of why analysts have customarily been so quick to dismiss any function of tradition in Calvin's thought, and thus grant readers a mirror into the ways that the modern mind seeks to classify, categorize, and harness the past. This exercise will begin with an exploration of one of the greatest barriers to discussing tradition: The twentieth and twenty-first-century Western mind does not truly know what tradition is.²³ Genealogically, this makes sense, as the modern world appropriates both the wealth of traditions from the classical, medieval, Renaissance, and early modern experience, and the deep suspicions of tradition that come from the various rationalistic revolutions, especially the Enlightenment and the scientific revolution.²⁴ The classical world exercised an enormous sway over the manner in which medievalists considered both the sensible and ideal worlds.²⁵ In turn, the medieval

²³ Perhaps the most famous Roman Catholic effort at understanding tradition, Yves Congar's *Tradition and Traditions*, is introduced in one of its modern translations by an introduction that bluntly states, "Tradition is widely misunderstood and widely vilified." Yves Congar, OP, *Tradition and Traditions: The Biblical, Historical, and Theological Evidence for Catholic Teaching on Tradition*, translated by Michael Naseby and Thomas Rainborough (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1997), xix.

²⁴ This is not to say that the Enlightenment stands alone. The Scientific Revolution sought to overcome the influence of accepted truths to free the mind to consider the experimentally demonstrable. Further, Thomas S. Kuhn has argued in his *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), that far from a process of predictable progress that reflects the accumulation of scientific knowledge, science progresses by erratic jumps defined by paradigm shifts. But to shift one's paradigm always requires the destruction of the tradition that one knows. For a fascinating application of Kuhn's thesis in Catholic moral theology, see Mark S. Massa, SJ, *The Structure of Theological Revolutions: How the Fight Over Birth Control Transformed American Catholicism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

²⁵ The literature on this is vast. A small sampling suggests the influence. See Werner Jaeger, *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, 3 vols., translated by Gilbert Highet (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939–1945); Jean LeClercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study in Monastic Culture* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1961); Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964); Irena Backus, *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Eugenio Refini, *The Vernacular Aristotle: Translation as Reception in Medieval and Renaissance Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

world wielded a similar force upon the early modern mind.²⁶ The early modern world, almost unknowingly bound by the hegemony of the mentalities of the medieval world, directed its attention to the classical world and the riches to be found there.²⁷

But the path that was marked by the importance and authority of tradition did not march unimpeded into the modern world. The power of the Enlightenment, or *Aufklärung*, spread its mantle over Western thought. Building upon the advances of the Scientific Revolution that had largely sought to avoid entanglement with questions of religion, the Enlightenment shattered those polite dividing walls. Immanuel Kant would write that the goal of enlightenment was release from self-incurred tutelage. Further, he particularly pointed this release chiefly at religion because he believed that the powers of his day had no desire to act as guardians in the matters of art and science.²⁸ This revolutionary way of conceiving the place of both religion and the authority of historical communal practices touched all of Western rationality. Hans-Georg Gadamer's later diagnosis of the hegemony of Enlightenment models of rationality has proved correct.²⁹ The Enlightenment was a revolution, one that convulsed familiar patterns of thought without providing a sufficient number of explicit models as replacements.

Faced with this new mental landscape, intellectual culture could and did develop in myriad ways. Scientific discoverers forged new pathways

²⁶ Again, this represents only a small sample. See Marcia Colish, *Medieval Foundations of the Western Intellectual Tradition, 400–1400* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997); M. D. Chenu, *Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century: Essays on New Theological Perspectives in the Latin West*, translated by Lester K. Little (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968); Erika Rummel, *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate in the Renaissance and Reformation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995); Rummel, *Biblical Humanism and Scholasticism in the Age of Erasmus* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

²⁷ A small illustration of this tendency can be seen in the following titles: Eugene F. Rice, *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988); Arnaud Visser, *Reading Augustine in the Reformation: The Flexibility of Intellectual Authority in Europe, 1500–1620* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); A. N. S. Lane, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Baker 1999); David C. Steinmetz, *Luther and Staupitz: An Essay in the Intellectual Origins of the Protestant Reformation* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1980); Karla Pollmann and Willemien Otten, eds., *The Oxford Guide to the Historical Reception of Augustine*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Hilmar Pabel, *Herculean Labors: Erasmus and the Editing of St. Jerome's Letters in the Renaissance* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

²⁸ Immanuel Kant, "What is Enlightenment?" in *Immanuel Kant, Philosophical Writings* (New York: Continuum, 1999), 462, 466.

²⁹ Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 2nd revised ed., edited and translated by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall (New York: Continuum, 2004), esp. 174–83.