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Message from the Editor

Michael Parker (mike.parker@etsc.org)
Evangelical Theological Seminary in Cairo

Despite the troubles and uncertainties of life in Cairo in the past few years, the Evangelical Theological Seminary in Cairo (ETSC) has continued without interruption to carry out its mission: the preparation of students for ministry and church leadership in Egypt and in the region of the Middle East in general. In seeking to fulfill this mission, ETSC has not merely been treading water, happy to survive amid the tumult. It has been developing and expanding in remarkable ways. Last year it inaugurated the Center for Middle Eastern Christianity; this year it is engaged in revising the curriculum and giving the campus a much-need facelift, including a renovated chapel; and soon ETSC will be expanding its campus onto an adjacent property, giving space for new offices and other facilities.

ETSC, which turned 150 last year, is clearly enjoying a period of renewal and expansion—perhaps even a renaissance, if that word is not considered too immoderate. As part of this effort we are now also launching an annual, online, academic publication, the Cairo Journal of Theology (CJT). The current edition was planned and largely executed by an editorial committee that consisted of Mark Nygard (General Editor), Hani Yousef, Venis Boulos, and Tharwat Waheeb. When Mark, my predecessor, returned to the United States last year, all that remained to be done was some light editing and formatting; hence most of the credit for this first issue should be given to the previous editorial team.

CJT is intended primarily to promote Christian scholarship about the Middle East, but the journal will also include articles of general interest to scholars of Christianity. Our first edition nicely demonstrates this bifocal perspective. It includes an article by David Grafton about the relationship of the church and state in
Egypt and a review by Stanley Skreslet of Heather Sharkey’s recent history of American Evangelicals in Egypt, but it also has two contributions concerning European theologians: Willem de Wit’s article on Herman Bavinck, and Mark Nygard’s on John Calvin. We hope that this balanced approach will appeal to an expanding readership.

Welcome to this first edition of the Cairo Journal of Theology.
Coptic-State Relations: Looking Back to Look Forward

David D. Grafton (dgrafton@ltsp.edu)
The Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia

The Revolution, What Now?

The January Revolution and subsequent political events have been exciting and unnerving for all Egyptians. Images of protestors carrying signs for “life, freedom and human rights,” and the participation by people of all economic, social, and religious backgrounds at Taḥrīr Square will be cherished in Egyptian history for many years to come. And yet, the necessary steps forward toward a new Egypt must go through an uncharted path. The ongoing negotiations by different parties, including the very diverse Islamic organizations, have been the cause for concern for many Egyptians. While nationalist political parties, liberal secularists, reformist Muslims, Salafis, and the Coptic Orthodox Church all publicly debate the future shape of Egypt, the question of Coptic Evangelical participation is an important one. What role will the Evangelical community play? What resources do the Evangelical community have to offer the public debate and conversation about the future of Egyptian society and government?

Coptic Evangelicals have historically been quietists in respect to religion and political life. By this I mean that Evangelicals have not historically pursued projects leading to the transformation of political institutions for religious reasons. They certainly have been in the forefront of founding schools, hospitals, orphanages, etc., but in terms of public advocacy they had been content with working with individuals or small communities, not

* This article was written in 2011.—Ed.
addressing larger national issues.¹ The original Presbyterian and Anglican missionaries whose work ultimately created indigenous Egyptian Evangelical communities were predominantly Pietists. The Pietist perspective focused upon the salvation of an individual believer through the reading and explication of Scripture. In their view, this would naturally and inevitably lead to the regeneration of a believer’s individual morals and affect society at large. Thus, American and English missionary methods focused heavily upon education.² There was no need to be concerned with larger social issues as the natural progression of individual regeneration would ultimately lead toward a moral and ethical society. And yet, like the Reformation in Europe, the Evangelical reformation did not lead to such a transformation of society but the creation of a new community, the Evangelicals. This community, since its recognition by the Ottoman Empire in 1850, is now its own millah with its own set of communal laws and mores.

While Copts have always been committed to their national identity and have participated fully in the governance of Egypt as well as its defense, there has been little discussion given to a theological and scriptural basis for an Evangelical public engagement with and for Egyptian society. The January Revolution and subsequent political events have prompted many Copts to fear an Islamist or salafi government. The dramatic events may even have prompted some Evangelicals to begin searching through Scripture for Apocalyptic signs of the end times.³ However, the historical record demonstrates that the Coptic Church has faced numerous challenges and opportunities throughout its nearly two thousand years; and that the present events, as important as they

¹ By contrast, the European Calvinist and American Reformed theology assumed that Christian community would become a “city on a hill” (Matthew 5:14) that would change social and political structures toward a more righteous society.


³ This has been a common response by Christians in response to Islamic threats. See Robert G. Hoyland, *Seeing Islam As Others Saw It* (Princeton, N.J.: Darwin Press, 1997).
are for the future of Egypt, are yet another period to engage the public sphere. This essay is not an attempt to provide such a Coptic Evangelical theology of public engagement or social ethic. Rather it is intended to prompt some thinking on this topic. Our hope is that this essay might prompt further conversation to look forward to a new Egypt.

(It is important to note that in this article I will use the term “Coptic” in reference to the Christian tradition in Egypt, while the specific adjectives “Orthodox” and “Evangelical” will refer to particular Churches. This general reference to Coptic should not be passed over, and is important to my overall argument of the history of the Church in Egypt.)

Looking Back at Coptic-State Relations

It is perhaps tempting to categorize the periods of Coptic interaction with the State in four separate periods: pre-Christian, Christian, Islamic and Modern Secular rule. However, this classification would gravely misinterpret the historical sources and only support various ideologies. Such thinking also creates anxiety that the current political period threatens to remove the Copts from a Modern era back to the medieval prisons of “dhimmitude.”

While it is clear that the world now rightfully presses forward toward implementation of the equal and human rights of citizens within democratic governments, such countries have hardly ever existed. It is not a given that Christian and Modern Secular governments have provided golden ages for the Coptic community, while Roman pagan and Islamic rule have been the periods of Christian persecution. History is not that neat. Rather, the historical record demonstrates that at any one given moment Copts were either granted economic and political opportunities or communally repressed depending on the particular views of each

---

4 This has been the argument of Bat Yeor, in The Decline of Eastern Christianity under Islam: From Jihad to Dhimmitude (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1996).
5 Even the United States did not grant equal citizenship rights to African Americans in 1868 and to Women in 1920.
ruler in power, regardless of his religious persuasion, and that while one segment of the Coptic community might suffer, others might flourish.

The Middle East Council of Churches’ publication, Christianity: A History of the Middle East, rightly provides several chapters on the “Rise of Eastern Churches” that review the fifth to the eighth centuries. Mār Sāwīrus Isḥaq Saka states that the seventh and eighth centuries, after the Islamic conquest, were a period of administrative, spiritual, social and intellectual renaissance for the Syriac Church.  

According to Fr. Samīr Khalīl Samīr, the rise of the Abbasid dynasty gave rise to the participation of Arab Christians in the Arab Renaissance with the likes of Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq and Quṣṭā ibn Lūqā, among others.  

Thus, the common narrative that the coming of Islam overcame Christendom and suppressed the dhimmi may be a contemporary re-reading of history based upon our current experiences rather than actual fact.

Early Roman Rule
At the shrine of St. Mark in Abbasiya, worshippers can view a painting of the martyrdom of St. Mark by the crowds of Alexandria. From this large mural one can sense that Coptic Christianity has from its very origins until the present day been under siege from society at large. However, historical sources seem to indicate that early Christianity grew within a pluralistic society in which the Roman government tolerated numerous sects, secret societies, and religions. While Christians in Palestine or Asia Minor may have had to fear occasional oppression from the Romans, as we find with the letters of Pliny to Trajan, Egypt was quite different. When the Romans came to Egypt in 31 BCE, they encountered a large Egyptian pantheon as well as a well-established Jewish community. This atmosphere allowed Christians to maneuver and propagate with little problem from the State. After all, Paul had argued that the Christians were to sub-

---


7 Ibid., 495–529.
ject themselves even to Pagan rulers (Romans 13:1–7), while Clement even stated that Christians were to ask for blessings upon the Roman rulers (1 Clement 63:1). This religious pluralism was also manifest within the Christian community. Most scholars agree that the Nag Hammadi texts, now displayed in the Coptic Museum, reveal that Christians held a variety of theological and ecclesiastical positions.  

Age of the Martyrs

It was not until after the Bar Kokhba revolt of 135 CE that the Romans began to view the Jews, and subsequently the Christians, as dangerous to the Empire. The second century was a difficult period for the Christians within the Roman Empire. Whereas Emperor Philip “the Arab” extended favor to Christians, possibly due to his exposure to Christians in Syria, his successor was not so gracious. Decius was proclaimed Emperor in Alexandria in 249 and immediately ordered all Romans to offer sacrifices to the gods. The Coptic Patriarch Dionysius has recorded stories of mobs lynching Christians in the streets and forcing them to renounce their faith. This was, unfortunately, only the beginning. The next emperor, Valerian, kept Christians under pressure. However, it was in 303 that Emperor Diocletian unleashed the Great Persecution. Christians were killed, churches were burned, and scriptures seized. Known as the “Era of Martyrs,” it is this period that has left its permanent mark on the Coptic Church. It is this period from which many of the Orthodox saints originate. It is also from this period when the Coptic calendar begins its reckoning, from the beginning of Diocletian’s reign, solidifying the idea that the Coptic Church is built on the blood of the martyrs.

The Christian Empire

Constantine’s Edict of Toleration of 313 was not so much an imposition of the Christian faith on the Empire as an imperial recognition of its right to exist alongside other ancient religions.

---

9 Eusebius Hist. eccl. VI.41.10–12.
Late antique archaeology points to the continued practice of traditional religion and the Egyptian priesthood alongside Judaism and Christianity. It was Emperor Theodosius, however, who declared non-Christians “mad” and liable to imperial punishment.\(^\text{10}\) It is in the early 5\(^{th}\) century that we find violence perpetrated against the ancient Egyptian cults by the Coptic priesthood and monks. The Church historians Rufinus and Sozomen note Patriarch Theophilus’ destruction of the Serapeum in Alexandria in 391 (against the will of the Emperor). Theophilus’ successor, Cyril, presided over the martyrdom of the pagan philosopher Hypatia in 415. Cyril also expelled the Jews from Alexandria and had serious disputes with the Roman magistrate Orestes. Thus, we find throughout the 4\(^{th}\) and early 5\(^{th}\) centuries a gradual violent cultural movement to “Christianize” the country, while the government still held to a policy of open toleration of these religions.\(^\text{11}\) It was in 529 that Emperor Justinian closed all Greco-Roman and Pharaonic temples, effectively outlawing all religions but Christianity. As Alain Ducellier notes, the Church in the new Byzantine Empire utilized the imperial social and administrative organization and “modeled its own structures after those pre-established by the State.”\(^\text{12}\) Bishops and priests, in effect, became civil servants and administrators. The Church and the State were two sides of the same coin. But as Athanasius wrote to Emperor Ossius, “To you God has handed over the Empire, whereas to us, he has entrusted the affairs of the Church.”\(^\text{13}\)

**The Chalcedonian Schism and the Development of an Egyptian National Church**

It has been argued that throughout the Christological controversies of the 4\(^{th}\) and 5\(^{th}\) centuries that the Egyptian Church began to


\(^{11}\) Stephen J. Davis, *The Early Coptic Papacy: The Egyptian Church and Its Leadership in Late Antiquity* (Cairo: AUC Press, 2004), 64–74.

\(^{12}\) Alain Ducellier, “Autocracy and Religion in Byzantium in the 4\(^{th}\) and 5\(^{th}\) Centuries,” in Badr, *Christianity: A History of the Middle East*, 102.

\(^{13}\) Ducellier, “Autocracy and Religion in Byzantium in the 4\(^{th}\) and 5\(^{th}\) Centuries,” 111.
secede from Byzantine control as a nationalist movement and protest against foreign authority.\textsuperscript{14} Eastern and Coptic histories are replete with their condemnation of the oppression of the Byzantines. The watershed event, of course, was the Council of Chalcedon where Emperor Marcian attempted to unify the universal church under one Empire. However, this resulted in the first major split of the Church, where the Egyptian, Syrian, and Armenian bishops refused to acknowledge the Greek imperial formula of the “two natures of Christ.” Their disagreement was not with the concept of the divinity and humanity of Christ, but the enforced Greek imperial terminology dictated from Constantinople. Because of the Coptic Church’s refusal to accept the official and imperial Chalcedonian formula of faith, they lived for almost two hundred years under Byzantine pressure, discrimination, and in some cases persecution. Stephen Davis has called this “ecclesiastical colonialism,” where the Imperial Church sought to impose its views on the Egyptians.\textsuperscript{15} This schism reached a critical point when Emperor Heraclius appointed Cyrus the Bishop of Alexandria in 630. Cyrus served as both the de-facto ecclesiastical and political head of the Empire in Alexandria and violently suppressed those Coptic priests and bishops who refused to acknowledge the Chalcedonian formula, and exiled the beloved Coptic Patriarch Benjamin.

\textit{Arab Muslim Conquest}

Much has been written and discussed about the Islamic Conquest of Egypt. Many views, however, are often expressed within the context of the current tensions of the rise of the \textit{salafism}. While there is no doubt that the Arab Muslims militarily conquered Egypt, their coming was experienced as no different than any other empire that conquered Egypt over the centuries. In fact, the establishment of \textit{Fusṭāṭ} as a separate Arab Muslim encampment


\textsuperscript{15} Davis, \textit{The Early Coptic Papacy}, 87.
north of Babylon demonstrates that, from their earliest policy decisions, the Muslims were content with merely occupying and benefiting from the rich resources of the Egyptian Nile river valley, rather than imposing Islamic *shari’a*, a concept that would not begin to take root until after al-Shaf’i in the 9th century.

Many of the Coptic sources look back on this time as a punishment on the Byzantines for their heresy and oppression of the true Church. The 7th century Bishop John of Nikou noted, “This expulsion (of the Byzantines) and the victory of the Muslims is due to the wickedness of the emperor Heraclius and his persecution of the orthodox [Copts].” Likewise, the 10th century *History of the Patriarchs* noted “The Lord abandoned the army of the Romans [Byzantines] as a punishment for their corrupt faith.” Scholars have debated whether the Copts supported and aided the Arab Muslims in their conquest over the Byzantines in Egypt because the sources do present a complicated picture. But what is clear is that the deep divide between the Copts and the Byzantines created an atmosphere conducive for the Arab Muslims to easily take control of Egypt. The Copts as non-Chalcedonians lost little sleep over the fact that the Byzantines had been defeated. The most prominent example of the official Coptic view is the well-known story of ‘Amr ibn al-Ās and Patriarch Benjamin.

After the Byzantine Patriarch and general Cyrus was defeated and retreated to Constantinople ‘Amr called for the Coptic Patriarch Benjamin, who had been in hiding for over ten years, and invited to take up his papal seat in Alexandria. The story as remembered in the *History of the Patriarchs* has ‘Amr asking for Benjamin’s blessing on the continued Arab Muslim advance through North Africa.

“Resume the government of all your churches and of your people, and administer their affairs. And if you will pray for me, that I may go to the West and to Pentapolis, and take possession of them, as I have of Egypt, and return to you in safety and speedily, I will do for you all that you shall ask of me.” Then the holy Benjamin prayed for Amr, and pronounced an eloquent discourse, which made Amr and those present with him marvel, and which contained words of exhortation and much profit for those that heard him; and he revealed certain matters to Amr, and departed from his presence honoured and revered.\textsuperscript{18}

Whether this record was an actual event or a later implanted memory does not matter here. Early Arab rule was content to allow the Copts to keep their established civic and religious institutions. The administration, organization, and taxation, etc., was all kept in the hands of the Copts. The Coptic Patriarch became the de-facto civil administrator for the foreign government, responsible for the internal affairs of the Egyptians while the Arabs received the taxes of the wealthy and in-kind tribute from the rich Nile Valley to be distributed throughout the Muslim Empire.\textsuperscript{19}

We find no reference to the \textit{Pact of 'Umar} during this period, only a well-known treaty relationship between a foreign power and a vassal state. As Azīz Atiya notes, “the relationship between the Copts and the Arabs was based pre-eminently on revenue and taxation.”\textsuperscript{20} But if the early Arab-Coptic relationship was seen as no different than that experienced in other times of occupation in Egypt, the Coptic view of the Arab Muslims would begin to change at the end of the 7\textsuperscript{th} and beginning of the 8\textsuperscript{th} century.

\textit{Arabization and Islamization of Egypt}

Around 705, the Umayyad caliph 'Abd al-Mālik began the Arabization of the Islamic Empire, declaring that all administration


\textsuperscript{20} A.S. Atiya, “Ḳibṭ,” \textit{EI}².
should now be undertaken in the Arabic language. While this did not happen immediately, it began a process. Coins were only to be minted with Arabic calligraphy from the Qurʾān. The result was increased central control of taxation by the Arab Muslims. In fact, Coptic monks who had previously been exempt from taxation were now required to pay their tax.\textsuperscript{21} It is the burden of taxation on the Copts that prompts Coptic conversion to Islam.

While the *History of the Patriarchs* recognized the overthrow of the Umayyads by the ‘Abbasids in 750 as God’s bidding, to take “vengeance upon them,” the Copts soon realized that ‘Abbasid rule would continue the standing procedure of heavy taxation.\textsuperscript{22} The burdens were too much to bear. In 831 Egyptians in the Delta revolted. Called the Bashmuric Revolt, this rebellion was brutally crushed. Whereas Iraqi Christians fared fairly well under the ‘Abbasid reign, in Egypt the Copts suffered.\textsuperscript{23}

It is important to remember, however, that Egyptian Muslims themselves also faced heavy burdens due to taxation and the arbitrary despotic rule of governors sent from first Damascus and then Baghdad. But for the Copts, it is during the mid-9\textsuperscript{th} into the 10\textsuperscript{th} centuries in which we find the majority of Copts begin converting to Islam. Conversion occurred for three reasons, primarily: 1) relief from extra tax burdens that were placed on the Copts in their role as *dhimmīs*; 2) for professionals who wanted to advance in their careers conversion to Islam was extremely beneficial; and most importantly, 3) as the dominant culture changed conversion became an opportunity to participate in dominant, or “pop” culture. It was a tidal wave that could not be stopped.

In 850 the ‘Abbasid Caliph al-Mutawakil issued his infamous declaration prohibiting Copts from serving in the government. The edict reminds us that the Copts maintained sufficient control over the day-to-day administration of the government in the mid-

\textsuperscript{21} Hoyland, *Seeing Islam As Others Saw It*, 284.

\textsuperscript{22} Mark N. Swanson, *The Coptic Papacy in Islamic Egypt (641–1517)* (Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 2010), 21.

9th century. While the pronouncement was never fully carried out, and as Copts continued to serve within the government, it is an important marker to denote the shift from a Christian majority culture to an Arab-Islamic one.\textsuperscript{24}

\textit{Faṭimid Rule (969–1147)}

Aside from the period of intense persecution during the reign of Caliph al-Ḥākim (996–1020), who imposed strict laws not only on the Copts, but also on Muslims, especially women, the occupation of Egypt by the Faṭimids witnessed the most beneficial period for the Copts under Islamic rule. It is true that Al-Ḥākim destroyed numerous churches in Egypt as well as the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, initiating the Crusades. The Muslim historian Maqrīzī notes that many Copts converted to Islam during al-Ḥākim’s persecution. However, the Faṭimid period was a high point of Christian-Muslim relationships. As noted by Ḥanna Jerjis and Vivian Fouad, the Copts participated in the highest levels in the administration of the government.\textsuperscript{25} In addition, the \textit{History of the Patriarchs} notes the extensive building of churches during this period, al-Ḥakim’s rule being the exception of course.\textsuperscript{26}

The great miracle of the Muqāṭṭam is reported to have taken place during this period, under the reign of Muʿizz al-dīn Allāh (932–975). What is often overlooked in the miracle narrative is the fact that the origin of the story centers around the dialogical encounter between the Caliph Muʿizz al-dīn Allāh, his vizier Yaʿqūb ibn Killis, who had converted from Judaism, and the original author of the \textit{History of the Patriarchs}, Sawīrus ibn al-Muqāffa’. The dialogue was a common feature of court life, marking the interaction among Jews, Christians, and Muslims, as well as in daily economic encounters. The important study done on the Medieval Jewish records found at the Ben Ezra Synagogue in Old Cairo by Shelomo Gotein demonstrates a resilient Jewish

\textsuperscript{24} David D. Grafton, \textit{The Christians of Lebanon: Political Rights in Islamic Law} (London: I.B. Tauris, 2003), 34.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 539.
community interacting with the Muslim population of Old Cairo and Fuṣṭāṭ.²⁷

The significant interaction between Egyptian Copts, Jews, and Muslims at all levels of society, including within the government, was the result of several factors. First, the Isma‘īlī persuasion of Shi‘ism was itself a minority sect within the predominant Sunni Islamic world. Isma‘īlī rule created an openness that fostered pluralism. Of course, the Caliph was still a Muslim and the rule Islamic, but the ahl al-dhimma participated in a cosmopolitan Arab-Islamic culture. Second, because of the dominant Arab-Islamic culture, it became difficult for the Copts to maintain their own separate cultural identity. It is in this period that another large wave of Copts converted to Islam. The majority of Copts could not read or understand Coptic, and the Church had to face the reality that Arab-Islamic culture was the dominant culture in which they were living. Patriarch Gabriel ibn Turayk (1131–1145) prescribed the use of Arabic in parts of the Coptic Mass so that the Gospel could be understood in the common language. Thus, the Patriarch officially implemented the Arabization of the Copts that had originally begun by ‘Abd al-Mālik in the early 8th century. However, this change only officially recognized what had been the case for some time, that the Copts had fully adopted Arabic language and culture by the 12th century. This change is reflected in the growth of the Copto-Arabic literature, of which the History of the Patriarchs is the most famous example.

Ayyubids (1171–1250)
The Ayyubid period was an unsettling time for the Copts, as they were caught between their Muslim rulers and the invading Latin Catholic Crusaders. The Copts were often accused of assisting the Crusaders and faced discrimination and persecution, even though the Copts assisted in the defense of Damietta in 1218.²⁸ Farah Firzlī notes well the difficulties faced by the Middle Eastern

²⁸ Atiya, 92.
Christians on account of the Latin Crusaders. However, Salah al-Dīn faced his most pressing challenge in the cleansing of Egypt from its Shi’a expressions of Islam. He closed al-Azhar, which at that point was the center of Ismai’lī teaching, and reopened it as the important Sunni center of learning that it is today. An important event in this period is the fact that Patriarch Christodoulos (1046–1077) moved the Papal seat from Alexandria to Cairo to have easier access to the Muslim ruler in overseeing the livelihood of the Coptic community. As Sunni jurists began to articulate further concepts of al-dhimma during this period, it was imperative that the representative of the Coptic community be able to advocate for his community.

Many of the difficulties faced by the Copts during the Ayyubid reign, however, were due to internal issues. For twenty-six years (from 1216–1235 and again from 1243–1250) the Coptic Church had no Patriarch to represent it before the Sultan. When it did elect the controversial Ibn Laqlaq, his papacy was plagued by controversy from the very beginning. His election was disputed, leading to what some sources indicate was his appointment by al-Mālik al-Kāmil. The controversies during Ibn Laqlaq’s papacy were known by the Muslims as a time of fitnah and the problems were brought directly before the Sultan’s court where the Patriarch was humiliated and died shortly afterward.

For all of the political difficulties of the 13th century this time was one of the Golden Ages of Coptic culture. Recent archaeological and historical research has discovered the rise of the Coptic arts and their patronage by important Coptic businessmen and leaders. This may have been the result of increased trade with the Levant due to the Ayyubid rule of Egypt and Syria. In addition, Georg Graf’s monumental Geschichte der christlichen arab-

---

29 Farah Firzli, “Christians in the Middle East Under the Franks,” in Badr, Christianity: A History of the Middle East, 559–79.
30 Kurt J. Werthmüller, Coptic Identity and Ayyubid Politics in Egypt 1218–1250 (Cairo: American University of Cairo Press, 2010), 44.
32 Swanson, The Coptic Papacy in Islamic Egypt (641–1517), 92.
ischen Literatur notes the extensive number of Coptic authors during this period.\textsuperscript{33} Included in this list is, of course, the Awlād al-ʿAssāl family that so distinguished itself. Also included is the one of the most prolific preachers in Coptic history, Boulos al-Būshī. We learn from this period that while texts may provide official histories from the top, realities of daily life usually reflect something completely different. The same might be said for the works of Islamic jurists: while they may articulate stringent concepts of \textit{al-dhimma}, actual social practice may have differed depending upon the whims or views of the ruler.

\textit{Mamlūks (1250–1517)}

Returning to the 15\textsuperscript{th} century Arab historian al-Maqrīzī, the Mamlūk period is noted as the “fall of the Christians.”\textsuperscript{34} While the rule of independent warlords of Turkish or central Asian descent led to one of the most important building eras since the Pharaonic period, it was a low point in history for the Copts. Most of the historic monuments in and around the old districts of Cairo are attributed to this era, including the monumental aqueduct, which facilitated the growth of Cairo as a major military and economic power. However, as in most cases during such times of power, the average Egyptian felt the brunt of arbitrary despotic rule. The Copts were especially subject to oppression. The Mamlūk period is noted for the destruction of churches, numerous riots and sporadic violence against Coptic neighborhoods. While the Mamlūk rulers did not go out of their way to persecute the Copts, social conditions deteriorated to such a low level that they became the scapegoats for the frustration of the \textit{reaya}. In addition to the despotic rule of the sultans, Egypt suffered from the fears of the


\textsuperscript{34} As cited in Werthmuller, \textit{Coptic Identity and Ayyubid Politics in Egypt 1218–1250}, 50.
Mongol invasions in *bilād al-shām*, several droughts, earthquakes, and most importantly the bubonic plague.\(^{35}\)

It is during this period that the *radd 'ala al-dhimma* literature reaches its height among Islamic jurists. Islamic scholars, including Ibn Ṭaymiyya and al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya, began articulating what they felt were the important restrictions on the *dhimmīs* that had not been kept by the previous Muslim rulers. In a time of political, social and economic uncertainty, these authors sought to bring the Sunni community back to its pure roots as they imagined it.\(^{36}\)

**Ottoman Rule (1517–1801)**

In many ways, the Ottoman rulers of Egypt were not different from the previous Mamlūk warlords. They were foreigners occupying Egypt, having little in common with the Egyptians. However, it was the 16\(^{th}\) and 17\(^{th}\) centuries that saw the rise in economic conditions as the Ottomans engaged in trade with Europe. This resulted in a rise in the standard of living and further social stability. The Copts benefitted from the global trade as Coptic businessmen acted as intermediaries for the Venetians and French, among others. Samīr Marqos has noted the important work of Copts as traders, merchants, landowners, and government officials in the area of taxation.\(^{37}\) Much of the communication between Europe and Egypt at this time can certainly be attributed to the Latin Catholic missionary activity, especially that of the Dominicans and Capuchins.


When Muḥammad ‘Alī wrested Egypt from direct control of the Ottoman Empire, he began the movement toward a modern state. Enamored with the culture and opportunities of the French, who had occupied Egypt from 1798–1801, Muḥammad ‘Alī sent


young civil servants to study in Europe. They returned and began instituting reforms. These reforms pre-dated the Ottoman tanzmāt, but worked hand in hand with the Ottoman imperial prescripts of 1839 and 1856, as well as the abolishment of the jizya in 1855. These formal declarations eradicated the dhimmī status and the millet system, and affirmed Christians and Muslims as equal before the eyes of a new civil law. Of course, such formal pronouncements did not eradicate discrimination but they did set a new standard for citizenship in a nation state.

The debate continues to this day as to who is responsible for the al-nahda in Egypt during the 19th century. The Coptic Orthodox argue that Cyril IV, the “Father of Reform,” preceded the Evangelicals in his work to bring the Copts out of darkness. The Coptic Orthodox also point to the formation of the majlis al-milli in 1874. One of the members of the majlis was Boutros Ghālī, who would become the first Prime Minister of Egypt. The importance of the majlis as a leading association of Coptic Orthodox lay leaders would ultimately lead toward the founding of the Sunday School Movement by Ḥabīb Girgīs in 1918. It was this movement that was vital for the continuing Coptic Orthodox Renaissance as established under Cyril VI and Shenouda III.38

Certainly, the Anglican and Presbyterian missionaries have held that it was the missionary school system that contributed to the enlightenment of Egypt. The introduction of Evangelicalism had as its goal the resurrection of a decaying Coptic Orthodox Church. As mentioned above, the Evangelical missionaries focused on the development of a school system throughout the country. The importance of the schools in Assiut, Alexandria, Cairo, and Tanta, among others cannot be underestimated in terms of their effect on raising the standard of living of Egyptians, especially young women. Adīb Naguib Salamā also notes the important work in health care and development undertaken by

38 See Metropolitan Bishoy, “Revival of the Egyptian Church Since the Middle of the Nineteenth Century,” in Badr, Christianity: A History of the Middle East, 775–96.
the Evangelicals. Of note certainly would be the remarkable vision of Dr. Samuel Ḥabīb in the founding of CEOSS.⁴⁹

And of course, Muḥammad ‘Alī should certainly be credited for his part in the renaissance of Egypt through his government reforms. He opened up the first printing press in Būlāq to publish the new ideas with which his young civil servants had returned from Europe.⁴⁰ Regardless of “who was first,” in helping to develop a modern nation state based on a constitution and the equality of citizenship, what can be clearly noted is that Egyptians from different communities all contributed.

One cannot speak of the modern nation of Egypt without mentioning the British Occupation from 1882–1956, of course. In many ways, the British occupation was a step backward for Coptic-Muslim relations. While the British worked hard at implementing a modern secular state that did not view Egyptian subjects as Muslim or Christian, but rather as individual citizens, its policies did exacerbate religious identities. The Coptic and Muslim Congresses of 1911 are clear examples of the modern expression of communal identity in response to the pressures of the occupation and the “veiled protectorate.” Ultimately, however, both Copts and Muslims came together during the famous 1919 revolution and continued to work together to form national political parties. It should not be overlooked that the rise of the Ikhwān al-Muslimūn took place during this period of British occupation, and was a response to the changing cultural and political atmosphere of Egypt.

The Modern Nationalist State (1953–?)

Since 1952, a strong central Arab Nationalist government has ruled Egypt. With its harsh security structure, this Egyptian regime offered stability at a cost. As the standard of living has

---

⁴⁹ Adīb Naguib Salamā, “Evangelical Missions and the Churches in the Middle East: Egypt and Sudan,” in Badr, Christianity: A History of the Middle East, 736.
dropped due to the role of *infitah*, as the gap between the rich and the poor has increased, and as illiteracy has continued to rise at an alarming rate since the mid-1970s, each religious community, Sunni Muslim, Coptic Orthodox, Coptic Catholic, and Coptic Evangelical, have begun to provide social, economic, and educational resources for their own communities. Where they saw the government as failing in its role, they stepped in to provide services for their own community at the expense of a larger national identity. This has exacerbated the divide between communities.

Throughout this article, we have seen how the Coptic community suffered from the vicissitudes of local and foreign domination, as well as benefited from local and foreign rule. Throughout its long history, Copts have suffered persecution from pagan and foreign Christian empires, as well as Muslim and local nationalist regimes. It is important to remember that while Islamic culture is predominant in Egyptian society today, its history and development was not direct and automatic. The Coptic majority did live under Muslim rule but predominated culturally for nearly three hundred years after the coming of the Arabs. It was not until the mid-10th century that Copts began converting to Islam for financial as well as for cultural reasons. But, the harshest period for the Copts occurred not under pietistic Islamic law but under a Machiavellian rule of foreign warlords. During the Mamlūk period, the Church suffered under arbitrary despotic rule. And yet, so did the local Muslim populace. It would be helpful to remember that while the current *salafī* conversations tend to focus on how to implement *sharī‘a*, Muslim political rule was implemented by rulers who sought out *muf̢īns* to support their own decisions. During the classical medieval Islamic period, the jurists served as independent consultants to the sultans. But it was always the ruler who decided just what, if any, laws to implement.

The coming of Muḥammad ʿAlī at the beginning of the 19th century prompted the slow and steady movement toward the modern ideas of citizenship and statehood. The development of these modern ideas under Muḥammad ʿAlī, which have been incorporated into modern Egyptian society, have been seen as “foreign” ideas or solutions (*al-halul al-mustawrada*) by some. Of
course, the history of Islam underlines that much of Islamic rule has itself been un-Egyptian, and in some cases anti-Egyptian. While public pronouncements of both Islamic rulers and jurists have often clarified their understanding of the place and role of the \textit{al-dhimma}, the reality on the ground was often much different. The simple fact that the Muslim Caliphs and Sultans continued to prohibit the service of Copts within the government is an indication that the prohibitions were never carried out systematically or in a uniform manner.\textsuperscript{41} On the contrary, Copts have always been an indispensable part of the Egyptian government, even in the military.

Looking Forward . . .

Evangelical views of Church-State relations have varied greatly over time since the Reformation in Europe in the 16\textsuperscript{th} century. The primary response of Coptic Evangelicals, however, has been to encourage and support communal spirituality that would have a positive impact on the well-being of an individual and stand as a witness to the benefits of an enlightened spirituality and life. Being the smallest and newest of religious communities in Egypt, there has been no other choice. Upon reflection, this means that regardless of the type and form of rule of Egypt, Coptic Evangelicals must always reconcile themselves to their minority status and their role as a leaven for positive social and ethical renewal: educationally, economically, socially, and perhaps even politically.

This brief review should remind us that as monumental as the January Revolution is, regardless of the ultimate incarnation of a new Egyptian system, it is another historical experience of Coptic participation in Egypt’s history. It may be tempting to view the current political movements as cataclysmic, but Coptic Evangelicals may rest assured that the Church triumphant as recorded in Scripture is larger than the historical vicissitudes of human political organizations and states. Current events do not point to a culmination of history, nor an apocalyptic Armageddon. Copts and

\textsuperscript{41} Grafton, \textit{The Christians of Lebanon}, 39–42.
Muslims have always lived, worked, and supported Egypt together. While those relationships have often been unequal, strained, and even crushed, the relationships have never been broken. What is clear is that the future of Coptic-Muslim relationships must come from Egyptians and Egyptian ideas themselves and not Christian, Muslim, or even secular ideologies from abroad. And, while there will be difficulties, history reminds us that the Church has survived and has always contributed to Egyptian society in a wide variety of ways and that it will continue to do so. For Coptic Evangelicals the question is: in what way and by whom?
A Brief History of Predestination
in the Writings of John Calvin

Mark Nygard (mnygard001@luthersem.edu)
Bowdon, North Dakota

It may seem a bit bold for a Lutheran professor serving a Presbyterian seminary to attempt to offer his colleagues and friends an article on a Calvinist specialty. I assure you that my intentions are honorable. Lutherans are as interested in predestination as Reformed theologians, if in a somewhat different way, and what Calvin said is interesting to us, too! We, also, have pressing reasons for trying to understand exactly what Calvin wrote and why.

But more than that, I offer this “history” conscious of the truism that outsiders often see and raise questions that insiders don’t notice, and often helpfully so. It may be that a history of predestination in Calvin hasn’t been thought about recently, and that such a history may stimulate some reflection. If predestination can be preserved as a point of conversation and fruitful thought and not just an article to be believed, it is more likely to do the work it needs to do in the life of faith.

Development of a Doctrine

The doctrine of predestination has become such a defining article of faith for the shape of Reformed theology that its importance, if not centrality, for John Calvin is accepted without further reflection. In other words, Calvin is understood to have built systematically upon the understanding that God by his inscrutable will has irrevocably chosen some for eternal salvation and others for eternal damnation, and this, from the beginning of Calvin's ministry. For those who assume this, it may come as a mild shock to con-

* Mark Nygard completed this article in 2012 when he was the director of Graduate Studies at the Evangelical Theological Seminary in Cairo.—Ed.
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Consider that it might not always have been so, that there might have been a time in Calvin's life when the article was not well articulated, that it might have experienced considerable change in importance and implications over the period of Calvin's work.

Calvin himself offers wonderful resources to the scholar interested in examining this possibility through his successive revisions of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, with editions in Latin in 1536, 1539, 1543, 1550, and 1559, and in French by his own hand in 1541, 1545, 1551, and 1560. It would appear to be a straightforward task to trace the course of Calvin's thought on predestination through his continuous editing of the *Institutes*, but translation issues complicate the task for the non-Latin reader. Though the definitive 1559 Latin edition has been rendered into English and published many times, the only other edition to be so honored is the 1536 Latin edition, translated by Ford Lewis Battles in 1975. A translation of the 1539 Latin edition by Battles still remains unpublished and inaccessible after his death. Fortunately for this project, the 1541 French edition established by Jacques Pannier and published in 1961, was available. And, though it breaks the simplicity of the method, *Calvin's First Catechism* of 1538, translated by Ford Lewis Battle and published with commentary by I. John Hesselink in 1997, provides valuable information during the early years of development. It is the intent of this essay to document briefly the major changes in Calvin's articulation of the doctrine of election using the English translation of the 1536 *Institutes*, the English translation of the 1538

3 Wendel remarks that the Latin 1539 edition was actually completed in the final months of 1538. Since the French 1541 is a translation of this 1539 Latin, it reflects his thinking in late 1538, soon after the appearance of his *Catechism*, not three years later as the publication date would suggest. See Wendel, *Calvin*, 113.
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_Catechism_, the French 1541 *Institutes* based on the 1539 Latin edition, and the English translation of the 1559 *Institutes*, drawing such conclusions as we may about its role in Calvin’s theology.

**Predestination in the 1536 *Institutes***

Battle's English translation of Calvin's first edition of the *Institutes* requires 211 pages (not counting the dedicatory) and on the order of 125,000 words to present five chapters, entitled “The Law,” “Faith,” “The Sacraments,” “The Five False Sacraments,” and “Christian Freedom,” but no “Predestination.”⁴ Wendel notes that, in fact, predestination is mentioned only twice, and both of them in the chapter on Faith in the subsection on the Apostles’ Creed.⁵ In the first, more extensive mention under Article Three of the Apostles’ Creed on the Church, approximately 4 of the 24 paragraphs assigned to discuss the creed and approximately 1,800 words serve to distinguish the true Church of God's elect from the reprobate (one mention), delineate the gifts and the blessings that the elect may expect, and inspire the confidence they should have in the good will and faithfulness of the electing God.⁶ The discussion is followed by issues of excommunication and church discipline. The second mention is, by contrast, quite a peripheral one. In arguing for a more symbolic understanding of the descent into hell as Christ's experience of the dread of God’s judgment, Calvin has cause to mention the hope of believers (not elect) and the hopelessness of the reprobate: only 53 words in all and no full treatment in any case.⁷ It would thus seem that only about 1½% of the 1536 *Institutes* is clearly concerned with predestination, and that Calvin has no cause to bring it up in his treatment of other matters.

---

⁵ Wendel, *Calvin*, 265.
⁷ Ibid., 55.
A closer analysis of the predestinarian section under the Church suggests these characteristics in the 1536 Institutes.

1. It is pre-creation, “before the foundation of the world.”
2. It is universal, including angels, the deceased, and all nations: “in order that all may be gathered in,” though this “all” refers to the elect.
3. It is sanctifying: it renders the elect holy.
4. It causes an order of salvation: choosing, calling, justifying, sanctifying, glorifying.
5. Some members of the Church “in whom He has worked His own powers” are not members of the elect.
6. Likewise, some elect have not yet become part of the visible Church.
7. The elect cannot perish, for their foundation is sure.
8. The body of the elect, the Church, will not pass away from the earth.
9. It is not for us to investigate why, “breaking into the depths of the majesty.”
10. It is not for us to investigate who is the elect.
11. Yet there are sure marks given by Scripture by which the reprobate may be known “insofar as [God] wills us to recognize them.”
12. It remains only for us to believe the declared promise of absolution, for “by faith we possess Christ and all that is his.”

Clearly, the primary question being addressed here is what is the nature of the church, not who will be saved. The entire dis-
cussion is thus set in a basically ecclesiological context, not a soteriological one.

Predestination in the 1538 *Catechism*

The English translation of Calvin's *Catechism*, a shorter document, requires only 31 pages (not counting the introduction) and on the order of 15,000 words to present 33 articles of faith, the thirteenth of which is entitled Predestination. It is noteworthy that it now has an article of its own. Not only so, but with approximately 500 words it comprises roughly 3% of the text and is located more strategically after three articles on the Law leading to an article on faith in Christ, but before four articles describing that faith. By every outward indicator it would appear that predestination has risen in the attention that it receives.

There are internal signs as well. Now, two years after predestination was alluded to in the first *Institutes*, these characteristics are highlighted in the *Catechism*:

1) God’s Word bears fruit only in those predestined to be God's children before the foundation of the world.
2) God’s Word is the stench of death unto death to those who were condemned by the same plan of God.
3) It is not for us to know why he has willed this. This will bring only anxiety and trouble.
4) It is rather for us to acknowledge God’s justice and holiness in it.
5) Condemnation of all would be just; the salvation of some is pure mercy.
6) The elect are vessels of mercy. The reprobate are vessels of wrath.
7) We are to focus on the proclamation where his mercy is made clear.

---

8) What we seek in election is eternal life. We receive it in faith in Christ, the mirror of God’s will and the seal of his election.21

Here, instead of a single mention on the third page, the concept of the reprobate is brought to the beginning of the article and treated in parallel fashion with that of the elect. Apology for the doctrine is made midway through the article by introduction of Paul’s “vessels of wrath” language to justify God’s decision even if he were to condemn the entire race. And, in a separate phenomenon, the effects of predestination for the individual are not probed: its rendering holy, its causing the order of salvation, calling, justifying, and glorying. The doctrine is presented separately from its earlier assuring function.22 Neither, likewise, are the consequences for consideration of the church in its visible and invisible aspects pursued.

Predestination in the 1541 French Translation of the Institutes

By 1539 the Institutes had grown apace, and Calvin’s 1541 translation of them reflects that growth. At 360,000 words on 1,189 pages, the volume is almost three times as long as its 1536 predecessor.23 The number of chapters has expanded from five to seventeen, of which the eighth, “De la prédestination et providence de Dieu,” sits squarely in the center after justification by faith and consideration of the scriptures, but before prayer and the sacraments. Its 75 pages contain approximately 22,500 words, now well over 6% of the text, and make it one of the longer articles of faith in this edition, ranking it up there with such critical articles as the third on the law and the sixth on justification by faith. It is

21 Ibid., 17. The entire article fits on a single page.
22 The final sentences of consolation have their reason in Christ, not election. In fact, the reader is urged not to think further about predestination but to rely on Christ.
hard not to mark a radical and rapid evolution of attention towards election during this time.

It is also clear that by this time Calvin had encountered objection to and controversy about his position, because the first order of business after the introduction is setting up defenses. On the one hand one must not seek with inordinate curiosity and temerity to enter the “Sanctuary,” the “Labyrinth,” “the secrets” of God’s will. On the other hand one must not “seek to bury all memory of predestination” as a “perilous thing.”

He now needs to argue in various ways for its correct use as scripturally appropriate, not only here at the beginning, but again and again as he proceeds, citing examples from the Old Testament, diverse scripture from the New Testament, and the church fathers, favorably or unfavorably as needed. These arguments and defenses compose a considerable part of the new material offered in French in 1541 and are the most striking addition to it.

Not until the fifth page is the doctrine defined and an examination of its aspects begun. Quite simply, “We name predestination the eternal counsel of God whereby he has determined that which he wants to do with each person. For he has not created them all in the same condition, but has ordained some to eternal life and others to eternal damnation.”

Unprecedented is this upfront definition that, in systematic fashion, puts the scandal first

\[24\] Ibid., III:58–59. All translations from the French in this paper are my own.


\[26\] Ibid., 88 for Abraham, 67, 71–72 for Esau and Jacob, 68–69 for Manasseh and Ephraim, 68, 70 for Moses in Exodus 33:19, 88 for Isaiah 65:1, 102 for Moses and Pharaoh, 119 for Ahab [perhaps rather Jehoshaphat is meant] before the lying prophet Micaiah, 120 for Joseph and his brothers, 120 for Job, 121 for Jeremiah and the coming calamity, and 129–30 for God’s choice of Jonah to preach at Nineveh. A striking omission yet at this time is Job, which is cited (112), but not developed fully.

\[27\] Important verses cited by Calvin in this edition are, of course, Ephesians 1 and Colossians 1 (pp. 64), but also Romans 9–11, Paul on the potter, Peter, Paul, and James on God not respecting status, Acts 10, and John 6, 10, and 17.

\[28\] Ibid., 69 for Ambrose, Jerome, and Origen, 70–71 for Thomas Aquinas, 69, 76, 87 for Augustine.

\[29\] Ibid., III:62.
(actually, second, to its defense!). A new word is used to emphasize it, “immutable,” or unchanging.\textsuperscript{30} The concept is not new, but where in 1536 it assured the faithful of the steadfastness of God’s promise, the context is now human perplexity at God’s sovereign decision.

A new theme emerges early on when Calvin writes that Christians are encouraged to respond to the fact of election with lives that “demonstrate and witness to their election.”\textsuperscript{31} Three years earlier the elect would not have been expected to have formulated the shape of their Christian lives in terms of election. The fact that this is now being lifted up as “a vocation of the elect” shows again the new emphasis it is receiving.

**Predestination in the 1559 *Institutes***

The ultimate statement of Calvin’s theology is his final Latin edition of the *Institutes*, published 18 years after the works cited above, and it is this edition that is universally used in Reformed churches today. Now grown to 1,486 pages in the recently published Westminster John Knox edition, it holds on the order of 650,000 words, making it almost twice the size of the 1539/1541 editions. The volume is now broken into four major sections, or “books,” subdivided into 80 chapters, and further subdivided into 1,263 subsections, or “paragraphs.”\textsuperscript{32} In the third book, four or these chapters, XXI through XXIV, or 49 paragraphs, comprising approximately 29,000 words, are devoted specifically to election themes. In addition, two chapters with about 12,000 words on Providence have been moved to Book I (Chapters XVII and XVIII) to be treated with other material on the doctrine of God. In addition, four chapters of Book II (Chapters II through V) or about 38,000 words, treat the converse of the doctrine considered from below with emphasis on the bondage of the human will and the helplessness of humankind without God's help. Repeated ref-

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 63.
erences to predestination and related concepts occur throughout all this material. Taken together, it constitutes well over 10% of the entire volume. Thus, predestination and election considerations stand not only as a block of material solidly in the heart of Books Three and Four in material on the way in which Christ is received and God’s invitation is given, but also as significant chapters and portions of chapters throughout the books on creation and redemption as well. One may say it permeates the Institutes in a broader sense, having become a general awareness that connects many doctrines of faith throughout the work.

Of the four chapters on election as such, one is devoted entirely to proving the doctrine from scripture and the church fathers, and another to refuting diverse accusations made against the doctrine. Even in the other two chapters, apologies for the doctrine break forth, such as the same two initial objections that opened the 1541 French edition in Chapter XXI, and an aside on Judas as not being counterevidence in Chapter XXIV. It might be said that the doctrine is now mature, hardened and seasoned, as it were, by the attacks of its enemies, and defended and buttressed against almost every conceivable objection.

The definition of predestination offered in the 1541 French edition is preserved, perhaps, word for word. There is in fact much that is recognizable in the 1559 edition from its 1541 predecessor. Wendel even suggests that the main lines of the doctrine were set in place in the 1539 edition and that modifications after that time are not a “hardening of his doctrine,” but “in reality reducible to some new definitions and some more extended Biblical quotations.” Surely there is much truth in this.

Yet, some “new definitions” are noteworthy. The case of Israel is taken to illustrate a kind of two-tiered election not remarked before, in which by a first stage a nation is chosen as his heritage, and by a second “more limited” stage, particular individuals of

33 Ibid., II:932–64, that is, in Book 3, Chapters XXII and XXIII.
34 Ibid., II:922–25.
35 Ibid., II:975–76.
36 Ibid., II:926. See footnote 29, above.
37 Wendel, Calvin, 269.
the nation are chosen. Calvin considers the value of the first election, but makes it clear that it is the second election of individuals to eternal salvation that makes election so certain that it is without doubt the “actual election.”

Structurally parallel to this is Calvin’s distinction between God’s general and special calling. With the former the call of the Gospel goes forth to all people without distinction, but it does not do its work in them all. “The other kind of call is special, which [God] deigns . . . to give to the believers alone, while by inward illumination of his Spirit he causes the preached Word to dwell in their hearts.” Certainly, this is a distinction that fits the theological structure in which a predestining God chooses whom the Word will illumine.

Conclusion

It seems clear from our brief survey of four of Calvin’s works, three from the beginning and one from the conclusion of his ministry, that his doctrine of predestination was not a static thing over the years of his ministry. On the contrary, it shows continual growth and increasing richness. In particular, we have observed the following indications:

1. The space given to the concept in the Institutes increased from 1 1/2% in the 1536 edition to over 10% in the 1559 edition.
2. The prominence of the concept increased from a relatively minor and casual service of another doctrine in one part of one chapter in the 1536 edition, to a titled section in the 1538 edition, to a multi-chaptered treatment in its own right and permeation of other subject matter in the 1559 edition.
3. Predestination changed in function from an ecclesiastical use in the 1536 edition, helping to define the Church, to a more soteriological function as early as the 1541 edition, something to which believers may bear witness by their actions.
4. It grows in boldness. Where in the 1536 edition the concept of reprobate was mentioned only twice, by 1541 the scandal

38 Calvin, Institutes (1559), II:928–30.
39 Ibid., II:974.
of arbitrary separation of the reprobate from the saved is systematically “in your face” by clear definition and early treatment.

5. Its context is increasingly the perplexity that confronts it at every turn, as demonstrated by the growing volume of supporting evidence from scriptures and the fathers and by the careful parrying of every conceivable objection.

The fact of the change is not in question. The evidence for that, even in such a short paper, is striking. Yet the change was sketched with only the broadest strokes using only a fraction of the data available, and that in translation. It would appear to be a fruitful field of research to consider the other sources in the original languages and to attempt to make some judgments about the connection between the growth of the doctrine in Calvin’s theology and its effects on Calvin and his community. No finer data could we ask for.
An Invitation to Read Herman Bavinck in the Middle East

Willem J. de Wit (http://willemjdewit.com)  
Evangelical Theological Seminary in Cairo

Jesus did not come to judge the world, but to save it (John 3:17); the monk leaves the world and judges it by going to the desert. Jesus isolated himself in a deserted place early in the morning (Mark 1:35) to strengthen himself for daily work and his life work; the monk sees the essence of virtue in ascetic exercise itself and changes means into goal.

—Herman Bavinck

Who Wrote Bayna al-‘āql wa-al-īmān?

Bayna al-‘āql wa-al-īmān

Bayna al-‘āql wa-al-īmān1 is the Arabic translation of a popular presentation of the Christian faith written by the Dutch theologian

---

* This article was written in 2012.—Ed.


Bristley’s guide is a very helpful tool for finding one’s way to Bavinck’s writings and offers an overview of his life and work, a Bavinck bibliography, and an overview of secondary literature both in English and in Dutch. For a couple of comments and additions, see Willem J. de Wit, On the Way to the Living God: A Cathartic Reading of Herman Bavinck and an Invitation to Overcome the Plausibility Crisis of Christianity (Amsterdam: VU University
Herman Bavinck (1854–1921). While there has been a renewed interest in Bavinck in Reformed and Presbyterian circles from North America through Italy to South Korea since the last decade, he still seems to be relatively unknown in the Arabic speaking world. This article is an invitation to Christians in the Middle East to read more by and about Bavinck in English (or—ideally—in Dutch) and to consider the translation of some of his other works into Arabic.

For, while Bayna al-ʿaql wa-al-īmān will easily be recognized as a fair elaboration of the faith of the Reformed/Presbyterian confessions, it should be clear that Bavinck’s oeuvre includes many other writings that are arguably more important and inter-

Press, 2011), 175–76, which can be downloaded from http://willemjdewit.com/living-god (subsequent footnotes will refer to this work as OWLG).

For the most recent developments in Bavinck studies, see the website of the Herman Bavinck Institute at Calvin Theological Seminary (http://bavinckinstitute.org/). The “Herman Bavinck Bibliography” (http://bavinckinstitute.org/resources/bibliographies/herman-bavinck-bibliography/) is kept up-to-date and includes many direct links to works by Bavinck in Dutch and English and studies about Bavinck on the internet. An even larger collection of Bavinck’s writings is available at the Dutch website Project Neocalvinisme (http://www.neocalvinisme.nl/tekstframes.html).

The most important biographies of Bavinck are Ron Gleason, Herman Bavinck: Pastor, Churchman, Statesman, and Theologian (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2010); R. H. Bremmer, Herman Bavinck en zijn tijdgenoten (Kampen: Kok, 1966); and V. Hepp, Dr. Herman Bavinck (Amsterdam: Ten Have, 1921). Factual biographic information in this article has especially been derived from Bremmer’s biography.

See e.g. John Bolt, “Herman Bavinck Speaks English,” in Bristley, Guide to the Writings of Herman Bavinck (1854–1921), 28–39; Andrea Ferrari, “Bavinck in Italianaanse context,” in Ontmoetingen met Herman Bavinck, ed. George Harinck and Gerrit Neven, AD Chartas-reeks 9, 119–24 (Barneveld: De Vuurbaak, 2006); and Hae-Moo Yoo, “Herman Bavinck en de gereformeerde traditie in Korea,” in Harinck and Neven, Ontmoetingen met Herman Bavinck, 125–41.

Bavinck’s eloquent Dutch of a century ago, containing relatively long sentences adorned with many synonyms, cannot easily be translated into current academic English, which prefers a more concise and exact style, but may in fact more naturally be rendered into beautiful Modern Standard Arabic.
estating. After a brief sketch of his life, this short article will introduce some of his personal letters, his major four-volume *Reformed Dogmatics*, his works on worldview and education, and his reflections on following Jesus Christ, suggesting how these themes can be relevant for Arab readers and Egyptians in particular.

**Bavinck’s Life**

Bavinck was born in Hoogeveen, the Netherlands, on December 13, 1854. He and his family did not belong to the major Dutch Reformed Church, but to a smaller, theologically more conservative Reformed denomination, which had its own seminary in the town of Kampen. This denomination was rooted in the 1834 secession from the main church and Bavinck’s father was one of its pastors. From 1874 to 1880 Bavinck studied in Leiden, in those days the bulwark of modern, liberal theology in the Netherlands. In 1880 Bavinck completed his studies with a thesis on the ethics of the reformer Huldrych Zwingli (1484–1531). After a pastorate from 1881 to 1882 he became a professor in Kampen. In 1891 he married Johanna Adriana Schippers and after three years the couple had a daughter.

In 1880 Abraham Kuyper (1837–1920), another famous Dutch theologian, founded the Free University in Amsterdam. In 1886 he was one of the leaders of a second secession from the Dutch Reformed Church. In 1892 most churches of the 1834 and 1886 secessions united to form the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands. The new church now had two places to train future

---

5 Bremmer calls the Dutch edition of *bayna al-ʿaql wa-al-īmān* “not very captivating” (*Herman Bavinck en zijn tijdgenoten*, 249).

6 This section is a mainly a shortened version of *OWLG*, 17–19.

7 Nowadays, the official English name of the Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam is “VU University Amsterdam,” but in Bavinck’s day the name was translated as “Free University.”

8 In Dutch the 1834 secession is usually called “Afscheiding” and the 1886 secession “Doleantie.” In 2004 the history of the secessions partly came to an end when the Dutch Reformed Church and the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands united into the Protestant Church in the Netherlands. However,
pastors: the seminary in Kampen and the faculty of theology of the Free University. Bavinck made strong efforts to merge the two, but when these failed in 1902, he moved to Amsterdam and became a professor at the Free University in succession to Kuyper, who had become prime minister of the Netherlands in 1901. In 1911 Bavinck himself became a member of the Upper Chamber of the Dutch Parliament. He died on July 29, 1921.

Although the details of Dutch church history may not be immediately relevant for readers of Bavinck in other parts of the world, his rootedness in the tradition of the secession (“I am a child of the Secession and I hope to remain so”9) means that he did not understand himself as a representative of the dominant culture of his day, but rather of the subculture or counterculture of a minority. In fact, this may make it easier for (Protestant) Christians in the Middle East to identify with him.

Letters

“Will I remain standing? God grant it!” wrote Bavinck in his diary on September 23, 1874, the day he arrived in Leiden to study theology. This struggle to remain standing as a Christian while many of his contemporaries drifted away from the cross is a theme that underlies many of Bavinck’s works and comes more to the surface in some of his letters.

A particularly interesting starting point to begin one’s reading of Bavinck is his correspondence with Christiaan Snouck Hurgronje (1857–1936), with whom he became close friends during his studies in Leiden and who would become one of the leading Western specialists on Islam—his trip to Mecca in 1885 made him famous throughout Europe.10 The friendship lasted until

since the nineteenth century several other Reformed denominations have come into being that continue the tradition of the Secession. Being a son of the Secession, Bavinck can be regarded as a father both to the Protestant Church in the Netherlands and to these other Reformed denominations.


10 The correspondence has been published as Herman Bavinck and Christiaan Snouck Hurgronje, Een Leidse vriendschap: De briefwisseling tussen
Bavinck’s death. While the letters give us some insight into Bavinck’s views on Islam, one can especially learn from them that even (or perhaps, especially) a pastor and a theologian may have to struggle with doubt and halfheartedness. For example, reflecting on his studies in Leiden Bavinck wrote:

The innocence of a child’s faith, of the unlimited trust in the truth that has been instilled in me, you see, that is what I have lost and that is much, very much. . . .

I know that I will never regain it. . . . Sometimes, when I still meet some people in the congregation, who possess it and fare so well by it and are so happy, well I cannot help, but I wish I could believe again as they do, so happily and so cheerfully; and then I feel that, if I had this and could preach in such a way, animated, warm, always fully convinced of what I was saying, yes one with it, indeed, then I would be strong, powerful, then I could be useful; living myself, I would live for others.

But I know that it is over, that it is no longer possible.

And a few years later he confessed:

Sometimes I perceive in my own soul an unspoken desire that Scripture might not be true, that the newer criticism might be right, and in this I see something of that secret enmity that the sinful heart feels against the Holy One and that can only be overcome by faith and prayer. . . . Exactly this experience of

---


the soul, in connection with others, ties me to Scripture and confession, although I feel in my mind the objections that can be brought against Christianity as deeply as you do.\textsuperscript{13}

This is not to say that Bavinck lost his faith or was always struggling. One of his students remembered:

He did much more than mere teaching. As a Christian he was able to make one feel the width and glory of God’s revelation in Christ, to make one realize the limits of the temporary over against the eternal, to make one look forward from knowing in part to the day of the full solution of the mystery. He carried one away to kneel before the throne of the Lamb.\textsuperscript{14}

Bavinck’s letters can offer readers a mirror in which to face their own struggles and that reading them together, for example as students or as pastors, can open a conversation about questions that are otherwise not so easily shared.\textsuperscript{15}

**Dogmatics**

Bavinck’s main contribution to Reformed theology is his four-volume *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek* [Reformed Dogmatics], originally published from 1895 to 1901, revised from 1906 to 1911, and published in English from 2003 to 2008 and in Korean in 2011.\textsuperscript{16}


\textsuperscript{14} H. W. van der Vaart Smit, “De dogmatische betekenis van Dr H. Bavinck,” *Vox theologica* 8 (1936): 43. English translation and similar testimonies in *OWLG*, 36.

\textsuperscript{15} *OWLG*, 20, proposes a *cathartic* reading of Herman Bavinck.

While Bavinck was well-versed in Reformed theology of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, he also had a clear affinity with patristic and medieval theology: “Men like Irenaeus, Augustine, and Thomas do not exclusively belong to Rome. They are Fathers and Doctors to whom the whole Christian church has obligations.”

This “catholic” (ecumenical) basis may make his dogmatics interesting even for orthodox churches in the Middle East. While Bavinck did not see Calvinism as the only truth and spoke about John Wesley with appreciation, his discussion of Israel and the millennium in his chapter on eschatology follows the main stream of the Reformed/Presbyterian tradition and may be especially appreciated by those who are concerned about the influence of dispensationalism among Protestants in the Arab world.

Bavinck’s doctrine of Scripture has especially drawn much attention. While he himself admitted by the end of his life that

17 Bavinck, Gereformeerde dogmatiek (1895), 1:iii; English translation in OWLG, 47.
18 “Let American Christianity develop according to its own law. . . . Calvinism is surely not the only truth!” Herman Bavinck, Mijne reis naar Amerika, ed. George Harinck, AD Chartas-reeks 2 (Barneveld: De Vuurbaak, 1998), 58; see OWLG, 44.
19 See e.g. Herman Bavinck, “Nader bescheid,” De Wachter (October 20, 1909), 3; cf. OWLG, 50–51.
“the problem of Scripture” still waited a solution,\(^{21}\) his contribution is important as an attempt to get rid of a mechanical (“dictation”) view of inspiration and to replace it with an organic view of inspiration, which recognizes the specific circumstances and personalities of the biblical authors without diminishing Scripture’s authority as the Word of God. My impression is that Bavinck can help Christians to articulate their distinct understanding of inspiration in a context in which the dominant model for inspiration is that of the sending down of the Qur’ān from heaven.

While the mystical union with Christ has been proposed as the main theme of Bavinck’s dogmatics\(^{22}\) and was perhaps an important point in his own spiritual life as well,\(^{23}\) more often the phrase “grace restores nature” is seen as the central theme.\(^ {24}\) Grace, Bavinck taught, does not alienate us from (earthly) life in general, but redeems it from the consequences of sin and will eventually bring it to completion.

Worldview and Education

Although Bavinck is best known for his *Reformed Dogmatics*, he did not see dogmatics as the be all and end all of Christianity. In

\(^{21}\) Hepp, *Dr. Herman Bavinck*, 331; cf. *OWLG*, 77–82.


\(^ {23}\) See e.g. the quotation from his manuscript “De mensch, Gods evenbeeld” in *OWLG*, 34.

his view (Reformed) Christians should engage in all areas of culture. In an early article he wrote:

The Reformed is a complete view of world and life. It puts humans in a special relationship to God and therefore also in a specific relationship to all things: to family, state, society, art, science, etc. Besides dogmatic principles, there are also moral, political, social, scientific, and aesthetical principles. Nothing exists on which Reformed principles do not put their peculiar mark.25

These words anticipate much of what Bavinck would later write, especially during the last two decades of his life. In 1904 he published a book entitled Christelijke wereldbeschouwing [Christian Worldview]26 and many of his other books and articles can be read as elaborations of his Christian worldview for a specific area of life, for example the family, ethics, the sciences, social relationships, and aesthetics.27

His works on education deserve special mention. His Paedagogische beginselen [Principles of Education]28 has been called

26 Herman Bavinck, Christelijke wereldbeschouwing: Rede bij de overdracht van het rectoraat aan de Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam op 20 oktober 1904 (Kampen: Bos, 1904), http://www.neocalvinisme.nl/tekstframes.html; German: Christliche Weltanschauung, trans. H. Cuntz (Heidelberg: Winter, 1907).
28 Herman Bavinck, Paedagogische beginselen (Kampen: Kok, 1904); summarized and discussed in English in C. Jaarsma, The Educational Philosophy of Herman Bavinck: A Textbook in Education (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1935) and J. Brederveld, Christian Education: A Summary and Critical
as relevant for Christian philosophy of education as Calvin’s *Institutes* were for subsequent theology. Interacting with the leading educational theories of his time, he developed a distinctly Christian view of the goal, starting point, and method of education. A key verse for him was 2 Timothy 3:17: “... that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work” (ESV).

Whether one agrees with his position or not, his works can open the eyes of Christians to the reality that fundamental reflection on education from a Christian perspective is possible. In a context in which some groups seek to put a more distinctively Islamic stamp on school education, Bavinck’s work can stimulate Christians to reflect on and articulate their own ideal of education.

**Following Jesus Christ**

Following Jesus Christ is an important theme in Bavinck’s life. In the diary that he wrote during his studies in Leiden he repeatedly expressed the hope that he would be a “worthy follower of Jesus.” On two occasions he wrote about “the imitation of Christ” (following Christ) in more detail: in a series of articles in 1885–1886 and in a brochure in 1918. In 1886 he criticized the monastic ideal of imitation: “Jesus did not come to judge the world, but to save it (John 3:17); the monk leaves the world and judges it by going to the desert. Jesus isolated himself in a deserted place early in the morning (Mark 1:35) to strengthen himself for daily work and his life work.”

Although Bavinck’s remark about the monk in the desert might suggest that he had Saint Anthony and the Coptic Orthodox Church in mind, it is much more likely that this “monk” refers to the many in his own Reformed denomination who, in his view,

---

*Discussion of Bavinck’s Pedagogical Principles* (Grand Rapids, MI: Smitter, 1928).

29 A. B. W. M. Kok, *Dr Herman Bavinck* (Amsterdam: Bakker, 1945), 74.

30 Quoted in Bremmer, *Herman Bavinck en zijn tijdgenoten*, 32.

thought “too exclusively.” He saw the tendency to leave the world symbolized in the seminary in Kampen: it was not a university but only a separate seminary, and it was not in a real city but only in the small town of Kampen. His ideal was a Christian university and he saw this ideal partly realized in the Free University. Writing to Snouck Hurgronje, he emphasized that his work on the catholicity of the Christian faith—in the sense of its relatedness to all areas of life—was intended as a “medicine against the separatist and sectarian tendencies that sometimes show up in our church.” He added, “There is so much narrow-mindedness and so much pettiness among us, and, worst of all, this is counted as piety.”

In 1900 Bavinck reviewed Charles Sheldon’s famous book, *In His Steps: What Would Jesus Do?*, remarking that the question posed in its subtitle not well formulated:

> Jesus did not occupy a post in society and did not hold an office in church or society. He was neither a husband nor a father of a family, neither a farmer nor a merchant, and neither a scholar nor an artist. . . . He was something else and infinitely more: He was the Redeemer of sinners, the Savior of the world.

> For this reason, the question “what would Jesus have done in my case?” is not well posed . . .

> . . . If one cannot imagine that Jesus would have been a husband or a father of a family—and that cannot be imagined

---

indeed—, one might decide to abstain from marriage or to leave one’s family and to do nothing but traveling through the country, preaching and performing miracles.

... The true meaning of following Jesus is not that we copy and imitate him, ... [but] that we, independent and free, as God’s children, in our circumstances and relationships, even if it costs us the greatest self-denial and bearing the heaviest cross, fulfill that same will of God which Christ ... fulfilled in a perfect way. For whoever does God’s will is Jesus’ brother and sister and mother.\(^{35}\)

During the first decade of the twentieth century, Bavinck dealt intensively with the problem that the Christian faith is contested at an intellectual, academic level, a struggle that resulted in his 1908 lectures on *The Philosophy of Revelation.*\(^{36}\) In his brochure on the imitation of Christ ten years later, when the First World War was in its fourth year and he had been a member of the Upper House of the Dutch parliament for seven years, he located the crisis of Christianity’s plausibility much more in everyday moral life than in academic discourse:

All these questions come together in the question about the imitation of Christ and life in the modern world. Is there still room for such an imitation in the cultural life of the present? Can it

\(^{35}\) Herman Bavinck, “Wat zou Jezus doen?” *De Bazuin* 48 no. 8 (1900).

still be taken seriously by people in the state, in industry and business, in the marketplace, the stock-exchange and the bank, in office and factory, in science and art, in war and at the front? While Bavinck was critical of the spirit of the French Revolution, it is hard to say where he would have stood exactly in the case of the Egyptian revolution of 2011. However, it is clear that he would have recommended that Christians neither seclude themselves from the world in the monasteries of St. Paul and St. Antony, except perhaps for a short retreat, nor withdraw themselves to the confines of an evangelical seminary or a Protestant church, but face the question, difficult as it may be, of what it means to follow Jesus Christ at Midan Tahrir, in a system that is still vulnerable to corruption, or in a public sphere that is—even more than before—dominated by a different religion.


38 For example, he wrote a preface to a Dutch “classic” on unbelief and revolution: Herman Bavinck, “Voorrede,” in Ongeloof en revolutie, by G. Groen van Prinsterer, 3rd ed., v–xiii (Kampen: Bos, 1904).
Review of *American Evangelicals in Egypt* by Heather J. Sharkey
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Heather Sharkey sets out to produce a “secular history” (p. 14) of Presbyterian mission in Egypt between 1854 and 1967 that “illuminates both the Egyptian and American dimensions of this historical exchange while attending to the changing landscapes of social attitudes and religious beliefs” (p. 16). In meeting this aim, she has added significantly to what can be known about Protestant mission history in the Middle East, the rapidly evolving character of Christian-Muslim relations since the nineteenth century, and the social, cultural, and political aspects of these encounters.

Sharkey pays close attention to a range of social forces and multiple overlapping contexts that affected the work of this missionary group, including the nineteenth-century evangelical culture of American Presbyterianism, British colonial activity in the Middle East, the rise of Egyptian nationalism in the twentieth century, and the postcolonial dilemma of Western missionaries in the region. She drills deeply into the holdings of the Presbyterian Historical Society, located in Philadelphia. Sharkey also draws extensively from several previously underutilized resources, most notably her own interviews with contemporary Egyptian Protestant leaders and retired missionaries, the archives of the

*This review was first published in *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 33 (2009): 159–60.*

Sharkey’s focus on twentieth-century issues is especially welcome, since relatively few scholars have chosen to concentrate on this phase of Presbyterian mission history. A nuanced chapter entitled “The Mission of the American University in Cairo,” in which the career of its founding president, former United Presbyterian mission executive Charles R. Watson is featured, stands out. An extended discussion of Samuel Zwemer’s conversionist activities in Egypt clarifies the nature of the transition Watson’s educational initiative represented. In her treatment of decolonization (1945–67), Sharkey shows how successive Egyptian governments worked steadily to limit missionary independence. American backing for the newly established State of Israel further eroded the social legitimacy of American missionary efforts in the Middle East, while stoking the production of antimissionary propaganda in Arabic. Throughout, Sharkey considers the “ambiguity of power” (p. 4) that surrounded the American Presbyterian Mission in Egypt. It is her contention that social proximity to British imperial power between 1882 and 1918 created a “colonial moment” for the mission which then slowly dissipated during the interwar years, before giving way to a situation of much greater vulnerability within a fully independent Muslim-majority nation.