

Antwerp. Here he was associated with Marnix of St. Aldegonde in a committee to spread political and religious literature; for this activity the authorities put a price of three hundred guilders on his head. Junius escaped capture, fleeing to Breda only a half hour before his house was raided. For the next few years he was forced to move to Ghent (1566), and, after a short stay there, he fled to Germany, where he was appointed minister of the church of Reformed refugees at Schönau by the elector Frederick III. He left Schönau for Heidelberg when the elector commissioned him and Immanuel Tremellius, a Jew converted to the Reformed religion, to write a new Latin translation of the Hebrew Old Testament, first published in Frankfurt in 1579. The *Sacra Biblia* of Tremellius and Junius gained tremendous influence, and its exegetical annotations were highly valued. Published together with Beza's Latin translation of the Greek New Testament, it was reprinted well into the seventeenth and even the eighteenth century.⁴

Due to the restoration of Lutheranism at Heidelberg in 1576 by Frederick's son Louis IV, Junius was forced to go to Neustadt an der Haardt, where he became professor of Hebrew at the *Casimirianum*, a theological school founded by John Casimir. Casimir was also a son of Frederick III, but he remained loyal to the Reformed religion. During his stay at Neustadt, Junius taught alongside Zacharias Ursinus, the author of the Heidelberg Catechism, and even delivered Ursinus's funeral oration when he died in 1583. After the reintroduction of Reformed religion in the Palatinate, Junius returned to Heidelberg and in 1584 became a professor of theology there.

In 1591 the French king, Henry IV, asked Junius to come to Paris to be his advisor in Protestant affairs. On his trip to France he visited Leiden where, in 1592, he accepted an appointment as professor of theology. In 1594 Franciscus Gomarus arrived at Leiden to be his colleague and stayed there until 1611. Junius declined invitations to be a

4. *Sacra Biblia sive Testamentum Vetus ab Imman. Tremellio et Francisco Junio ex Hebraeo Latine redditum. Et Testamentum Novum a Theodoro Beza è Graeco in Latinum versum* (Amsterdam: Bleau, Willem Jansz, 1639); *Sacra Biblia...Graeco in Latinum versum* (Amsterdam: apud Joannem Janssonium, 1648); *Sacra Biblia...Graeco in Latinum versum* (Hannover: sumptibus Nicolai Fösteri, 1715).

minister at La Rochelle and professor in the new university of Franeker. In 1598 the Company of Pastors at Geneva invited Junius to come to assist the Dutch students there. Junius refused, however, perhaps due to increasing ecclesiological differences with Beza after his publication of the *Eirenicum*.⁵

On October 23, 1602, at the age of fifty-seven, Junius died, a victim of the Black Death. Gomarus conducted the funeral oration, which was published in 1602 at Leiden under the title *Oratio in obitum F. Junii*. Throughout his life Junius married four times. His two most well-known children were from his second and third marriages: his daughter Elisabeth, who married the famous humanist scholar Gerardus Johannes Vossius (1577–1649); and his son Franciscus Junius (the younger) (1589–1677), who was the first Reformed minister with Remonstrant sympathies at Hillegersberg.⁶

Junius as Scholar

One can easily conclude from Junius's biography that the dark events surrounding the Reformation history of Germany and Flanders profoundly and emotionally affected him until the end of his life. This memory, together with other dramatic events of his Huguenot and family history, colored his identity and personality. As an academic,

5. See Karin Maag, *Seminary or University? The Genevan Academy and Reformed Higher Education, 1560–1620*, St. Andrew's Studies in Reformation History (Aldershot, England: Scolar Press, 1995), 75.

6. Although Junius (the younger) had Remonstrant sympathies, he subscribed to the "Acte of Stilstand," a formula of submission by which ministers who were prepared to recant Remonstrant opinions could remain within the public church. In 1621 he left for England, where he became librarian in the service of Thomas Howard, Count of Arundel. He became an expert in ancient painting and sculpture and published an influential book on this subject that was translated into English. He was also well versed in linguistic studies, especially Gothic and Frisian languages. For more on Junius (the younger) see Franciscus Junius F.F., *De Pictura Veterum libri tres* (Amsterdam: apud Johannem Blaeu, 1637); Franciscus Junius F.F., *De Pictura Veterum libri tres* (Rotterdam, 1694) (including his biography by J. C. Graevius). This work was translated into Dutch and saw three editions (1641, 1659, and 1675). A German edition was published in 1770 in Breslau. The English translation appeared in 1638 as *The Painting of the Ancients* (London: Richard Hodgkinson, 1638).

Junius can be categorized as a scholar who worked in the tradition of advanced humanist scholarship and Protestant theology. In early modern Protestant thought, and especially during the beginning period of confessionalization in which the religious scene in Europe grew more and more polarized, Junius was one of the foremost and creative voices addressing themes and challenging questions of his day throughout his writings. This is evident in that soon after his death in 1602 most of his writings were published as a collected work (his *Opera Theologica*), which saw three editions: Geneva (1607), Heidelberg (1608), and again Geneva (1613).⁷

Browsing through the two tomes of his *Opera Theologica* (comprising more than five thousand pages), one is impressed by the great diversity of subjects. This impression was shared by the nineteenth-century theologian Abraham Kuyper, who in 1882 published an edition of selected works of Junius. In the preface, Kuyper pointed to the international reputation of Junius, stating, “Junius taught everywhere, in France, Switzerland, Germany, and in the Netherlands (*apud nostrates*).” According to Kuyper, Junius was a preeminent teacher and scholar as well as a strong defender of Augustine’s and Calvin’s teachings.⁸

Junius was a prolific and versatile author. Besides several commentaries on the Pentateuch, the Old Testament prophets Ezekiel and Daniel, and a commentary on Revelation, he wrote on Hebrew grammar, exegesis, dogmatics, and ecclesiastical and natural law as well as other political issues that seemed to influence thinkers such as Hugo Grotius.⁹ Junius’s polemical writings include works against the *Controversiae* of the Jesuit Robert Bellarmine, consisting of seven *Animadversiones* in which

7. Unless specified by date, in this introduction I used the 1608 edition of the OT. References to Kuyper’s edition are also generally included.

8. “*Ubiq̄ue Iunius docuit. In Gallia, in Helvetia, in Germania, in Belgia, apud nostrates.*” See Kuyper, ed., ix.

9. Sarx, *Franciscus Junius d. Ä.*, 282ff. See also Hans Peterse, “Franciscus Junius (1545–1602) in Leiden: Sein Einfluss auf die protestantische Irenik in den Niederlanden des 16. und 17. Jahrhundert,” in *Reformierte Spuren: Vorträge der Vierten Emdener Tagung zur Geschichte des Reformierten Protestantismus*, ed. Jan Marius Lange van Ravenswaay and Herman J. Selderhuis, Emdener Beiträge zum reformierten Protestantismus, Bd. 8 (Wuppertal: Foedus, 2004), 97–102.

he discussed (among other things) Bellarmine's views on Holy Scripture and the authority of church councils and the pope. Most of these were published during the last years of his life.¹⁰ He also wrote against the Polish Socinians Christophorus Ostorodt and Andreas Voidovius, who arrived at Leiden in 1598 determined to study there. While Junius cordially received them, he refused to discuss their views as he thought them to be dangerous and heretical. In part owing to his instigation, Ostorodt and Voidovius were later forced to leave the Netherlands.¹¹

Junius also wrote noteworthy pieces on federal theology. In 1585 he began his academic career in Heidelberg with two orations on federal theology, and just before his death in 1602 he addressed the same subject in chapters 25 and 26 of his Leiden *Theological Theses* (respectively entitled *De foederibus et testamentis divinis* and *De veteri et novo Dei foedere*); in these writings he offered an extensive examination of federal terminology and salvation in its historical setting.¹² Although Junius did not develop a full-blown federal system within these pieces, he did mention the divine covenants with Adam, Noah, Abraham, Israel, and the church and further argued that God's revelation in various times and periods took place in the context of a covenant. This covenant of God is a gracious "disposition of God and offers the only

10. *Animadversiones VII. in Roberti Bellarmini controversiam primam christianae fidei...quam Rob. Bellarminus Politianus societas Jesu (ut vocant) disputationum suarum libris exaravit adversus huius temporis haereticos*, in OT, 2:406–1747. For their contents see Venemans, *Franciscus Junius*, 114–116; Sarx, *Franciscus Junius d. A.*, 288.

11. Venemans, *Franciscus Junius*, 46–47. Junius equated the Socinians with the followers of Paul of Samosata; this is made explicit in the titles of his Heidelberg publications of 1590 and 1591: *Defensio Catholicae doctrinae de S. Trinitate personarum in unitate essentiae Dei, adversus Samosatonicos errores specie inanis philosophiae in Polonia exundantes* as found in OT, 2:2–23.

12. Junius's two Heidelberg orations are as follows: *Francisci Junii Biturgis De promissione et federe gratioso Dei cum Ecclesia. Oratio prima*, in OT (Geneva, 1613), 1:13–22; *Francisci Junii Biturgis De foedere et testamento Dei in Ecclesia vetere. Oratio secunda*, in OT (Geneva, 1613), 1:22–30. The Leiden theological theses were entitled *Theses theologicae quae in incluta Academia Lugdunobatava ad exercitia publicarum Disputationum, praeside D. Francesco Iunio variis temporibus a Theologiae Candidatis adversus oppugnantes propugnatae sunt*, in OT, 1:1592–1752. For the two theses on divine covenants see OT (1608), 1:1661–1669; Kuyper, ed., 183–191.

way of salvation without which no one can or will ever attain grace with God."¹³ But Junius did not confine his understanding of covenant to its theological and ecclesiastical dimensions. It was especially the Noahic covenant that he used in political and juridical areas, proposing a civil or state covenant (*foedus civile*) on which the political commonwealth had to be based.¹⁴ This suggests Junius's possible impact on the federal political philosophy of Johannes Althusius (ca. 1557–1638), the Herborn school of federalism, and even the federal theology of Johannes Cocceius (1603–1669).¹⁵

As a respected Reformed orthodox theologian, Junius provided leadership under which the Leiden theological faculty could thrive. Together with Gomarus and Lucas Trelcatius Sr. (1542–1602), Junius made an important contribution to the development of the theological faculty of Leiden University, where he finished out his career. Remarkably, the humanist scholar and philologist Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540–1609) was of another opinion, calling Junius an *ingenium desultorium* (a superficial mind). In his letters to colleagues, Scaliger wrote rude and insulting things about the Leiden theology professor, even jotting down invective marginal notes such as “ape” (*simia*) and “donkey” (*asinus*) while studying Junius's philological works.¹⁶ Scaliger, who was a rather conceited and narrow-minded person, thought little of Junius's philological scholarship perhaps because he envied Junius's position as *professor primarius* at Leiden University. Scaliger's dislike of Junius may also have been the result of the latter daring to contest Scaliger's views of biblical chronology.¹⁷

13. OT, 1:1663: “...dispositio gratuita & unica salutis via, sine qua nullus unquam hominum in gratiam cum Deo rediit, aut redibit” (*Theses theologicae*, XXV, 14).

14. See Sarx, *Franciscus Junius d. Ä.*, 258–270.

15. See C. Malandrino, “Politische Theorie und Föderaltheologie,” in *Jurisprudenz, politische Theorie und politische Theologie: Beiträge des Herborner Symposiums zum 400. Jahrestag des Politica des Johannes Althubusius 1603–2003*, ed. Frederick S. Carney, Heinz Schilling, and Dieter Wyduckel (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2004), 123–142.

16. Venemans, *Franciscus Junius*, 50n188.

17. Christiaan Sepp, *Het godgeleerd onderwijs in Nederland: Gedurende de 16^e en 17^e eeuw* (Leiden: De Breuk en Smits, 1873), 1:89–99.

According to most of his colleagues, however, Junius's scholarship was greatly valued; the renowned humanist scholar Gerardus Johannes Vossius (1577–1649) defended Junius, his father-in-law, against Scaliger's negative comments, as did Hugo Grotius and Franciscus Gomarus, who both studied at Leiden University under the tutelage of Junius. Christiaan Sepp rightly observes that Scaliger appears to have retracted his insults in the memorial poem he wrote after the death of Junius:

For you a wailing school her master mourns,
An orphan church weeps for you her father,
And for her doctor groans the whole wide world.¹⁸

Mention should also be made of Junius's long-standing correspondence with the humanist scholar Justus Lipsius (1547–1606), a prominent representative of the Stoa-reception (Tacitus) in the second half of the sixteenth century. This exchange of letters clearly shows that Junius fully participated in the Republic of Letters (*respublica literaria*) in Europe during his professorship at Leiden. It was a stimulating factor for the development of his own ideas on social and political issues.¹⁹

It is also important to comment on Junius's relationship with Jacobus Arminius, who became professor at Leiden University in 1603. Junius carried on a correspondence with Arminius after meeting him at Leiden in 1596 at the wedding of Geertje Jacobsdochter (Arminius's aunt) and Johannes Cuchlinus, who had been regent of the Satencollege since 1592. During the wedding celebration, Arminius and Junius discussed the doctrine of predestination and agreed to exchange letters on the subject.²⁰ They promised to keep the correspondence confidential lest it cause trouble in the church. In this correspondence Arminius complained that Junius's position on predestination required the existence of sin for the execution of the decree of election. Junius responded

18. "*Te moerens scola flet suum magistrum / orba ecclesia te suum parentem / Doctorem gemit orbis universus.*" See Sepp, *Het godgeleerd*, 1:99. The Latin quotation is taken from the *praefatio* of Kuyper, ed., IX. See also Venemans, *Franciscus Junius*, 4.

19. See Sarx, *Franciscus Junius d. Ä.*, 98–99.

20. For more details of the correspondence between Junius and Arminius see Carl Bangs, *Arminius: A Study in the Dutch Reformation* (Grand Rapids: Francis Asbury Press, 1971), 199–203; Venemans, *Franciscus Junius*, 47–49.

to this complaint with twenty-eight propositions in which he refuted Arminius and defended his own view. Although he did not defend full supralapsarianism like Beza, Junius emphatically denied that his views made God the author of sin. When this correspondence was publicized by one of Junius's students, Arminius continued the debate, but Junius refused any further discussion. In 1613 the correspondence between Arminius and Junius was posthumously published under the title *Amica Collatio cum Francisco Junio*.²¹ In order to prevent Arminius's appointment at Leiden, Gomarus—then the senior member of the theological faculty—told the story that on his deathbed Junius had warned him against appointing Arminius as his successor at Leiden University. The curators of the university did not believe the story, however, telling Gomarus that he had no authority to speak on the matter.²²

It seems that the relationship between Junius and Arminius was somewhat ambivalent. While they could appreciate each other, theologically they disagreed. Despite the fact that Junius and his family had cordial relationships with the Remonstrants, it cannot be inferred that he shared the opinions of Arminius and later Remonstrants. The words of praise that the Remonstrant historian Geeraert Brandt dedicated to Junius in a Dutch poem show that he was admired for his peaceable disposition even by his theological opponents:

Famous Junius, virtuous pastor,
 and fourfold nobleman, by origin, intellect, science, and virtue,
 you are unlike the cruel torture of the Spanish fury.
 Your weapons were words, the power of Holy Scripture, the
 sharp sword of the Spirit, and the shield of endurance.
 You have contended falsehood by truth, hatred by love.
 Popish strong-arm tactics must make way for reason's gentle
 power.²³

21. Posthumously published in Leiden as *Amica cum D. Francisco Junio de praedestinatione per litteras habita collatio* (Lugduni Batavorum: apud Godefridum Basson, 1613).

22. See G. P. van Itterzon, *Franciscus Gomarus* ('s-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff, 1930), 81–82; and Keith D. Stanglin, *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation: The Context, Roots, and Shape of the Leiden Debates, 1603–1609* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 24.

23. See Geeraert Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie en andre Kerkelyke Geschiedenissen*,

Three Major Works

Junius's three most influential writings were his *Theological Theses*, the *Eirenicum*, and *True Theology*. The *Theological Theses*, composed during his time at Leiden, cover in short, numbered paragraphs the principal topics of theology. Consisting of fifty-seven heads of doctrine, these theses deal with theology, Scripture, tradition, God, predestination, the Trinity, creation, sin, law, gospel, covenant, Christ, faith, the Christian life, the church, sacraments, and the state of the soul after death. At the end of the Leiden theses, the editor of the first volume of Junius's *Opera Theologica* added several sets of theological theses that had been disputed under Junius at the University of Heidelberg—fifteen disputations referred to as the *Heidelberg Theses*.²⁴ Both sets of theological theses belong to the genre of the *disputatio*, the most celebrated genre of academic discourse since the middle of the thirteenth century. The academic background to this *disputatio* genre was the scholastic method. Both in his Heidelberg and Leiden theses Junius fully participated in this tradition, demonstrating an increasing precision in determining the context and content of theological concepts and terms by means of logical analysis.

A second important work published shortly after Junius's arrival at Leiden was his *Eirenicum on the Peace of the Catholic Church among Christians* (1593).²⁵ This work appeared almost simultaneously in both French and Latin editions. The French edition was addressed to the Catholic clergy in France (à Messieurs du Clergé, qui sont au Royaume de France). According to Cuno, this French edition must have been published before July 1593, the month of King Henry IV's conversion to the Roman Catholic Church. As Junius expressed hope that the Gallican Catholic Church in France would free itself from the Holy See in Rome,

in en ontrent de Nederlanden (Amsterdam: Jan Rieuwertsz, Hendrik en Dirk Boom, 1674), 2:30–42. The poem is printed on page 778 in the first volume of Brandt's two-volume work underneath the portrait of Junius.

24. *Theses aliquot Theologiae in Heidelbergense Academia disputatae in OT*, 1:1752–1784; Kuypers, ed., 289–338.

25. Junius, *Eirenicum de pace Ecclesiae Catholicae inter Christianos, quamvis diversis sententiis, religiose procuranda, colenda, atque continenda: In Psalmos Davidis CXXII & CXXXIII Meditatio* (Leiden: Fr. Raphelingius, 1593).

a dedication of this kind to the French Catholic clergy after July 1593 would have been meaningless. As can be further verified from Junius's correspondence with H. Smetius, the *Eirenicum* was indeed published before Henry IV's transition in March of 1593.²⁶ The Latin edition was addressed to Maurice, landgrave of Hesse, who was deeply involved in the Lutheran and Reformed disputes in his county.

In short, the *Eirenicum* consists of meditations on Psalms 122 and 133 in which Junius warmly urges cultivating a spirit of peace and unity in the churches, especially in Germany and France. For this reason Junius is often considered a representative of the so-called Reformed irenicism. While the religious scene in Europe grew more and more polarized as a result of confessionalization, Junius called for ecclesiastical peace. If resolution could not be immediately reached over theological disputes, Junius called on Christians to at least join forces. His irenic attitude emphasized how much common ground confessional enemies actually shared. He expressed appreciation for this by saying that although no confessions were equal, all were forms of Christianity with a common belief in the same Savior; likewise, those who professed Christ were all Christians. If they as brothers (*fratres*) would engage in constructive dialogue, abandoning all ambition to rule over one another, he was sure they could one day unite as members of a church that was catholic in the original meaning of the word: a universal church.

In this respect Junius was one of the first Reformed theologians who hoped that the disputes plaguing European Christendom might be resolved through serious dialogue. In the following decades, eminent scholars of every confession—such as George Cassander (Roman Catholic), George Callixtus (Lutheran), Hugo Grotius (Remonstrant), and David Pareus and John Dury (Reformed)—adopted the same approach.

Junius's mediation was further sought on the local level. He was frequently asked by church governments and city magistrates to mediate between conflicting religious parties. Thus, for example, the Utrecht magistrate requested him to mediate in a conflict involving one

26. Cuno, *Franciscus Junius*, 141.

of Utrecht's parish churches, the Jacobskerk. The conflict was between the Reformed consistory and the followers of the "liberal" pastor Huibert Duifhuis (1531–1581), who rejected any form of ecclesiastical discipline introduced by the local government. Although Junius did not agree with an Erastian model of church government, he counseled against separation of the Jacobi parish because right doctrine was not at stake.²⁷ At the request of Arminius and Jean Taffin, then ministers of the Walloon church in Amsterdam, Junius also became involved in the English separatist movement of the Brownists in Middelburg and Amsterdam led by Francis Johnson and Henry Ainsworth. In 1598 these English separatists published a confession of faith (*Confessio Fidei Anglorum in Belgio exulantium*) both to express their theological convictions shared with the Reformed churches but also to enumerate their objections against the Anglican Church. This confession was sent to the universities of Leiden, St. Andrews, Heidelberg, and Geneva, and the authors invited each theological faculty to respond with feedback. Junius felt forced to intervene, and by means of several letters he responded saying that this *consensus* was not reason for the crafting of a new confession of faith, and their separation was not warranted due to the deviating doctrines they listed. Therefore, the accusations directed against the Anglican Church (and the Amsterdam congregation) were unnecessary. Consequently, Junius argued their separated congregation was unnecessary and even illegitimate.²⁸ In both cases—Utrecht and Amsterdam—Junius strove to uphold the peace of the churches (*pax ecclesiarum*) as he had in his *Eirenicum*.

27. *Francisci Junii ad Ecclesiam Dei quae Ultrajecti est, de communionem sanctorum in pietate sanctimonia, charitate et oace per unitatem Spiritus colenda paraenesis* (Trajecti ad Rhenum: apud Salomonem Rodium, 1595). See Benjamin Kaplan, *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 131–132.

28. See Cuno, *Franciscus Junius*, 82–187; Venemans, *Franciscus Junius*, 43–45. At the Synod of North Holland in 1601 the Brownists were convicted as schismatics. See J. Reitsma and S. D. van Veen, eds., *Acta der Provinciale en Particuliere Synoden* (Groningen: J. B. Wolters, 1892), 1:306–308.

A Treatise on True Theology: Its Historical Context, Genre, and Purpose

Junius's most influential Latin work, *A Treatise on True Theology*, was first published in 1594. Junius dedicated this work to the curators of Leiden University and consuls of the city of Leiden. The full force of this treatise can be correctly determined only when it is considered together with his *Eirenicum*, published one year earlier. The historical value of *True Theology* is most evident when it is considered as a demonstration of the connection between humanist scholarship and the Reformed tradition in Junius's thought. It also demonstrates his attempt to establish a well-defined confessional identity of Reformed theology, one that at the same time was open to points of conversation with representatives of other confessions.²⁹

In this respect *True Theology* must be placed in the context of the confessional debates of the late sixteenth century. In Junius's estimation, the primary cause of these confessional conflicts was the imperfect nature of every human being, which indicated that this was not simply the fault of theologians and believers of other confessions but also of those in the Reformed church. What mattered most was not the issue of labeling something as orthodox as opposed to heresy, but the inadequacy of theological thinking. Junius did not expect a complete *consensus* in theology, for no theologian can claim that he has fully understood and grasped theology in an absolute sense (*theologia absoluta*). In this life theological knowledge remains imperfect pilgrim theology (*theologia viatorum*). Junius thus expected humility of his colleagues, urging them to be aware of their own imperfections and limitations when doing theology. Echoing his *Eirenicum*, in the last chapter of *True Theology* Junius outlines the two main concerns of this work: "The goal set before us in this life is *the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God*. We all must strive together for this unity in the communion of the saints and stretch every muscle, to the utmost of our ability, to lay hold of the fruit of that unity."³⁰

29. See Sarx, *Franciscus Junius d. Ä.*, 236–241.

30. See page 232 below. Cf. *De Theologia, OT*, 1:1423 (Kuyper, ed., 100).

In the preface to *True Theology*, Junius noted that this work was written due to the request of some of his “good men and my most devoted colleagues” (*bonorum et amantissimorum collegarum meorum postulatione*). His main goal in writing this treatise was to explain both what theology and a theologian are in order to inform all Christians about the value of theology in Jesus Christ (*de dignitate sua in Christo Iesu*) and to convince them of the seriousness of their task (*de sui muneris gravitate*), “avoiding other concerns as though they were sheer cliffs and the most treacherous Syrtes.”³¹ Junius thus expressed his hope that his expositions on true theology would help Christians to “spend their time in these duties day and night with utmost zeal in the presence of the Lord (who through the Spirit instructs those who reflect upon and read these works).”³² In this preface he also expressed his gratitude that the curators of the university had called him to Leiden, as he could now entirely devote himself to private study and public lectures. Leiden was for him “like Sparta”; here he was free from other all other occupations and troubles, things he had abhorred for so many years.

During his teaching years at Heidelberg, Junius had already addressed the question of the nature of theology. At the end of the first volume of his *Opera Theologica* is a set of twenty-seven theses, with the first one entitled “On the Definition of Theology.”³³ Moreover, during his teaching period at Leiden, Junius also discussed the topic, which is evident from the Leiden theses also printed in his *Opera Theologica*.³⁴ The question of the nature of theology was also included in the cycle of disputations at Leiden University presided over by Junius, Gomarus, and Trelcatius (published as *Compendium Theologiae*). Its first disputation, presided over by Junius and defended by Antonius Walaeus, consisted of twelve theses and was entitled *De vera theologia* (1597).³⁵ A

31. See page 83 below.

32. See page 83 below.

33. *De theologiae definitione*, thesis 1, as found in OT, 1:1752–1754.

34. *Theses Theologicae de variis doctrinae Christianae capitibus* as found in OT, 1:1592–1752.

35. Antonius Walaeus defended the twelve theses entitled *De vera theologia* under the presidency of Junius: *Disputationum theologiarum repetitarum prima: de vera*

final indication of Junius's longstanding reflections on the nature of the-ology can be found in a three-volume dogmatic handbook entitled *Sum of several commonplaces of Sacred Theology*, printed in the Genevan 1613 edition of his *Opera Theologica*.³⁶

Although comparison of these publications does not reveal any novel insights on the part of Junius, Donald Sinnema is of the opinion that Junius's various reflections on the nature of true theology reveal a developing position that came to maturation in *True Theology*. While Sinnema notes some areas where divergent formulations appear, a detailed comparison of these, though certainly worthwhile, exceeds the purpose of this introduction. It is sufficient to say here that Sinnema has shown that in some respects the Leiden reflections mark a change in Junius's thinking regarding the genus of true theology. Whereas in the Leiden theses Junius defined theology's genus as "the divine wisdom of things," in the earlier Heidelberg theses he distinguished theology as *scientia* for the following reason: "[Theology] alone has a just knowledge (*cognitionem*) of demonstrative conclusions concerning God and divine things, which conclusions are necessary, and they cannot be otherwise. It renders the mind of the knower steadfast and is content with con-templation of the truth by itself."³⁷ Sinnema further argues that the Heidelberg formulations reflect the arguments of Thomas Aquinas on this subject.³⁸

True Theology is comprised of thirty-eight chapters and is preceded by thirty-nine theses in which Junius defines his terms and essential

theologia. Quam...preside...D. Francisco Junio...: Sustinere adnitur Antonius Walaeus Gandensis. (Lugduni Batav.: ex officina Ioannis Patij, Die X. Decembris Anno, 1597).

36. Junius, *Summa Aliquot Locorum Communium SS. Theologiae tribus libris comprehensa*, in *OT* (Geneva 1613), 2:1809–1886.

37. Junius, *Theses Theologicae Heidelbergenses*, thesis 5, in *OT*, 1:1752: "Genus Theologiae scientia esse dicitur: quia haec sola iustam conclusionum apodictarum de Deo et divinis rebus cognitionem habet, quae conclusiones sunt necessariae, neque aliter se habere possunt; animum scientis immotum efficit; et veri contemplatione per se contenta est."

38. See Donald Sinnema, "Reflections on the Nature and Method of Theology at the University of Leiden before the Synod of Dort" (MA thesis, Institute for Christian Studies, Toronto, 1975), 67–78.

theological concern for understanding the task of theology. The work belongs to the so-called *locus* of prolegomena in which a rationale for the systematic organization of doctrine was presented. This organization became necessary in the later institutional and academic setting of Reformed theology.³⁹ It was only when Reformed academies and universities were established that formal discussion of the status and task of theology as well as its connection with other disciplines (especially philosophy) became urgent. These prolegomena set out the premises, presuppositions, or principles of their system of thought, providing an interpretative paradigm. One of the fundamental issues in the prolegomena of the Reformed orthodox systems was the meaning and usage of the term *theology*; considered as part of prolegomena were theology's parts and divisions, genus, subject, and object. For this reason Junius's teaching on this topic is of considerable interest. As will become clear when reading this piece, the importance of this treatise is that it clarifies the Reformed concept of Christian theology as fundamentally a relational enterprise, determined by and determinative of the divine–human relationship. In what follows I present a short overview of the main issues and arguments of *True Theology*.⁴⁰

The Existence of True Theology

The presentation of theology according to its origin, nature, forms, and parts occupies a central position in early orthodox prolegomena. In his presentation of the subject matter, Junius follows the standard scholastic pattern of argumentation as given in the following three questions: *An sit?* (Whether it is?), *Quid sit?* (What is it?), *Qualis sit?* (Of what sort is

39. See Richard A Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725*, 2nd ed., 4 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 1:53–55 (henceforth PRRD). According to Sinnema, the epistemological distinction between archetypal and ectypal theology reflects the influence of Thomas Aquinas so that Thomas is a direct source of Junius's archetypal/ectypal scheme.

40. In the following sections I draw heavily on my article: Willem J. van Asselt, "The Fundamental Meaning of Theology: Archetypal and Ectypal Theology in Seventeenth-Century Reformed Thought," *Westminster Theological Journal* 64 (2002): 319–335.

it?). Junius answers the first question in the affirmative: theology does exist. According to Junius, the existence of theology can be demonstrated not only from the etymology of the word *theology* but also from natural light (*naturae lux*), the consensus of all people (*consensus omnium populorum*), and the subject matter of theology itself (*res ipsa*).⁴¹ If God is the principle of all good things, then the conclusion can be made that all mankind has some knowledge of God and consequently knows the possibility and existence of theology.

Junius's affirmation of the existence of theology leads him to consider the second question concerning the nature of theology. Before answering this question, however, Junius desires that the reader know the distinction between false and true theology:

Thesis 3: Even if all believe that theology exists, nevertheless it is commonly spoken of in two ways. For one theology is true, the other is false and subject to opinion.

The truth of the matter has produced this equivocation which we have here established, when compared with our own vitiated and erroneous judgment and perception. For indeed it arises from the truth of the subject that the wisdom of divine matters exists, whatever in the final analysis it is and of what sort, and is also said to be true. But as a consequence of the perversion of our judgment and, with the sediment of our senses, so to speak, removing spiritual tastes from our minds, it happens that in this very serious matter also (as in other things) we embrace something false in place of what is true.⁴²

While Junius is of the opinion that a full discussion of false theology is not useful for Christian theology, he does provide a short definition and classification of it. False theology, he says, is *duplex*: it can be either

41. Thesis 2 states: "The subject itself as well as the agreement of all the nations demonstrates that theology exists. The subject shows it, for it is both true that God exists and that He is the principle of every good thing in the universe; and God both speaks and acts. The agreement of all nations shows it, for all by the light of nature acknowledge that theology exists." See page 93 below. Cf. *De Theologia*, OT, 1:1374 (Kuyper, ed., 46).

42. See page 95 below. Cf. *De Theologia*, OT, 1:1375 (Kuyper, ed., 47).

common (*vulgaris*) or philosophical (*philosophica*). False theology that is vulgar subsists in the imperfect principles of our nature, whereas philosophical false theology—the root of the three branches of mythical, physical, and political theology—is comprised of false conclusions made by erroneous arguments. This division is essentially an assimilation of the distinction made by Stoic philosopher Marcus Terentius Varro (116–27 BC), one that is generally followed by most Reformed scholastics. According to Junius, it was Augustine who transmitted this threefold division to the Christian tradition.⁴³ Nevertheless, Junius bypasses a thorough discussion of this paradigm because he wants to concentrate on the truth of theology as it leads to salvation. Since Junius's object is limited at this point—that is, true theology—pagan or natural theology does not play a role in his treatise on true theology. This is also true for much of later Reformed orthodoxy.

True Theology as Sapientia

As Junius's audience does not deny the existence of true theology, he proceeds immediately to answer the question, What is theology? (*Quid sit?*) Determinative of Junius's answer to this question are his answers to two other questions: first, whether our theology is a science and, second, whether this theology is theoretical (contemplative) or practical.⁴⁴ First,

43. See pages 96–97 below. Cf. *De Theologia*, OT, 1:1376 (Kuyper, ed., 47): "From the time, moreover, that the trunk, as it were, begins to emerge from that root of common theology, this philosophic kind is immediately spread into those three branches which I have previously designated by their respective titles: I mean, *superstitious*, *natural*, and *civil* theology. This is in accordance with Augustine's explanation from Varro and Seneca in *The City of God* 6.5. Those men said that mythical or superstitious theology is that which the poets especially employ for dramatic pleasure. The natural or physical type of theology is that which philosophers employ for understanding the world and searching out its true nature, in their own practices and academic pursuits. Finally, the political or civil theology is that which more powerful men employ, in order that they might establish certain laws of states and republics by the authority of religion." Cf. Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Theology and the Philosophy of Science*, trans. Francis McDonagh (London: Westminster John Knox Press, 1976), 7–8, who points to Clement's *Stromata* and to Aristotle.

44. It should be noted that the term *scientia* as used by Junius and other seventeenth-century theologians indicates a disciplined body of knowledge resting upon evident

Junius asks whether theology is *intelligentia*, *scientia*, *ars*, *prudentia*, or *sapientia*—namely, intelligence, knowledge, art, prudence, or wisdom. This fivefold classification comes from an important discussion in Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*; from the early thirteenth century onward the medieval doctors assimilated this paradigm, using it in their discussions of the genus of theology.⁴⁵ Because it was not specifically addressed in the theology of the Reformers, the Reformed scholastics drew upon this Aristotelian classification in order to identify their view of the genus of theology. According to the Aristotelian paradigm, academic disciplines are intellectual dispositions (*habitus intellectuales*) that are included within the basic disposition for knowing (*habitus sciendi*). Using Aristotle’s five basic ways of knowing (*intelligentia*, *scientia*, *ars*, *prudentia*, and *sapientia*), Junius next asks whether true theology can be best correlated with any of the recognized genus of academic discipline. Theology, he argues, is unlike *intelligentia* since *intelligentia* is identified as knowledge of principles but not of conclusions; theology, however, consists both in principles and conclusions drawn from them. Junius further argues that theology cannot be identified with *scientia* (discipline of drawing conclusions), nor is theology best identified with *ars*, which proceeds from *intelligentia* and *scientia* and terminates in some external work. Thus, Junius makes the case that theology must be viewed as *sapientia*. As seen in the following quotation, theology is wisdom in the sense that it combines theoretical and moral dispositions or capacities:

But our definition of theology encompasses all of these simultaneously. It includes the intellection of first principles, the knowledge of conclusions and ends, and it is the most beneficial skill of our work, by which we strive toward God. Clearly there is nothing that can pass judgment on all these matters with reliability except for wisdom, nothing else that can arrange them appropriately or set them forth in a saving manner. Now since this is the case,

principles. The rise of modern science was certainly evident in the seventeenth century, but the term *scientia* had not been restricted to the empirical and inductive disciplines. See Muller, “Scholasticism Protestant and Catholic: Francis Turretin on the Object and Principles of Theology,” *Church History* 55 (1986): 193–205.

45. See Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, VI, chapter 3.

there is no other genus that can be established for theology than wisdom, since it makes judgments about the first principles of the sciences in the understanding and about the conclusions from these, as well as embracing by its power all things that are necessary for the perfection of every good, and making use of them all most wisely.⁴⁶

From this discussion it appears that Junius was profoundly aware of the importance of the medieval debate over this issue. Although he did not cite the medieval theologians directly, it is apparent that he drew substantively upon them. Moreover, his words seem to suggest that this debate originated in Augustine's distinction of *sapientia* from *scientia* according to which sciences dealt with temporal things and wisdom with eternal things.⁴⁷

The second question Junius discusses under the section *Quid sit theologia?* is whether theology is contemplative or practical. Although he believes the issue is important, he deals with it briefly because his conclusions concerning the genus of theology entail the position that theology must be viewed as both theoretical and practical—that is, theology consists of things to be believed and things to be done. Theology defined as wisdom is “the most reliable indicator of principles, the most complete starting point of all sciences both theoretical and practical, and the wisest judge of all actions and reasons, greater than every limitation.”⁴⁸

The Divisions of True Theology

Having discussed the definition of theology, including the possibility or existence of true theology and its demarcation from false theology (including the discussion of the genus of true theology), Junius proceeds to elaborate the third question, *Qualis sit?* In his answer Junius was the first Reformed theologian to use the influential and basic division of

46. See page 101 below. Cf. *De Theologia*, OT, 1:1375 (Kuyper, ed., 49).

47. See, e.g., Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, trans. R. P. H. Green, *Oxford Early Christian Texts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), I.8.17–19.

48. See page 100 below. Cf. *De Theologia*, OT, 1:1375 (Kuyper, ed., 48).

theologia archetypa and *theologia ectypa*.⁴⁹ This division is perhaps best clarified by quoting theses 6 through 10 (theses that immediately follow his discussion of true theology as *sapientia* as expressed in thesis 5):

5. [True] theology is wisdom concerning divine matters (chapter 2).

6. This theology is either archetypal, undoubtedly the wisdom of God Himself, or it is ectypal, having been fashioned by God (chapter 3).

7. Archetypal theology is the divine wisdom of divine matters. Indeed, we stand in awe before this and do not seek to trace it out (chapter 4).

8. Ectypal theology, whether taken in itself, as they say, or relatively in relation to something else, is the wisdom of divine matters, fashioned by God from the archetype of Himself, through the communication of grace for His own glory (chapter 5).

9. And so this so-called theology taken in itself, in fact, is the whole wisdom of divine matters, communicable with what has been created according to the capacity of the one communicating it.

10. But the theology that is relative is the wisdom of divine matters communicated to things created, according to the capacity of the created things themselves. It is, moreover, communicated by union, vision, or revelation.⁵⁰

Archetypal and Ectypal Theology

In his comments on thesis 7, Junius introduces the distinction between archetypal and ectypal theology. He defines archetypal theology as the theology of God in Himself. It is the theology according to which the triune God knows Himself and everything that is outside Him

49. See also Heinrich Schmid, *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche: dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1983), 25–30; Robert D. Preus, *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism: A Study of Theological Prolegomena* (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1970), 1:114; 1:168–172; Muller, *PRRD*, 1:225–238; Van Asselt, “The Fundamental Meaning of Theology,” 322–324.

50. See pages 85–96 below.

by an indivisible act of knowing. It is God's eternal and essential wisdom and therefore God's essence itself in which all things are present without being the result of a discursive process.⁵¹ Because the topic *de theologia* was not methodologically treated by Luther, Calvin, or their contemporaries, later generations of Protestant theologians like Junius fell back on the theological prolegomena of the medieval scholastics.⁵² According to Junius, the concept of archetypal and ectypal theology can be traced back to the medieval scholastic distinction between divine self-knowledge and human knowledge of God. Junius's use of this distinction is a good example of the critical reception of the Christian tradition by Reformed theology. He refers to the orthodox fathers who used the term *archetypus* to indicate a *theologia exemplaris* of divine and immutable character, and the term *ectypa* to distinguish a theology that God accommodated to human understanding. More recent theologians (*recentiores*) call the first theology *secundum se*, or absolute, the latter theology *secundum quid*, or theology in relation to human creatures. Archetypal theology, however, is theology in its proper sense; that is, it is the infinite wisdom of God concerning Himself and His works *ad intra* as they are necessary to Him and ordered by Him in a perpetual relationship according to His infinite reason. On the other hand, ectypal theology is the wisdom creatures have concerning God and about the

51. See pages 108–109 below. Cf. *De Theologia*, OT, 1:1377 (Kuyper, ed., 51): “[Divine] wisdom indeed is eternal, essential, and is even the essence of God. To it all things are most present, not from any principles, composition or division of the intellect, reasoning, conclusions, knowledge, judging, and sequence, but in the simplest way: by a simultaneous, unparalleled understanding of everything, and not in succession as happens with created things. It gives birth to these principles from itself. It is not born from them. This wisdom produces intellect, reason, conclusions, knowledge, and wisdom itself in others. It persists in itself immutable and without variation.”

52. See Joannes Altenstaig and Joannes Tytz, *Lexicon Theologicum* (Cologne, 1619; Hildesheim: Olms, 1974), 907–911. See also Sebastian Rehnman, *Divine Discourse: The Theological Methodology of John Owen* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 57–63. According to Rehnman the concept of archetypal theology can be traced back to Aristotle's conception of a divine science that is most honorable and alone divine (*Metaphysica* I, ii, 14). Pseudo-Dionysius supposed a theology of God himself, a theology of created spirits, and a theology of pagans. Similar divisions can be found in the twelfth century.

things that are ordered toward God, all communicated by Him. The two are so disparate that it is impossible to subsume them under one common chapter. Therefore, for Junius archetypal and ectypal theology cannot be placed under one genus since archetypal theology is identical with the divine essence, which by definition cannot be shared with anything else.⁵³ There is then a radical disjunction between God's own infinite and necessary (Trinitarian) wisdom and knowledge of Himself and man's finite and contingent wisdom and knowledge of God.

According to Junius's contemporary Amandus Polanus (1561–1610), professor of theology in Basel, the distinction between divine and human knowledge can be traced back to Scotus's commentary on the *Sententiae*, where he introduced the concepts of *theologia in se* and *theologia nostra*.⁵⁴ In his own systematic formulation of Reformed theology, Polanus references this medieval author's definition. Not surprisingly, Junius's discussion of archetypal and ectypal theology is reminiscent of Scotus's definition of theology.⁵⁵ Arguably, the distinction of archetypal and ectypal theology also stands in continuity with

53. See pages 104–105 below. Cf. *De Theologia*, OT, 1:1376 (Kuyper, ed., 50): “And indeed this archetypal theology seems to me once to have been called by the orthodox fathers exemplary. God has fashioned the second kind of theology on the model of the divine and immutable exemplar, proportionally to the creatures' capacity. More contemporary authorities have designated the former theology as in relation to itself, and the second one as relative. The one theology is the very same thing as unbounded wisdom, which God possesses concerning His own person and all other things, as they have been set in order with respect to Him necessarily, individually, and by an uninterrupted relation among themselves. This happens according to His own infinite reason. But the second theology is that wisdom which the creatures have concerning God according to their own manner, and concerning those things that are oriented toward God through His communication of Himself. Now indeed these two kinds of theology are so different that they cannot truthfully be related to some one, definite head and shared genus.”

54. Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf, *Syntagma theologiae christianae*, 2 vols. (Hannover: apud Claudium Marnium, 1609), 2:11–12.

55. Duns Scotus, *Lectura librum primum sententiarum*, in *Opera Omnia* (Civitas Vaticana: Typis polyglottis Vaticanis, 1950–), XVI, prolog. q. III, lec. iv: “Sacra theologia, sive in se considerata, sive prout est in nobis, tum quoad veritates necessarias, tum quoad contingentes, habet pro objecto primo, & adaequato ipsum solum Deum; quatenus tamen est de contingentibus, & est in Deo, vel beatis, habet pro subjecto essentiam divinam, ut est haec.”

early Protestant thought. According to Muller, traces of it can be found in Luther's distinction between *theologia gloriae* and *theologia crucis* and in Calvin's distinction between the eternal word of God and the revealed Word of God.⁵⁶

For Junius, archetypal theology is uncreated and identical with the divine being itself. It is essential to God, and thus it is most simple, eternal, intuitive, nondiscursive, absolute, incommunicable, infinite, and most perfect.⁵⁷ It is infinite because as principle of all things it pertains to every universal and particular; before God nothing is hidden, but all things are open and laid bare to His eyes (Heb. 4:13). It is incommunicable for it belongs to God alone (*propria Dei*); as such it cannot be comprehended by any creature, and so we are not called to search it out, but to adore it.⁵⁸

Although similar statements are found in later Reformed scholastics, this use of the term *theology* for divine knowledge was not supported unanimously. According to Muller, Lucas Trelcatius (1573–1603) and Franciscus Turretinus (1623–1678) developed a simpler division of theology, limiting the proper use of the term *theology* to human knowledge of God. Junius, however, does not hesitate to use the term *theology* both for God's knowledge of Himself and for human knowledge of God.⁵⁹ Nevertheless, Junius stressed that God's uncreated and essential archetypal theology differs entirely from ectypal theology, the latter being accidental and finite and a sort of outflow and efflux (*aporroë*) of the former. Junius explains:

Thesis 8: Ectypal theology, whether taken in itself, as they say, or relatively in relation to something else, is the wisdom of divine

56. Muller, *PRRD*, 1:125.

57. Muller notes there existed a "minor point of disagreement" among the Reformed orthodox as to whether the distinction between archetypal and ectypal theology is parallel to the distinction between *scientia necessaria* and *scientia libera* in the divine attributes. Junius tended to identify *theologia archetypa* with the *scientia necessaria*. See Muller, *PRRD*, 1:234.

58. See page 107 below. Cf. *De Theologia*, OT, 1:1377 (Kuyper, ed., 51): "Thesis 7: Archetypal theology is the divine wisdom of divine matters. Indeed, we stand in awe before this and do not seek to trace it out."

59. For this debate among the Reformed scholastics see Muller, *PRRD*, 1:131.

matters, fashioned by God from the archetype of Himself, through the communication of grace for His own glory.⁶⁰

With this definition Junius clarifies the different causes of ectypal theology. Although theology is preeminently in the mind of God Himself, this divine self-knowledge is the causal basis for human theology. Ectypal theology is thus created by God, its efficient cause. Just as the moon receives its light from the sun, so God, in ectypal theology, communicates His true light to creatures.⁶¹ But not only is God the efficient cause (*causa efficiens*) of ectypal theology, He is at the same time its final cause (*causa finalis*) because theology is meant to glorify God. Junius further explains that the material cause (or subject matter) of ectypal theology concerns the *res divinae*, and the formal cause is indicated by the phrase “[Ectypal theology] is fashioned from the archetypal one through the communication of grace (*ex archetypo illa informatam per communicationem gratiae*).”⁶²

Junius’s use of Aristotelian aetiology raises the issue of the Protestant scholastic use of causal language. The popular response has been that this language is symptomatic of an excessive Aristotelianism and, in the case of the Reformed orthodox, is evidence of a betrayal of the more biblical approaches to theology as given by the Reformers. Some have claimed this is evidence of a Protestant scholastic metaphysical and deterministic interest. But Junius introduces the causal terminology of Aristotle simply to explain the origin of ectypal theology. In this way he formalized and nuanced the discussion, providing a context within which the arguments concerning the distinction between archetypal and ectypal theology could be understood. As evident in this work,

60. See page 113 below. Cf. *De Theologia*, OT, 1:1379 (Kuyper, ed., 53).

61. See pages 114–115 below. Cf. *De Theologia*, OT, 1:1379 (Kuyper, ed., 54): “And indeed because God alone is true light and subsists through *Himself*, nor are there any shadows in Him...therefore, in the same way that the sun lends its light to the moon, so we have with certainty established from the words of his own apostles (Eph. 3:10; James 1:18) that God, in whom is light, and that true light which illuminates every person who comes into this world (John 1:9), is a light to created things, and that He shares His own light with them and makes His manifold wisdom known in heaven and on earth.”

62. See page 115 below. Cf. *De Theologia*, OT, 1:1380 (Kuyper, ed., 54).

Junius used causal language not as an overarching pattern, but as a heuristic tool designed to ground a whole series of issues explaining his theological epistemology.⁶³ This especially becomes clear when we note Junius's distinction regarding the causes of ectypal theology; he differentiates between the internal concept of ectypal theology in the mind of God and the external form in which God communicates this concept to human beings. The internal concept in the mind of God is His divine will and grace; the external form is the body of knowledge that God decided to reveal to mankind. Junius compares God's internal concept of ectypal knowledge to a source (*fons*), whereas the external form he likens to a lake (*lacus*) derived from the source.⁶⁴

Furthermore, the concept of ectypal knowledge existing in the mind of God must be distinguished from archetypal theology. Junius calls the former *theologia simpliciter dicta* or theology absolutely considered; this differs from archetypal theology in that the latter is incommunicable while the former is communicable. When communication of ectypal knowledge takes place then *theologia simpliciter dicta* becomes *theologia secundum quid* (i.e., relational theology), for it depends upon God's

63. The work of Paul Kristeller, Charles Schmitt, and Heiko Oberman, and its application to Protestant scholasticism by Preus, Muller, and Trueman, have shown that this facile equation of scholasticism and Aristotelianism is no longer tenable. See Paul Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic, and Humanist Strains* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961); Charles B. Schmitt, "Towards a Reassessment of Renaissance Aristotelianism," in *Studies in Renaissance Philosophy and Science* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1981); Preus, *Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:72; Muller, *PRRD*, 1:passim; *PRRD*, 2:232–235. In this regard the work of Carl Trueman is particularly helpful: see his *The Claims of Truth: John Owen's Trinitarian Theology* (Carlisle, Pa.: Paternoster, 1998), 34–46.

64. See pages 115–116 below. Cf. *De Theologia*, OT, 1:1380 (Kuyper, ed., 54): "For form, from whatever craftsman it arises, is properly constituted as twofold: The one exists in the mind of the craftsman, while the other is in his work. And thus inasmuch as internal and external action alike are contemplated in our affairs, so also is form twofold: internal and external. We designate the internal form that eternal concept, so to speak, of the divine will and grace contemplated in God Himself. But the external one is the effect of that eternal concept (as we would put it) on other things, made in its own time. God fashions this wisdom in two ways, internally by His most wise counsel, and externally by His most powerful work. But because this form is twofold, it subsists in God as in a fountain but is diverted into other things as into lakes."

gracious accommodation of Himself to a form that finite beings are capable of understanding. Junius calls this accommodated theology a second-order theology, whereas he considered *theologia simpliciter dicta* to be a first-order theology.

This does not mean, however, that for Junius the identity of archetypal theology with the divine essence of God renders Him incapable of communicating to the created order. God Himself bridges the gap by graciously revealing ectypal theology to His creatures by an act of His free and contingent will *ad extra*. At the same time, the distinction between archetypal and ectypal theology underscores the fact that human beings do not have direct access to the knowledge of God. Thus, humans are dependent on God's external self-disclosure. In other words, there is no way of access from man to God, but only from God to man.

Finally, Junius stresses that both forms of ectypal theology (*theologia simpliciter dicta* and *secundum quid*) equal the distinction between *theologia in se* and *theologia in subjectis*, namely, theology in itself and theology in finite knowing subjects. While the former (*theologia in se*) is communicable by God—but cannot be grasped by human effort—ectypal theology *in subjectis* is a mediated and communicated theology. It is an act of God's will without which He would remain unknown and unknowable. Therefore, the main interest of theologians, Junius comments, should not be focused on ectypal theology that is *theologia in se*, but on the theology *secundum quid* or *in subjectis* (that is, the relational and communicated form of ectypal theology). Junius concludes this section emphasizing that “this theology is particularly ours, the one by the communication of which we drink from the abundance of God in Christ Jesus (John 1:16).”⁶⁵

Three Kinds of Ectypal Theology

Having discussed the fundamental distinctions between archetypal and ectypal theology, Junius discusses next the three *genera* of ectypal theology (*in subjecto*), each distinguished from the next as it can be communicated in different ways and to different subjects: by union (*unione*)

65. See page 116 below. Cf. *De Theologia*, OT, 1:1380 (Kuyper, ed., 54).

to Christ, by vision (*visione*) to the beatified, and by revelation (*revelatione*) to the pilgrim or *viator*. In descending order, ectypal theology can thus be communicated to Jesus Christ, to the spirits in heaven, and to people on earth. When ectypal theology is communicated by union, the result is the theology of Christ as the God-man (*theanthropos*) or the theology of the Mediator (*theologia unionis in Christo*); when communicated to the blessed in heaven, the result is *theologia visionis*; and when communicated to men on earth it results in *theologia revelationis*. Junius's discussion of this threefold communication of ectypal theology is worth quoting at length:

The first theology is the highest and most complete of them all, from which we all draw (John 1:16). And it exists in Christ according to His humanity. The second theology is perfect, by which blessed spirits acquire in the heavens the glorious vision of God and by which we ourselves will, in the same way, see God (1 John 3:2). The third, finally, is not perfect in its own right, but rather through the revelation of faith it has been so endowed with the principles of the same truth that it can conveniently be called full and complete from our perspective. Yet it is incomplete if it should be compared with that heavenly theology for which we hope, as the apostle taught the Corinthians (1 Cor. 13:12). And so this, in sum, is our theology.⁶⁶

It is particularly interesting that Junius's subdivisions of ectypal theology *in subjecto* are dominated by a christological emphasis. This christological framework is unmistakably present as Junius makes the point that the theology of union in Christ is the principle of the two other forms of ectypal theology—the theology of vision and revelation. Whereas archetypal theology is the *matrix* of all forms of theology, the theology of union is the mother (*mater*) of the two other forms of ectypal theology, that is, the theology of vision and revealed theology. Junius concludes:

The archetypal is the fount of them all, but the ectypal is, as it were, the common reservoir or storage vessel. From the divine

66. See pages 119–120 below. Cf. *De Theologia*, OT, 1:1383 (Kuyper, ed., 56).

fullness of this saving vessel, created things draw in two ways: One group of them by sight in God's presence, the other by revelation, though they are of course absent and on pilgrimage away from the Lord (2 Cor. 5:6–7). From these two modalities the two other *genera* of ectypal theology have proceeded: One of these the orthodox fathers called the theology of the blessed, the other, that of pilgrims. Therefore the second form of the ectypal theology is the theology of the blessed, or the exalted theology. The third we can call that of pilgrims or the humble type. And so Christ sanctified both these types of theology in His own person, since He both experienced the humble theology in the humiliation of the flesh, and now enjoys the exalted type in that very exaltation by which He now has been exalted above every name, evidently so that He might show that the common principle of each theology resides in Himself.⁶⁷

The conclusion seems to be justified that in *True Theology* Christology undergirds the presuppositions and approach to the nature of true theology.

Pilgrim Theology

The last category of ectypal theology is that of pilgrims on earth or *theologia viatorum*—a theology preceding the theology of the beatified in heaven. Here Junius draws upon the traditional distinction between pilgrims and blessed, along with the corresponding *in via* and *in patria*, a concept that dates back to at least Augustine and was used extensively by medieval theologians.⁶⁸ Commenting on 1 Corinthians 13:8–9, Junius declares that in contrast to the perfection and permanence of both the theology of union and vision, the theology of the “viator” is “mixed with our weakness and imperfection because it comprehends only the basic principles of that most perfect theology in heaven. By these principles

67. See pages 129–130 below. Cf. *De Theologia*, OT, 1:1387 (Kuyper, ed., 59).

68. See, for example, Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, I.5.10; I.11.22; I.17.34. For late medieval theology, see Altenstaig and Tytz, *Lexicon Theologicum*, 908–909. See also Heiko Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (Durham, N.C.: Labyrinth Press, 1983), 62–63, 77.

that are indeed perfect in and of themselves but rendered imperfect in a certain way [they] are carried up to heavenly perfection.”⁶⁹ The language of *in via* and *in patria* further indicate a strong teleological and eschatological orientation of theology. Theology on earth is thus always a pilgrim theology and, therefore, an imperfect theology.⁷⁰

According to Junius, nature and grace are the two basic forms for the communication of revealed or pilgrim theology. Nature represents an internal or immanent ground for the communication of divine knowledge, whereas grace represents an external ground for its communication. On the basis of the former a natural (revealed) theology is constructed, and on the basis of the latter is built a supernatural (also revealed) theology.⁷¹

A final comment should also be made about Junius’s identification of theology as a mixed discipline (i.e., that it is both speculative/contemplative and practical). Although Junius’s distinctions between archetypal and ectypal theology can be traced back to Scotist origins, this does not mean he held the Scotist view of theology as an essentially practical discipline. Like most of the Reformed orthodox, Junius assumed that theology was a mixed discipline in its approach to the knowledge of God; it is both contemplative and practical.⁷²

69. See page 136 below. Cf. *De Theologia, OT*, 1:1388 (Kuyper, ed., 61).

70. See also Johann Heinrich Heidegger, *Corpus theologiae christianae*, 2 vols. (Zurich: J. H. Bodmer, 1700), I.1.lxvii: “Theologia viae, seu tradita in Systemate, seu, ut habitus mentem occupans, quamdiu peregrinamur a Domino, imperfecta semper est, & continuo profectu de die in diem perfici debet. In omnibus enim & singulis imperfectior, quam in via cognosci poterat. Quis enim vel Prophetarum vel Apostolorum omnia mysteria, quae in verbo Dei continentur, perfecte intellexit?”

71. See pages 141–143 below. Cf. *De Theologia, OT*, 1:1390 (Kuyper, ed., 63–64). “Thesis 14: The mode, moreover, of communicating theology is twofold, by nature and by grace. The former happens as an internal principle of communication. The latter, by an external principle of the first one. Thus it happens that the one theology is termed natural and the second supernatural.... When we say natural, we do not want it in this passage to be understood by the same meaning as we showed in the first chapter above from Varro and Augustine, but rather by its own sense and taken in itself as we will soon (if God wills) define it.”

72. See page 114 below. Cf. *De Theologia, OT*, 1:1379 (Kuyper, ed., 53): “In this category of wisdom [theologia ectypa] doubtless it was proper that both of these should be set: the theoretical and the practical [τὸ θεωρητικὸν, καὶ τὸ πρακτικὸν].

The Significance of Junius's True Theology for Reformed Dogmatics

After its introduction by Junius, the distinction between archetypal and ectypal theology (along with its subdivisions) became commonplace in Protestant orthodoxy and was treated in every systematic work of note. Whereas Junius offered a thorough and at times original investigation of the fundamental meaning of theology and its scientific foundations, his successors primarily presented a summary of his main results. This is true not only of the Reformed theologians but also of Lutheran dogmaticians. Thus Johannes Gerhard (1582–1637), generally considered to be the most prominent orthodox Lutheran theologian after Luther, followed (at times *verbatim*) the order of Junius's discussions.⁷³ In fact, there is little difference between the Lutheran and Reformed orthodox on these points, except on the matter of the *theologia unionis*.

According to Junius and his Reformed colleagues, and contrary to most Lutheran scholastics, the theology of union did not involve the communication of archetypal theology to Christ's human nature. While Gerhard simply stated that the theology of union was, by virtue of the personal union, a perfect knowledge of God and divine things, the Wittenberg professor Abraham Calov (1612–1686) went a step further, asserting that Christ, according to His human nature, possessed archetypal theology by virtue of the exchange of properties between the two natures of Christ (*communicatio idiomatum*). According to Calov, this rested on the supposition that the unity of the two natures in Christ's person demanded a real communication or sharing of attributes.⁷⁴ Consequently the Lutherans stated that Christ was in possession of the archetypal knowledge of God as it was communicated to His human nature. Junius and the Reformed scholastics emphatically

The one is situated in the contemplation of what is true; the other in the useful knowledge of what is just and unjust."

73. For Gerhard's dependence on Junius, see Preus, *Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:114. See also Carl Heinz Ratschow, *Lutherische Dogmatik zwischen Reformation und Aufklärung*, Teil I (Gütersloh: Verlaghaus Gerd Mohn, 1964), 27–29 (on Johann Friedrich König's *Theologia positiva acroamatica* [Rostock: Richter, 1699]).

74. For a detailed discussion on Calov's reflections on archetypal and ectypal theology, see Preus, *Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 1:167–173.

denied this, arguing that the finitude of the human nature cannot grasp the infinity of God (*finitum non capax infiniti*). Furthermore, they argued Christ's humanity did not get lost in His divinity. Christ was like us in all things—also with respect to knowledge—and because His human nature has certain limitations, there was room for it to develop (cf. Luke 2:52). Thus, for Junius and the Reformed, Christ could not possess archetypal theology; the theology of union did not involve the communication of archetypal theology to Christ's human nature. Secondly, against the Lutheran doctrine of the *genus majesticum*—a doctrine stating that the human nature of Christ participates in the divine glory and majesty—Junius and his Reformed colleagues argued that this would imply a change in God's essence.⁷⁵ Rather, they argued the properties or attributes of each of the two natures coincide in the one person of Christ and could only be predicated of Him personally. The exchange of properties, therefore, exists from the two natures to the person, and not between the two natures. Because the *communicatio idiomatum* does not take place in the abstract (i.e., between the natures), but in the concrete (i.e., at the level of the person), Jesus Christ does not possess archetypal theology. Although a detailed description of this debate exceeds the limits of this introduction, arguably the results of Reformed and Lutheran Christology played a significant role in shaping the form and contents of Reformed prolegomena.

As indicated earlier, during the first half of the seventeenth century the distinction between archetypal and ectypal theology was assumed

75. See pages 122–123 below. Cf. *De Theologia, OT*, 1:1384 (Kuyper, ed., 56–57): “Therefore the human nature does not contain in itself that divine and archetypal knowledge because it is a mark of divine perfection that it cannot be communicated and of human weakness that it cannot contain those things which belong to divine perfection. Then the very personal union of the two natures in Christ also demonstrates by absolute necessity that the matter is as I have described. For the union of persons does not bring about either a confusion or a transfusion of the properties that pertain to the one nature or the other. But instead it requires that the saving properties of each nature be preserved in the common subject and its operations.... Whoever does not think that the knowledge of Christ as a man should be distinguished from the knowledge of that same one as God, such men for sure, though unawares, will slip little by little into the camp of Apollinaris.”

by nearly every Reformed author. To give only a few examples: Aman-
 dus Polanus concisely summarized Junius's paradigm in his *Syntagma*
 (1609); Johannes Alsted, professor of philosophy and theology at Her-
 born (Germany) and later in Weissenburg (Transylvania), used Junius's
 distinctions in his *Methodus Sacrosanctae Theologiae* (1614); Johannes
 Polyander addressed the topic in the *Synopsis purioris theologiae* (1625),
 an influential compendium of the period; and Johannes Wollebius cited
 Junius's distinctions almost *verbatim* in his *Christianae Theologiae Com-
 pendium* (1626).⁷⁶

During the second half of the seventeenth century, Junius's clas-
 sification became normative for many Reformed theologians in their
 study of theology as a discipline. It is found not only in the high ortho-
 dox systems of Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676), Melchior Leydecker
 (1642–1721), Petrus van Mastricht (1630–1706), and Francis Turretin
 (1623–1687) but also in the prolegomena of federal systems like those
 of Johannes Cocceius (1603–1669), Franciscus Burman (1628–1679),
 Johann Heinrich Heidegger (1633–1698), Abraham Heidanus (1597–
 1678), and Johannes Braun (1628–1708).⁷⁷ It is important to note the

76. Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae christianae, Synopsis Libri I*; J. H. Alsted, *Methodus sacrosanctae theologiae octo libri tradita* (Hanau: Conradi Eifridi, 1623), I, iv; *Synopsis purioris theologiae, disputationibus quinquaginta duabus comprehensa ac conscripta per Johannem Polyandrum, Andream Rivetum, Antonium Walaecum, Antonium Thysium, S.S. Theologiae doctores et professores in Academia Leidensi*, ed. Herman Bavinck (Leiden: Donner, 1881), I.i.3–9; Johannes Wollebius, *Christianae Theologiae Compendium* (Basel, 1626), *Praecognita*, I.i.

77. See Gisbertus Voetius, *Diatribae de Theologia, Philologia, Historia et Philosophia Sacra. Cum indice locorum quorundam Script. et syllabo mater. ac quaestionum Philosophico-theologicarum* (Utrecht: S. de Vries, 1668), 2–23; Voetius, *Syllabus problematum theologicorum: Quae pro re nata proponi aut perstringi solent in iprivatis publicis disputationum, examinum, collationum, consultationum exercitiis* (Utrecht; ex officina Aegidii Roman, 1643), A1r–A2r; Melchior Leydecker, *De Verbogentheid des Geloofs eenmaal den heiligen overgeleverd of het Kort Begrip der ware Godsgeleerdheid* (Rotterdam: Adrianus van Dyk, 1700), I. i. 4–6; Petrus van Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia*, 2 vols. (Utrecht: Thomae Appels, 1699), I.i.15; Heidegger, *Corpus theologiae christianae*, I.i.1; Franciscus Turretinus, *Institutio theologiae elencticae in tres partes distributa*, 3 vols. (Geneva: Samuelem De Tournes, 1688), I.iii. 5–8; Johannes Cocceius, *Aphorismi per universam theologiam breviores and Aphorismi per universam theologiam prolixiores in Opera omnia*, 8 vols. (Amsterdam: Someren, 1673–1675), VII: §2 and §3;

great variety of theologians who followed Junius's divisions and classification of theology as found in his *True Theology*. This should warn us against making a facile juxtaposition of federal–biblical theology with scholastic–dogmatic theology, an error found in many of the discussions of federal theology.⁷⁸

Furthermore, the archetypal/ectypal distinction was not confined to Continental Reformed theology, but can also be found in English Puritan theologians such as John Owen and Richard Baxter.⁷⁹ Jacobus Arminius also endorsed Junius's distinction between archetypal and ectypal theology, but later Arminian theologians like Simon Episcopius (1583–1643) and Philippus van Limborch (1633–1712) vehemently rejected this distinction as “vain subtleties without solidity and utility.”⁸⁰ By giving up this distinction, however, their theological systems

Cocceius, *Summa theologiae ex Scripturis repetita in Opera omnia*, 8 vols. (Amsterdam: Someren, 1673–1675), VI: cap. 1 §3; Franciscus Burman, *Synopsis theologiae & speciatim oeconomiae foederum Dei, ab initio saeculorum usque ad consummationem eorum*, 2 vols. (Utrecht, 1681), I.ii.36–37; Abraham Heidanus, *Corpus theologiae christianae*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Luchtmans, 1686), 1:1–2; Johannes Braunius, *Doctrina foederum, sive systema theologiae didacticae & elencticae* (Amsterdam, 1702), I.i.5.

78. See for example, C. S. McCoy, “The Covenant Theology of Johannes Cocceius” (PhD diss., Yale University, 1956), 89–90, 236; H. Faulenbach, *Weg und Ziel der Erkenntnis Christi: Eine Untersuchung zur Theologie des Johannes Cocceius* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973), 46–47.

79. See Trueman, *Claims of Truth*, 54–64; Rehnman, *Divine Discourse*, 57–71; Simon Burton, *The Hallowing of Logic: The Trinitarian Method of Richard Baxter's Methodus Theologiae* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 32–33.

80. For Arminius's use of the distinction between archetypal and ectypal theology, see Richard Muller, *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius: Sources and Directions of Scholastic Protestantism in the Era of Early Orthodoxy* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1991), 60–62. For Simon Episcopius, see his *Institutiones theologiae* in *Opera Theologica*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam: Ioannis Blaeu, 1650), I.1.4: “Nec dicam operose de Theologia, quas vocant, speciebus, in quas Theologiam analogice dividere quidam solent, videlicet de Archetypo & Ectypo, sive ut barbare quidam loquuntur, Archetypa & Ectypa... quae vanitatis plus habent quam utilitatis, & subtilitatis plus quam soliditatis, imo quae etiam falsa sunt.” For Philippus van Limborch, see his *Theologia christiana. Ad praxin pietatis ac promotionem pacis christianae unice directa* (Amsterdam: apud Henricum Wetstenium, 1686), I.i.1: “Solet vulgo Theologia dividi in Archetypam, qua Deus se ipsum novit & omnia divina; & Ectypam, quae expressa sit ad illam ideam, & communicata tripliciter: 1. per unionem hypostaticam, Jesu Christo; 2. per visionem, Angelis; 3. per revelationem, hominibus. Sed vitiose.

proved to be more open to seventeenth-century rationalism, whereas the Reformed system—due to its archetypal and ectypal paradigm—presented a vital opposition to it.

The divisions and classifications of *True Theology* were still prominent into the eighteenth century, evident in the prolegomena of late orthodox theologians. Johannes à Marck (1656–1731) and Bernardinus de Moor (1709–1780) carefully worked through Junius’s classifications.⁸¹ De Moor emphasized that the *archetypa–ectypa* distinction is founded on biblical grounds (e.g., Matt. 11: 27; 1 Cor. 2:10–11) and that it is conducive for thoughtful meditation on God’s revelation in conjunction with the practice of piety.⁸²

Finally, some nineteenth- and twentieth-century authors, such as Abraham Kuypers, Herman Bavinck, Louis Berkhof, and Wolfhart Pannenberg, commented on Junius’s arrangement of theology.⁸³ It is somewhat ironic that at the end of his career Karl Barth—more than once a severe critic of early modern Reformed theology—highlighted the importance of Junius’s distinction by stating in his *Einführung in die evangelische Theologie* (1962) that the history of Neo-Protestant theology would have been quite different and much better “if these seemingly

Theologia enim revelata non est expressa ad ideam cognitionis illius, qua Deus seipsum cognoscit naturaliter.”

81. Johannes à Marck, *Compendium theologiae christianae didactico-elencticum* (Amsterdam: R. & G. Wetstenii, 1722).

82. Bernardinus de Moor, *Commentarius perpetuus in Johannis Marckii compendium theologiae christianae didactico-elencticum*. 7 vols. (Leiden: Johannes Hasebroek, 1761–1778), I.i:7–11: “Atqui haec [theologia ectypa] est illa de rebus divinis notitia ex Dei decreto nobis revelata, ad quam nostra theologia subjektivata efformata esse debet: ut adeo haec theologiae divisio etiam cum phrasi Scripturae non male conveniat. Utilis tandem erit haec distinctio ad id, ut Theologus quivis pie discat versari in meditandis rebus divinis, atque ita a Deo sapere in iis quae ad Deum spectant, ut in sua de Deo cognitione non deviet ab illa, quae Dei est atque a Deo creaturae revelata.”

83. Abraham Kuypers, *Encyclopedie der heilige godgeleerdheid*, 3 vols. (Amsterdam: J. A. Wormser, 1894), 2:196–207; Kuypers, *Encyclopedia of Sacred Theology: Its Principles*, trans. J. H. de Vries (New York: Charles Scribner’s, 1898), 242–243; 248–250; 252–256; Herman Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics*, ed. John Bolt, trans. John Vriend, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 1:184–186; 2:107–110; Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949), 35; Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Systematische Theologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988), 1:12–13.

abstruse distinctions [*theologia archetypa* and *ectypa*] were not qualified as a ‘dogmatische Antiquität’ by the theologians of the fateful turn (‘verhängnisvollen Wende’) around the eighteenth century.”⁸⁴

Concluding Remarks

From this survey it becomes clear that Junius and early modern Reformed theologians utilized the insights of patristic, medieval, and Reformation theologians when framing their concept of theology. This is especially evident in *True Theology*. The use of the archetypal/ectypal distinction and the crucial significance of the theology of union in its relation to the two other forms of ectypal theology was, for the Reformed orthodox, a means of developing the principles and task of theology, a discipline to be determined by a strong Trinitarian and christological framework. In this context it is important to note here that natural theology is seen by the Reformed as a category of revealed theology; it is not an autonomous and independent source of knowledge. What is more, the archetypal/ectypal paradigm clearly differentiates between two entirely different forms of natural theology, forms often confused in contemporary literature: a pagan form and a Christian form. As Junius makes clear, the first form of natural theology belongs to the category of false theology, whereas the latter is designated as true theology (placed under the category of ectypal theology with its clear christological orientation).

This further indicates that the Reformed orthodox never used the term *Deus* (as the *principium essendi* of theology) in a neutral or unqualified sense in order to construe a rationalistic natural theology. From the very outset the prolegomena of the Reformed orthodox envisaged the triune God, or *Deus foederatus in Christo*, as the object of theology.⁸⁵ Christian theology, they argued, deals with God as covenanted in Christ not only in order to know Him but, first and foremost, to worship Him.

84. Karl Barth, *Einführung in die evangelische Theologie* (München: Siebenstern Taschenbuch Verlag, 1968), 90–91.

85. See *Theses theologicae*, XXV, 47: “Nam et hodie Deus, qui ex Filii sui Testamento nos regno coelorum donat, etiam per modum foederis se piorum et seminis eorum Deum fore spondet, et stipulatur a nobis, ut in praeceptis suis ambulemus.”

This contradicts the thesis of nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarship that argued that post-Reformation Reformed theology was instrumental in the rise of Enlightenment rationalism. According to this argument, post-Reformation Reformed theologians came to view special revelation as simply a completion of our natural knowledge of God, and thus Christian knowledge is able to fit well with a rationally based knowledge.⁸⁶

Junius's *True Theology* gives enough evidence to falsify the claim that post-Reformation Reformed theology presented a doctrine of a distant and unknowable God (the *Deus nudus absconditus*) as the axiomatic governing principle of the entire theological enterprise. Instead, as evident in this work, the overarching paradigm for understanding the principles and task of theology was the archetypal/ectypal distinction, and the parallel distinction between the essential or *ad intra* dimension and the contingent or *ad extra* dimension of divine agency. Furthermore, *True Theology* is an excellent example that early modern Reformed theology was *not* a rationalistic, deterministic, or decretal system, but rather a relational enterprise, determined by and determinative of the divine-human relationship.⁸⁷ The important role Junius played in helping shape this Reformed tradition and the significance of his *True Theology* for the development of Reformed dogmatics cannot be overestimated.

86. For example, see Otto Weber, *Foundations of Dogmatics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 1:118: "The question of natural theology, already raised by biblical texts, was now set forth as a result of the interior structure of theological thought itself."

87. See Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker, *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001), 205–226. Willem J. van Asselt, J. Martin Bac, and Roelf T. te Velde, *Reformed Thought on Freedom: The Concept of Free Choice in Early Modern Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), esp. 33–43.

Sample

Translator's Preface

When in May of 2013 I began working in earnest on this translation of Junius, I was largely unaware not only of the great joy that would accrue to me through the task of rendering his dense and stylized prose into manageable English, but also of the prominent position that Junius holds in the development of Reformed thought. Though I counted myself as having good familiarity with the theological and philosophical currents of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries for someone trained as a classicist, I soon realized how far deficient was my knowledge when I began to survey the literature surrounding the figure of Franciscus Junius and the events of his life and work. The many narrows through which Junius providentially squeezed himself, the close scrapes with death, the political intrigue and conspiracies—all of these were surprising to read from the pen of a man known, if at all, for developing the Leiden theology as a synthesis of medieval and Protestant exegetical and philosophical concerns. As I read more broadly, moreover, I began to see the wide-ranging influence that Junius exercised on subsequent generations of Reformed theologians and how his formulations were crucial to the work of Arminius and other Remonstrants, as well as to Francis Turretin, John Owen, and other Reformed scholars.

Before discussing briefly the translation and acknowledging those who helped me, I would like to comment on two aspects of Junius's writing that were, as a translator, quite pleasing to encounter. First, his Latin style is thoroughly Ciceronian, bearing all the marks of the late Renaissance obsession with rhetorical argumentation. It shows deep knowledge of Cicero's philosophical works (especially *De Officiis*, *De*

Finibus Bonorum et Malorum, and *De Natura Deorum*) and familiarity with his letters. In addition, Junius borrows phrases from the classical authors Caesar, Horace, Livy, Lucretius, Pliny, Terence, and Vergil, as well as the fathers Augustine and Tertullian. On the Greek side, he is grounded in Aristotle, of course, and alludes to Plato and Plutarch as well. It is impossible to know, except in the case of Cicero (whose works he mentions reading in the *Life*), whether Junius knew all these authors directly or via *florilegia* (i.e., handbooks) and as commonplaces learned from his own teachers (primarily, it would seem, in childhood and early youth). In addition, it is somewhat surprising that there are no allusions to the philosophical writings of Seneca, with which Calvin himself, and presumably other Reformers, was deeply familiar. The only reference to Seneca is in the definition of theology that Junius cites Augustine as having borrowed from him and Varro.

The second observation I would like to make is that, despite the incredibly dense and difficult prose arguments that Junius at times constructs (with commendable consistency)—necessitated, no doubt, by the complexity of his subject—it is evident that he is working diligently to edify his readers and even to allure them with metaphors, examples, and illustrations. Junius's use of analogies is not quite deft, in my estimation, but it is nevertheless a welcome respite to the packed scholastic reasoning, and winsome in its own way. His careful weaving together of biblical citations also adds a level of piety to the work that, while not like reading Calvin's *Institutes*, is genuinely pastoral and engaging.

In addition to the comments I make throughout the work on particular construals and concepts, it seems appropriate to set out briefly my overall approach to the task of translation, so that readers who may wish to compare (as I hope they will) Junius's Latin to my rendering will be better equipped to find points of disagreement and even consent. As Junius himself would no doubt be careful to assert, translation derives from the combination of the Latin verb *fero*, "to carry or to bear," with the prefix *trans-*, most easily rendered as "across." Though seldom considered, we must ask ourselves what is being "carried across" in any given translation.

Certainly it is not merely the words, for such would yield not a translation but a transliteration. For example “baptism” is not a translation of the Greek word βάπτισμα but a transliteration, in which the Greek letter *beta* is represented by English *b*, *alpha* by *a*, *pi* by *p*, etc. Sometimes transliteration can be very helpful, especially when the word in question is a term of art. Thus, I have retained *archetypal* and *ectypal* as transliterations of their Greek originals, as Junius himself does when bringing them into Latin.

Other terms of art, specifically the important trio of concepts *secundum se*, *secundum quid*, and *simpliciter*, as well as *in obiecto* and *in subiecto*, I have translated, thanks to Willem van Asselt's guidance, as follows. *Secundum se* has been rendered “in relation to itself” or “in relation to themselves” as the context requires; *secundum quid* has been construed as “according to something else” and “relative”; and *simpliciter*, composed of no parts, I have taken as “in itself.” *In obiecto* stands as “in the object” or “in an object” and *in subiecto* as “in the subject” or “in a subject.” Van Asselt also suggested “specifying characteristic” for *differentia*, which I have adopted throughout.

But transliteration, or word-for-word representation, of an author in another language is not truly translation. Rather, the goal of the translator is to convey unaltered and without comment the thought of the author as he has represented it in his own words, for it is the thought that one seeks to “carry across.” This usually means not searching for a single English word to stand for one Latin word, nor seeking to retain the order of the original clauses in an artificial or strained fashion in the target language. Instead, the translator must strive to capture the thought of the author and present it with utmost accuracy in English. The most difficult aspects of this task are (1) ensuring that the author's thought is truly conveyed, not an admixture of the author's thought with the translator's understanding; and (2) conveying in the target language puns and other artful structures that are more pleasing in the original. Examples of this would be *figura etymologica* (various plays on words) and the preference Latin shows for dense repetition as a mark of precision and good style, whereas English favors variety sometimes to the detriment of clarity. In translating Junius, I am more confident that I have succeeded in

overcoming the first difficulty than the second, though the reader must judge for himself.

In closing, I wish to acknowledge the many individuals who contributed to the success of this work. First, I thank my friend Jonathon Beeke who originally suggested that I consider translating Junius and put me in contact with Jay Collier. Richard Muller provided generous early encouragement and clarification of some important concepts and also graciously agreed to write the foreword. I owe a large debt to Willem van Asselt as well, whose 2002 essay on Junius both sparked my interest in the author and taught me much. That his introduction would also grace this volume was good news indeed. Calvin College supported this project by granting me a Calvin Research Fellowship as a Diekema Fellow and a one-course release in the fall of 2013 to work on the translation. My colleagues in the classics department, Young Kim, Mark Williams, and Jeff Winkle, offered helpful suggestions, as did Frans and Kate van Liere from the history department. Todd Rester also provided encouragement and helpful review. Lastly, Lia Gelder, as a Calvin College McGregor Research Fellow, helped considerably with the final edits and suggested the subject headings for the *Vita*.

The lion's share of thanks, however, is owed to my emeritus colleague Ken Bratt, who generously read every word of both the *Vita* and *Tractatus* with great care, providing meticulous and copious comments. His efforts not only improved the style and readability of the work considerably, but also helped to identify a few errors in my own construals. With much gratitude, this work is dedicated to him.

May God grant spiritual fruit from this endeavor to my wife, Tara, whose wit and wisdom are to me a constant source of joy and instruction, and to my four loving children, Freddie, Jillian, Lucius, and Sophia, whose graces and service to me are clear evidence of God's unfailing mercy. And may He continue to secure His church militant in that true and heavenly theology that will in His time bring all His children to maturity. *Soli Deo gloria.*