

Stephen B. Tipton

The Ground, Method, and Goal of Amandus Polanus' (1561–1610) Doctrine of God

A Historical and Contextual Analysis



Reformed Historical Theology

Edited by
Herman J. Selderhuis

In co-operation with
Emidio Campi, Irene Dingel, Benyamin F. Intan,
Elsie Anne McKee, Richard A. Muller, and Risto Saarinen

Volume 73

Stephen B. Tipton

The Ground, Method, and Goal of Amandus Polanus' (1561–1610) Doctrine of God

A Historical and Contextual Analysis

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek:

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data available online: <https://dnb.de>.

© 2022 by Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Theaterstraße 13, 37073 Göttingen, Germany, an imprint of the Brill-Group (Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands; Brill USA Inc., Boston MA, USA; Brill Asia Pte Ltd, Singapore; Brill Deutschland GmbH, Paderborn, Germany, Brill Österreich GmbH, Vienna, Austria)

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Hotei, Brill Schöningh, Brill Fink, Brill mentis, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Böhlau and V&R unipress.

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Typesetting: le-tex publishing services, Leipzig

Cover design: SchwabScantechnik, Göttingen

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Verlage | www.vandenhoeck-ruprecht-verlage.com

ISSN 2197-1137

ISBN 978-3-647-50187-1

Contents

List of Figures.....	11
Abbreviations	13
Preface	15
Chapter One: Introduction	19
1.1 Introduction	19
1.2 Secondary Literature	20
1.2.1 Scholarship of Post-Reformation Reformed Orthodoxy	20
1.2.2 Scholarly Research and Amandus Polanus	26
1.3 The Main Research Question	30
1.4 Methodological Considerations	36
1.5 Organization and Structure	39
Chapter Two: Polanus' Historical Context	41
2.1 Introduction	41
2.2 The Life of Amandus Polanus	41
2.2.1 Early Years and Education	42
2.2.2 Geneva and Travels	44
2.2.3 Professor of Old Testament	45
2.2.4 Academic Disputations at the University of Basel	47
2.2.5 The Works of Amandus Polanus	49
2.3 Polanus in the Context of the Post-Reformation Period	52
2.4 Philosophical and Methodological Influence:	
Aristotelianism and Ramism	57
2.4.1 Aristotelianism	59
2.4.2 The Ramist Alternative to Aristotelianism	63
2.4.3 Aristotelian and Ramist Influence in Polanus	65
2.5 Early Reformed Orthodox Contemporaries of Polanus	68
2.5.1 Zacharias Ursinus	69
2.5.2 Girolamo Zanchi	70
2.5.3 Lambert Daneau	72
2.5.4 William Perkins	72
2.5.5 Lucas Trelcatius Jr.	73
2.5.6 Gulielmus Bucanus	74

2.5.7 Bartholomäus Keckermann.....	75
2.6 Summary.....	76
Chapter Three: Theological Foundations of Polanus' Doctrine of God	77
3.1 Introduction	77
3.2 Overview of Book One of the <i>Syntagma</i>	77
3.3 The Definition of Theology	80
3.4 The Archetypal/Ectypal Distinction	85
3.5 The Authority of Scripture	93
3.6 Summary.....	97
Chapter Four: The Divine Essence and Names	99
4.1 Introduction	99
4.2 The State of these Doctrines in Early Reformed Orthodoxy	100
4.3 Polanus' Introductory Orientation	104
4.4 The Description and Distribution of the Doctrine of God	109
4.5 The Existence of God	111
4.6 The Essence of God.....	116
4.6.1 The Distribution of the Doctrine of the Divine Essence	119
4.6.2 <i>Excursus</i> on the Holy Trinity	124
4.6.3 The Names of God.....	129
4.6.4 The Essential Properties of God.....	131
4.6.5 The Distinction Between First and Second Order Essential Properties.....	136
4.7 Summary.....	140
Chapter Five: The First Order Essential Properties of God	141
5.1 Introduction	141
5.2 The State of First Order Essential Properties in Early Reformed Orthodoxy	141
5.3 The Structure of Polanus' Discussion	144
5.4 The Simplicity of God.....	149
5.5 The Perfection of God	160
5.6 The Infinity of God	164
5.6.1 The Eternity of God	166
5.6.2 The Immensity of God	167
5.7 The Immutability of God	172
5.8 Summary.....	174
Chapter Six: The Second Order Essential Properties of God	177
6.1 Introduction	177

6.2	The State of Second Order Essential Properties in Early Reformed Orthodoxy	178
6.3	The Structure of Polanus' Discussion	180
6.4	The Life of God	181
6.5	The Immortality of God.....	183
6.6	The Blessedness of God	184
6.7	The Glory of God.....	188
6.8	Summary.....	190
Chapter Seven: The Divine Wisdom		193
7.1	Introduction	193
7.2	The State of the Doctrine of the Divine Wisdom in Early Reformed Orthodoxy	193
7.3	Polanus' Discussion of Divine Wisdom.....	195
7.4	The Various Distinctions within the Divine Wisdom	202
7.4.1	The Categories of the Divine Wisdom	202
7.4.2	The Knowledge of God.....	204
7.4.3	The General and Special Knowledge of God.....	205
7.4.4	Divine Foreknowledge.....	207
7.4.5	Distinctions within Divine Foreknowledge	207
7.4.6	The Knowledge of Simple Intelligence and the Knowledge of Vision	211
7.5	Summary.....	217
Chapter Eight: The Divine Will.....		219
8.1	Introduction	219
8.2	The State of the Doctrine of the Divine Will in Early Reformed Orthodoxy	219
8.3	Polanus' Discussion of the Divine Will.....	221
8.4	Scholastic Questions Regarding the Will.....	223
8.5	Distinctions within the Divine Will.....	225
8.5.1	The Essential and Personal Will.....	226
8.5.2	The Efficient and Permitting Will.....	229
8.5.3	The Absolute and Conditional Will	231
8.5.4	The Revealed and Hidden Will	235
8.5.5	The Necessary and Free Will	239
8.5.6	The Distinctions Concerning the Objects of the Divine Will	240
8.6	Summary.....	244

Chapter Nine: Essential Properties of God Termed ‘Types’	
Within the Divine Will	247
9.1 Introduction	247
9.2 The State of These Various Properties in Early Reformed Orthodoxy	248
9.3 ‘Types’ within the Divine Will	252
9.4 The Goodness of God	253
9.5 The Grace of God	256
9.6 The Love of God	262
9.7 The Mercy of God	265
9.8 The Patience of God	268
9.9 The Kindness of God	270
9.10 The Justice of God	272
9.11 The Truth of God	276
9.12 The Holiness of God	278
9.13 Summary	280
Chapter Ten: The Divine Power and Freedom	283
10.1 Introduction	283
10.2 The State of Divine Power and Freedom in Early Reformed Orthodoxy	283
10.3 The Power of God	285
10.3.1 Divine Omnipotence	288
10.3.2 Impossibilia	290
10.4 The Freedom of God	293
10.5 <i>Excursus</i> on the Divine Decree and Human Freedom	299
10.5.1 The Divine Decree	299
10.5.2 Divine Creation and Providence	303
10.5.3 Human Freedom	306
10.5.4 <i>Excursus</i> Summary	307
10.6 Summary	308
Chapter Eleven: Conclusion	311
11.1 This Work in Summary	311
11.2 Synthesis of Polanus’ Doctrine of God	314
11.2.1 Review of the Main Research Question	314
11.2.2 Polanus and the Divine Decree	317
11.2.3 Polanus and the Interaction Between Reason and Scripture ..	321
11.2.4 Polanus and the Trinity	327
11.3 Polanus Put Positively	331

Bibliography	335
Primary Sources	335
Secondary Literature	339
Index of Names	349

List of Figures

Figure 1	<i>Tabulae Perpetuae</i> (Polanus, <i>Partitiones</i> (1599), <i>tabulae</i> 1–2)	66
Figure 2	Distinctions in Polanus' organizational method among the 'types' of the divine will.....	222
Figure 3	Distribution of the 'Types' of the Divine Will.....	253
Figure 4	The Organizational Structure of Divine Goodness.....	255

Abbreviations

- CD Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, G. W. Bromily and T. F. Torrance, eds., H. Knight et al., trans. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956–1975).
- PG *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, 161 vols. (Paris: J. P. Migne, 1857–1866).
- PL *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*, 221 vols. (Paris: J. P. Migne, 1844–1863).
- PRRD Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics, The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725*, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003).
- S.Th. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 5 vols. (Christian Classics, 1981). Translations of the *Summa Theologiae* are from *The Summa Theologiae of Saint Thomas Aquinas*, Latin-English Edition, vol 1. *Prima Pars*, Q. 1–64 (Scotts Valley, CA: NovAntiqua, 2008).

Preface

The question I have most often been asked with regard to my doctoral studies is, “Who is Amandus Polanus?” Once the introductions have been made, however, the second most frequent question (and, perhaps, the more important of the two) is, “Why study his doctrine of God?” In beginning to answer that, I must state from the outset that I have been fortunate to study a theologian whose view of God is very similar to my own. Indeed, as an ordained minister in the Presbyterian Church in America, I am encouraged by how often echoes of Polanus’ thought can be heard in the chapters and questions of my own doctrinal standards, the *Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms*. While I do not agree with every jot and tittle of Polanus’ theology, I have found in him a kindred spirit and companion with whom to dialogue and from whom to learn. I have also, from time to time, had the opportunity to find myself organizing my thoughts in neat pairs of twos.

This, however, does not answer the question: “Why study Polanus’ doctrine of God?” There is, on the one hand, a scholarly and historical interest – a desire to better understand the Reformed tradition generally and the early Reformed orthodox particularly. On the other hand, as a Christian, I have been reminded of the fundamental importance of God to all of theology. Whenever I think about God, a whole host of questions instantly spring to mind: Who is this God? What is he like? How can I be sure he exists? How can I know him? And once I do know him, how can I be sure he will remain as he has revealed himself to be? These very questions are at the center of Polanus’ doctrine of God. Furthermore, these answers to these questions radiate out into the whole of his theological project as, once we know this God, we come also to know ourselves in relation to him. Thus, the doctrine of God also forms the foundation of Polanus’ soteriology and ethics. While the entirety of his theology is not the focus of this work, it is my desire that this study of Polanus’ doctrine of God would bear much academic fruit as this important figure of Reformed orthodoxy and scholasticism is better understood in his own historical and theological context.

With regard to Polanus himself, I came across him in a rather serendipitous way. As part of my preparatory studies for pursuing a Ph.D., I needed to learn Latin. In addition to looking at a variety of works that have been translated, I wanted to work through a text that was not yet available in English. Couple this desire with my recent reading of *Reformed Thought on Freedom* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010), and it only took a quick search through the Post-Reformation Digital Library to find a work on *liberum arbitrium*. What I found was a disputation presided over by Amandus Polanus. The more I read and translated, the more I realized that

Polanus was a figure who had been too long neglected. While he figures repeatedly in Richard A. Muller's four-volume study, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), Muller himself acknowledges that his work is only a prelude to the many, in-depth, studies of individual theologians that would need to be accomplished in order to sharpen our understanding of Reformed orthodoxy.

This work would never have been possible without the help of many individuals – too many, in fact, to name. I would like to express my gratitude to my promoters Prof. Dr. Andreas J. Beck and Dr. Dolf te Velde for their many hours of reviewing and commenting upon my work and for their encouragement and exhortation to complete this beginning stage of my scholarly career. I am also grateful for the interactions with the members of the Institute of Post-Reformation Studies (IPRS) at ETF Leuven. I look forward to seeing the fruit of the research that is being incubated at this institution. I would also like to acknowledge my great appreciation for the various members of the research group *Classic Reformed Theology* (“Werkgezelschap Oude Gereformeerde Theologie”). While I have not had the opportunity to speak to all of them directly, I have greatly benefited from their work. In particular, I wish to acknowledge the tremendous help and encouragement that I received from the late Prof. Dr. Willem van Asselt and continue to receive from Prof. Dr. Antoon Vos during their time at ETF Leuven. I would also like to thank Ryan Hurd for his efforts to review my Latin translations and for the helpful suggestions he offered. Any errors in translation, of course, remain my own.

I am greatly indebted to those individuals who have read and made comments on this dissertation in part or in whole. I am particularly thankful to Prof. Dr. R. H. Reeling Brouwer, Dr. Stefan Lindholm, Prof. Dr. Aza Goudriaan, and Prof. Dr. Koert van Bekkum for their service as readers and for their helpful and insightful comments. As well, I thank the Doctoral Committee of ETF, Leuven, for their kind permission to publish my 2020 Doctoral Dissertation. This volume is a slightly edited version of that previous work.

I would also like to express my deepest appreciation and admiration for Dr. Derek Thomas and Dr. Duncan Rankin. Both of these men have been an enormous blessing to me in my ministry and have modeled for me what it means to be a ‘pastor-theologian’. I would also like to thank the elders, deacons, and members of Hillcrest Presbyterian Church in Volant, Pennsylvania, for their love, encouragement, patience, and grace as I have continued to both study and write and pastor in their midst.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family for their constant care, prayers, and support: my parents, Rhonda Matthews and David Tipton and step-parents, Creig Matthews and Brenda Tipton; my siblings, Allen Tipton and Katherine Blair; my daughters, Alicia Tipton and Meaghan Tipton; and most of all, Catherine, my lovely

wife who has stood by me through all things and who truly is the helper God has specifically fashioned for me.

“Since we have the same spirit of faith according to what has been written, “I believed, and so I spoke,” we also believe, and so we also speak, knowing that he who raised the Lord Jesus will raise us also with Jesus and bring us with you into his presence. For it is all for your sake, so that as grace extends to more and more people it may increase thanksgiving, to the glory of God.” (2 Corinthians 4:13–15).

Stephen Tipton, April, 2022

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This work provides a contextual and analytic exposition of the doctrine of God in the theology of Amandus Polanus (1561–1610) as he sets these doctrines forth in the *Syntagma theologiae christianae*. I intend to show that Polanus' theology is intentionally rooted in God's own self-revelation in Scripture and is aimed at the goal of doxology and worship of the Triune God. Further, I intend to show that the Trinity of divine persons is integral to Polanus' discussion of God's single and simple divine essence. Lastly, I intend to show that Polanus' use of logic and reason results organically from his understanding of man as he is made in the image of God and therefore does not function as the foundation of his theology.

The purpose of this work is twofold. First, it will present a summary and analysis of Polanus' doctrine of God by examining the structure of the *Syntagma*, the interactions Polanus has with various sources, the definitions and distinctions he employs, as well as the arguments he makes. My goal in this first purpose is to seek to understand Polanus' exposition of the doctrine of God as he expresses it in the *Syntagma*. Second, this work will present a critical engagement with the secondary literature by which I will consider the insights offered by a range of scholarly assessments of Polanus' theology and seek to evaluate various misunderstandings of his thought and work. My goal in this second purpose is both to incorporate insights into Polanus' doctrine of God that elucidate his theology and to correct or dispute views that obfuscate his theology.

This chapter provides four introductory sections. First, I present a survey of the secondary literature that is relevant to this work. This includes literature that deals with Reformed orthodoxy and scholasticism more broadly, literature that deals with the doctrine of God in the era of Reformed orthodoxy (especially the early phase of that period), and literature that is specific to Polanus. Second, I present the main research question and break this question down into its constituent parts. This portion includes a more detailed look at the main arguments from the secondary literature that are integral to my overall discussion of Polanus' theology. Third, I discuss the methodology I employ to analyze Polanus in this context. This includes a discussion of the primary sources from Polanus' work that are used throughout this work. Finally, I provide an overview of the organizational structure of my work.

1.2 Secondary Literature

1.2.1 Scholarship of Post-Reformation Reformed Orthodoxy

In order to approach the vast amount of secondary literature regarding Post-Reformation Reformed Orthodoxy, a certain level of simplification and categorization is necessary. While this work seeks to situate itself within the milieu of what is described below as 'newer' scholarship, a detailed discussion of the history of Post-Reformation scholarship is outside the scope of this work and has, at any rate, been accomplished by others. Therefore, this section will contain a broad sketch of the state of scholarship from the perspective of the 'newer' scholarship that seeks to orient the reader (and direct the reader to other studies) rather than exhaustively evaluate the 'older' scholarship. Furthermore, this section is designed particularly to orient the reader in preparation for the more detailed discussion of the secondary literature on Amandus Polanus in section 1.2.2, below.

Much of the scholarship of the post-Reformation Reformed orthodox period has been focused upon various lines of continuity and discontinuity between the theologians of this period and their Reformation, medieval, and patristic predecessors. The primary thesis of what can be described as the 'older' scholarship seeks to draw clear lines of discontinuity between the Reformed orthodox and the Reformers. Typically, this 'older' scholarship has seen this discontinuity in terms of two observations: 1) Reformed scholasticism is a predestinarian system, and 2) Reformed scholasticism is overly rationalistic. The primary thesis of what can be called the 'newer' scholarship seeks to demonstrate the presence of various lines of continuity and discontinuity between the Reformed orthodox and their various predecessors. Generally speaking, the Reformed orthodox were in continuity with the Reformers with regard to their overall theology but were more in continuity with medieval scholastics with regard to their overall methodology. Furthermore, this 'newer' scholarship argues that predestination does not serve as a 'central dogma' for the Reformed orthodox and that, while there is clear evidence of the usage of logic and reason among the Reformed orthodox, their theology should not be characterized as rationalistic. The remainder of this section is a chronological survey of the relevant secondary literature that traces out the origination and assessment of these theses.¹

1 This survey is relatively brief and only touches upon the major figures and positions. It is largely based upon Willem J. van Asselt, and Eef Dekker, "Introduction," in *Reformation and Scholasticism, An Ecumenical Enterprise*, Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker, eds., Texts and Studies in Reformation and Post-Reformation Thought (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001); Richard A. Muller, *Post Reformation Reformed Dogmatics, The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725*, 4 vols., 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003); Andreas J. Beck, *Gisbertus Voetius*

The first major period of the 'older' scholarship includes Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792–1860), Alexander Schweizer (1808–1888), and Wilhelm Gass (1813–1889).² Baur argued that the centrality of predestination to Protestant theology was a logical development in the history of Christian dogma. Schweizer argued that Protestant theology was both a predestinarian and a rationalistic system. He saw predestination (which he linked to the 'feeling of absolute dependence' as promulgated by his mentor, Friedrich Schleiermacher) as the central dogma (*Centraldogma*) of Protestant thought. Gass concurred, arguing that Reformed theology took its shape as a whole from this internal principle of predestination. It should be noted that these three scholars did not merely describe predestination as a 'central dogma.' Rather, this notion was for them in fact a normative element of theology.

In the second period of scholarship into post-Reformation Reformed dogmatics, this thesis would be challenged, yet in two different ways. Herman Bavinck (1854–1921) rejected the assumption of the previous period of scholarship that regarded predestination as a central dogma, "and applied a historical-critical method to his own description of Reformed theology."³ In this way, Bavinck's approach to Reformed dogmatics anticipates some of the aspects of the 'newer' scholarship described below. Heinrich Heppe (1820–1879), accepted the central dogma theory. Unlike the scholars of the previous period, however, he saw the central role of predestination in Reformed theology as a negative insertion into Christian theol-

(1589–1679) on *God, Freedom, and Contingency*, Church History and Religious Culture 84 (Leiden: Brill, 2022); J. Martin Bac, *Perfect Will Theology, Divine Agency in Reformed Scholasticism as against Suárez, Episcopius, Descartes, and Spinoza*, Brill's Series in Church History, Vol. 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2010); Willem J. van Asselt and Pieter L. Rouwendal, "The State of Scholarship: From Discontinuity to Continuity" in *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, trans. Albert Gootjes, Reformed Historical-Theological Studies (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011); and Dolf te Velde, *The Doctrine of God in Reformed Orthodoxy, Karl Barth, and the Utrecht School: A Study in Method and Content*, Studies in Reformed Theology, Vol. 25 (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

2 See, Alexander Schweizer, *Die protestantischen Centraldogmen in ihrer Entwicklung innerhalb der reformierten Kirche*, 2 vols. (Zurich: Orell, Fuessli & Co., 1846–1856); Ferdinand C. Baur, *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte* (Tübingen: L. Fues, 1847); Wilhelm Gass, *Geschichte der protestantischen Dogmatik in ihrem Zusammenhänge mit der Theologie überhaupt*, 2 vols. (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1854); van Asselt and Rouwendal, "The State of Scholarship," 10; and van Asselt and Dekker, "Introduction," 15.

3 Van Asselt and Rouwendal, "The State of Scholarship," 12. See also See Herman Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 4 vols., ed. John Bolt, trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003–2008); Heinrich Heppe, *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-reformierten Kirche: Dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt* (Elberfeld: R. L. Friedrichs, 1861); Heinrich Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics: Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources*, ed. Ernst Bizer, trans. G. I. Thompson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1978); and van Asselt and Dekker, "Introduction," 17.

ogy.⁴ According to Heppe, predestination did not arise as a central dogma because of a logical historical progression of theology (i.e., a logical development *within* theology), but because of external factors, particularly through Theodore Beza (1519–1605) and his *Tabula predestinationis*.⁵ Thus, the more pristine theology of Calvin, which was not focused upon or logically deduced from predestination as a central dogma, was overtaken by the ‘Calvinist’ theologians.

The turn of the twentieth century sees the next period of scholarship characterized by Hans Emil Weber (1882–1959) and Paul Althaus (1898–1966).⁶ Weber adopted the central dogma theory as mediated through Baur, claiming that predestination was used by Reformed orthodox theologians to introduce the rationalistic and rigid deductive system of the medieval scholastic method. Althaus, who was a student of Weber and well known for his Lutheran studies, argued that Reformed theology was a “rigid system” which, with the doctrine of predestination, “acquired a rationalistic and speculative character far removed from the biblical witness.”⁷ Thus, these scholars gave affirmative answers to the questions posed above, but appraised the inclusion of these elements within Reformed scholasticism negatively.

The fourth period of scholarship is characterized by the dialectical theology of Karl Barth (1886–1968), who provided a new perspective on Reformed orthodoxy in his *Church Dogmatics*.⁸ According to Bac, Barth viewed Reformed orthodoxy as “a mature expression of the theology of the church, because it combines the Reformed intent to study the biblical witness of revelation with the best medieval fruits of academic theology.”⁹ Furthermore, Barth rejected the notion that predestination was the central dogma of Reformed orthodoxy. Barth, however, expressed several criticisms of Reformed orthodoxy: its use of and the importance given to natural

4 See van Asselt and Rouwendal, “The State of Scholarship,” 13; van Asselt and Dekker, “Introduction,” 17; and Bac, *Perfect Will Theology*, 9.

5 See Richard A. Muller, “The Use and Abuse of a Document: Beza’ *Tabula Praedestinationis*, The Bolsec Controversy, and the Origins of Reformed Orthodoxy,” in *Protestant Scholasticism, Essays in Reassessment*, ed. Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark, Studies in Christian History and Thought (Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2005), 33–61; Richard A. Muller, *Christ and the Decree, Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 3–4; and Muller, *PRRD*, 1:86.

6 See Hans Emil Weber, *Reformation, Orthodoxie und Rationalismus* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1937); Paul Althaus, *Die Prinzipien der deutschen reformierten Dogmatik in Zeitalter der aristotelischen Scholastik* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1914); van Asselt and Rouwendal, “The State of Scholarship,” 14; and Bac, *Perfect Will Theology*, 9.

7 Van Asselt and Rouwendal, “The State of Scholarship,” 15.

8 Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, eds. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1956–1975) (hereafter, *CD*); van Asselt and Rouwendal, “The State of Scholarship,” 15; van Asselt and Dekker, “Introduction,” 20; and Bac, *Perfect Will Theology*, 9.

9 Bac, *Perfect Will Theology*, 9.

theology; the way Reformed orthodox theologians treated the doctrine of God by first considering the essence and attributes and only afterwards turning to the Trinity; and the way that the theology of the Reformed orthodox turned Scripture into a static and objective body of knowledge that could be studied by reason.¹⁰ Thus, Barth denied that predestination served as a central dogma in Reformed theology, but did appraise it as being overly rationalistic.

In the middle of the twentieth century, a number of scholars began to synthesize this older scholarship. Basil Hall sought to demonstrate a division between the theology of Calvin and what he saw was the degradation of theology that began with Theodore Beza, thereby introducing the phrase “Calvin against the Calvinists.”¹¹ Brian Armstrong continued the negative appraisal of predestination as a central dogma. He sought to demonstrate that scholastic theology did not come into Reformed theology with Beza, but was instead present from the beginning of the Reformation.¹² John S. Bray affirmed this notion, and summarized Reformed scholasticism according to six characteristics: first, it was a theology characterized as having been built upon rational principles and syllogistic argumentation; second, it was dependent upon the philosophy of Bellarmine; third, reason was given the same weight as Scripture in determining theology; fourth, Reformed theology was marked by the use of metaphysics in order to speculate about God’s essence and his will; fifth, Scripture was seen as a revealed collection of logical propositions; and sixth, there was a new understanding of faith that entered with the shift from the Reformers to Reformed scholasticism.¹³ It is important to note that for both Armstrong and Bray, scholasticism was not just a method used by scholastics, but had a particular content associated with it.¹⁴

The second half of the twentieth century has also seen what has been called ‘newer’ scholarship which has challenged much of the previous, ‘older,’ view of Reformed orthodoxy and scholasticism. An early wave is characterized by Heiko Oberman and David Steinmetz, who posited a significant level of continuity between

¹⁰ Bac, *Perfect Will Theology*, 10.

¹¹ Basil Hall, “Calvin against the Calvinists,” in *John Calvin*, ed. G. E. Duffield (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966). See also Thomas F. Torrance, *Scottish Theology: From John Knox to John McLeod Campbell* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996).

¹² Brian G. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism in Seventeenth-Century France* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969); van Asselt and Rouwendal, “The State of Scholarship,” 17; and van Asselt and Dekker, “Introduction,” 22.

¹³ John S. Bray, *Theodore Beza’s Doctrine of Predestination*, Bibliotheca Humanistica & Reformatorica, vol. 12 (Leiden: Brill, 1975); van Asselt and Rouwendal, “The State of Scholarship,” 17; and van Asselt and Dekker, “Introduction,” 23.

¹⁴ Van Asselt and Rouwendal, “The State of Scholarship,” 18.

medieval scholasticism and the theology of the Protestant Reformers.¹⁵ Significant criticism of the 'older' scholarship, as well as much positive appraisal of Reformed orthodoxy and Reformed scholasticism generally, is seen in the work of Richard A. Muller, Willem J. van Asselt, Antonie Vos, Eef Dekker, Andreas J. Beck, Dolf te Velde, J. Martin Bac, Carl Trueman, and others.¹⁶

This 'newer' scholarship of Reformed Orthodoxy is broadly characterized by a number of common conclusions:

- First, the Reformed orthodox theologians worked to codify and confessionalize the teachings of the Reformers. There is therefore a great deal of continuity between the first and second generation of Reformers and the various periods of Reformed orthodoxy.
- Second, Reformed orthodox theologians also show broad continuity with medieval scholastic theology.
- Third, this broad continuity with medieval scholasticism is partially due to the shared Christian (i.e., catholic) tradition and partly because scholasticism, whether medieval or Reformed, is first and foremost a methodology. Therefore, while the application of similar methods to same broad body of evidence is likely to produce similar results, methodology should be distinguished from content.
- Fourth, rather than functioning as a central dogma, the doctrine of predestination has a soteriological importance for Reformed orthodox theology.
- Fifth, the doctrine of God has been found to be foundational for both medieval and Reformed orthodox theology. This should not be taken to mean that their particular understanding of God is what stands as the center of their theology, but rather that God himself is the center and the foundational subject matter of theology.
- Sixth, Reformed scholasticism should be understood in its context as a theology of the schools and universities. In particular, an awareness of this institutional

15 Heiko A. Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (Harvard University Press, 1963); Heiko A. Oberman, *The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986); David C. Steinmetz, *Luther in Context* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995); David C. Steinmetz, *Calvin in Context* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); and Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark, "Introduction," in *Protestant Scholasticism, Essays in Reassessment*, Studies in Christian History and Thought, Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark, eds. (Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2005), xiii.

16 For representative works, see above, note 1. See also Willem van Asselt, J. Martin Bac, and Roelf T. te Velde, eds. *Reformed Thought on Freedom: The Concept of Free Choice in Early Modern Reformed Theology*, Texts and Studies in Reformation & Post-Reformation Thought (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010); and Carl R. Trueman, *The Claims of Truth: John Owen's Trinitarian Theology* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998).

and supra-individual framework is essential to correctly understanding the character, genres, and methodology of the theology of Reformed scholasticism.

- Finally, one of the main methodological continuities that characterizes the whole of theology from Augustine to Anselm, from Thomas to Zwingli, from Calvin to de Moor is captured in the phrase *fides quaerens intellectum*: that is, that theology begins with faith and then proceeds to seek understanding.

In addition, a number of methodological insights characterize the ‘newer’ scholarship:

- First, it seeks to understand the object of their study within its own historical and theological context. This is contrary to much of the older scholarship which tended to read Reformation and Reformed scholastic theologians in light of the scholar’s own context, issues, and theological formulations.
- Second, it seeks to understand their subjects in terms of continuity and discontinuity with contemporary and medieval sources. The primary axis of continuity is in terms of method: while Reformation and post-Reformation theologians may reach different conclusions than did their medieval scholastic predecessors, the majority of scholastic theologians of all eras were broadly united in terms of their methodology.
- Third, these ‘newer’ scholars see whatever discontinuity may arise between the Reformed orthodox and Calvin – or other Magisterial Reformers – as part of the ongoing development of Reformed orthodoxy. Thus, Calvin ought not be considered the standard or ‘high water mark’ of Reformed theology. Further, this means that Reformed orthodoxy should be evaluated on its own terms, and not in terms of its fidelity to what Calvin wrote.
- Fourth, several of these authors seek to understand particular issues of divine sovereignty and human freedom in light of Vos’ insights into the doctrinal formulations of John Duns Scotus, particularly the concept of synchronic contingency.¹⁷

This ‘newer’ wave of scholarship also includes research specifically focused upon the Reformed orthodox doctrine of God. Muller focuses upon the doctrine of God

17 See Antonie Vos, *The Philosophy of John Duns Scotus* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006); Antonie Vos, Henri Veldhuis, A. H. Looman-Graaskamp, Eef Dekker, and Nico W. den Bok, eds., *John Duns Scotus: Contingency and Freedom: Lectura I 39*, The New Synthese Historical Library 42 (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994); Antonie Vos, Henri Veldhuis, Eef Dekker, Nico W. den Bok, and Andreas J. Beck, eds., *Duns Scotus on Divine Love: Texts and Commentary on Goodness and Freedom, God and Humans* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).