

Calvin University

Calvin Digital Commons

CTS PhD Doctoral Dissertations

Calvin Theological Seminary Student
Scholarship

2014

Symphonia Catholica: the Merger of Patristic and Contemporary Sources in the theological Method of Amandus Polanus (1561-1610).

Byung Soo Han
CalvinTheological Seminary

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.calvin.edu/cts_dissertations



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Han, Byung Soo, "Symphonia Catholica: the Merger of Patristic and Contemporary Sources in the theological Method of Amandus Polanus (1561-1610)." (2014). *CTS PhD Doctoral Dissertations*. 22. https://digitalcommons.calvin.edu/cts_dissertations/22

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Calvin Theological Seminary Student Scholarship at Calvin Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in CTS PhD Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Calvin Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@calvin.edu.

CALVIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

**SYMPHONIA CATHOLICA:
THE MERGER OF PATRISTIC AND CONTEMPORARY SOURCES IN THE
THEOLOGICAL METHOD OF AMANDUS POLANUS (1561-1610)**

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF CALVIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
BYUNG SOO HAN

GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

MAY 2013

Copyright © 2014 by Byung Soo Han

All rights reserved

Contents

Acknowledgements	vi
Abbreviations	viii
Abstract	ix
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
1.1. Amandus Polanus and the Development of Early Reformed Orthodoxy	1
1.2. Polanus, Early Orthodoxy, and the Scholarly State of the Question	4
1.3. Reception and Use of the Church Fathers in Reformed Orthodoxy	8
1.4. Proposed Method	18
Part I. Amandus Polanus in Context	21
Chapter 2. Amandus Polanus in Historical and Theological Context	21
2.1. Historical Context: the Life of Amandus Polanus	23
2.1.1. Learning the <i>Summa</i> or Summary of Faith in Breslau	23
2.1.2. Theological Foundation in Basel	33
2.1.3. Encounter with Beza	44
2.1.4. Return to Basel: Ministry and Works	47
2.2. Theological Context: Johann Jacob Grynaeus and Robert Bellarmine	52
2.2.1. Theological Father: Johann Jacob Grynaeus (1540-1617)	53
2.2.2. Theological Opponent: Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621)	66
Part II. The Theological Methodology and Exegetical Theology of Amandus Polanus	69
Chapter 3. Theological Methodology	71
3.1. Polanus and the Construction of an Early Orthodox Reformed Theology	71
3.1.1. Introduction	71

3.1.2. Polanus's Theological Works and the Construction of Reformed Theology: an Overview	74
3.2. <i>Prolegomena</i> and <i>Principia Dua</i> : the Foundations of Polanus's Theological Method	78
3.2.1. What is Theology?	78
3.2.2. <i>Principia Theologiae</i>	92
3.3. Scripture and Tradition	105
3.3.1. Theological Sense of Tradition	106
3.3.2. Methodological Use of Tradition	115
3.4. Theology and Philosophy	120
Chapter 4. Exegetical Theology	146
4.1. Introduction	146
4.2. Biblical Interpretation	150
4.2.1. Polanus's Method in General: Hermeneutics and Polemics	150
4.2.2. Division and Interpretation of Text: An Example	177
4.3. Biblical Commentaries	182
4.3.1. Commentary on Malachi (1597)	183
4.3.2. Commentary on Daniel (1600)	188
4.3.3. Commentary on Hosea (1601)	196
4.3.4. Commentary on Ezekiel (1608)	200
Part III. The Relation of <i>Symphonia</i> and <i>Syntagma</i>	207
Chapter 5. <i>Symphonia Catholica</i> (1607)	207
5.1. Patristic Theology of Polanus's Reformed Contemporaries	208
5.1.1. Daniel Tossanus (1541-1602)	208
5.1.2. Abraham Scultetus (1566-1625)	216
5.1.3. Gaspard Laurent (1556-1636)	224
5.2. Patristic Theology of Polanus	227
5.2.1. The Causes of the <i>Symphonia Catholica</i>	228
5.2.2. Sources of <i>Symphonia Catholica</i>	234

5.2.3. Analysis of <i>Symphonia Catholica</i>	235
5.2.3.1. Structure	235
5.2.3.2. Some Characteristics	237
5.2.4. The Doctrine of Scripture	242
5.2.5. The Doctrine of Predestination	269
5.2.6. The Doctrine of the Church	280
5.3. Conclusion	298
Chapter 6. <i>Symphonia in Syntagma</i> (1610)	302
6.1. Introduction	302
6.2. <i>Symphonia in Syntagma</i>	304
6.2.1. Structure of <i>Syntagma</i>	304
6.2.2. Doctrine of Scripture	310
6.2.3. Doctrine of Predestination	321
6.2.4. Doctrine of Church	345
6.3. Concluding Remarks	374
Chapter 7. Conclusion	376
Appendix: These	382
Bibliography	385

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writing of a dissertation can be a lonely and isolating experience, yet it would obviously be impossible without the personal and academic support of numerous individuals. Above all, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my esteemed supervisor, Dr. Richard A. Muller, for his continuous support of my entire Th.M and Ph.D studies at Calvin Theological Seminary with expert guidance, theological erudition, and personal intimacy. Specifically, his oral and written comments on my papers and dissertation are always extremely perceptive, insightful, and appropriate. I am deeply indebted to him for inspiring and leading me to encounter the depth and width of Reformed orthodoxy. In addition, given his generosity and kindness toward me, as he has been equally so generous and kind for all of his students, he is worthy of being called “doctor angelicus.” I could not have imagined having a better advisor for my theological study. Besides my advisor, I also deeply thank the rest of my dissertation committee for their considerate suggestions, scholarly comments, and warm encouragement: Dr. Lyle D. Bierma, Dr. David M. Rylaarsdam, and Dr. Irena D. Backus.

My sincere thanks also go to Dr. Ronald Feenstra who during my course of studies showed me the sincerity and proficiency of a theology doctor and encouraged me to be a better theologian for the church of the Lord. I also deeply appreciate all the assistance provided by all the other members of faculty and all the staffs of Calvin Theological Seminary. I am particularly thankful to Dr. John Bolt, Dr. John Cooper, Dr. Calvin van Reken, Dr. Lee Hardy, Dr. James Bratt, Dr. James A. Smith, Rev. Richard Sytsma, Ina De Moor, Babara Blackmore, Sue Vander Laan, Paul W. Fields, and Lugene Schemper. My enormous debt of gratitude can hardly be repaid to all my good friends, Todd Rester, Sang Hyuk Ahn, Jeongmo Yoo, Albert Gootjes, Andrew McGinnis, Reita Yazawa, Theodore van Raalte, and Jonathan Marko for all the camaraderie that I have enjoyed, some of whom provided many stylistic suggestions and substantive comments to help me improve my dissertation and clarify my arguments. Also, much appreciation should be assigned to the Korean Student Association of Calvin Theological Seminary for encouraging me and providing me with the social and academic challenges and diversions.

My special gratitude goes out to my Korean professors and mentors, especially to Dr. Young Kyu Kim who was the first person to introduce me to Reformed orthodoxy and teach me

its theological abundance and significance with the deep knowledge of nearly all the disciplines in general, high science and technology in particular; to Dr. Jaesun Choi who encouraged me to finish the doctoral program with unceasing love and prayer since my college life; to Rev. Namjun Kim who provided me with a model to bring theological erudition and practical piety into unity in the field of the church; to Rev. Setaek Oh who seemed to me a great model of a pastor with ministerial authority; to Dr. Young Ahn Kang who, ornamented with sanctity of morals and great scholarliness in knowledge and language, provided me with good advice in a matter of academics; and to Rev. Seungyun Choi who taught me the essence of Christian ministry with emphasis on the dual knowledge of God and human beings. Worthy of special mention are some Korean churches: Ann Arbor Bible Church, Doorae Church, Yullin Church, and Boongdang Central Church for their financial support and prayer, and the Church of the Servant for good fellowship of Reformed faith and being my calling church.

It is hard to express in words my indescribable thanks to my wife, Eunkyong whose deep understanding, sincere faith, and immense support to me throughout my whole theological study are invaluable and immeasurable. I am very grateful for her care, love and trust in me. And also, much appreciation for long suffering, unconditional hug, constant prayer, and consistent encouragement should be to my three lovely children, Eunjin, Geunghyul, and Heri, and my parents-in-law, my brothers and sisters, and my brother-in-law.

Finally, I want to give glory and honor to the Triune God for His guidance, wisdom and love that undoubtedly enabled me to complete the whole course of study and my dissertation. I hope my life and this project will bring thanks and glory to the Triune God alone and benefits to His kingdom.

Abbreviations

The abbreviations used in the following chapters are:

CO: *Ioannis Calvini Opera quae supersunt omnia*, 59 vols., eds. G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss. Brunswick: C. A. Schwetschke, 1863 – 1900.

MO: *Philippi Melanthonis opera quae supersunt omnia*, 28 vols., ed. C. G. Bretschneider. 28 vols. Halle–Brunswick: C. A. Schwetschke, 1834 – 1860.

PG: *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, 161 vols. Paris, 1857 – 1866.

PL: *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Latina*, 221 vols. Paris, 1844 – 1855.

PRRD: *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003.

WA: *Dr. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, 70 vols. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau, 1883 —.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation intends to answer, by investigating the merger of patristic and contemporary sources in the theological method of Amandus Polanus, a significant question concerning the way in which the intellectual and methodological eclecticism of the Reformed was able to establish a coherent “system” of thought capable of defense as not only confessional but also orthodox in its theology and broadly catholic, drawing both on the thought of the Reformers and on the resources of the great tradition of Christian thought that extended back to the church fathers.

From a methodological perspective, Polanus’s development from the Ramistically-organized doctrinal framework of the early *Partitiones*, through the increasingly detailed and specialized efforts of the commentaries, disputations, and *Symphonia*, indicates a fairly clear, concerted effort to build toward a detailed systematic presentation – and in fact, each of these earlier efforts provided as it were building-blocks that would be incorporated into the *Syntagma*. This constructive labor itself serves to set aside the claim that Polanus based his theology on a deductive principle.

The specific focus of the dissertation is on the place and function of backgrounds and sources, traditional and contemporary, with particular emphasis on the place of the church fathers in Reformed orthodoxy. Polanus’s patristic work, *Symphonia*, and its eventual impact on his full systematic work, the *Syntagma*, provides a singular case, within the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, of the reformulation of patristic thought in a fully systematized form, suitable for combination with the results of biblical exegesis and contemporary doctrinal argumentation in the formulation of Reformed orthodox theology.

This study attempts to assess the claim of catholicity and orthodoxy by Reformed theology, demonstrating the formative function of patristic thought in Polanus’s theology. Further, the study illustrates the place of this traditionary exercise within the methodologically eclectic approach followed by Polanus and his contemporaries as they created a theology that drew not only on Scripture and contemporary philosophical assumptions but also on patristic, medieval, Reformation-era, traditionary Aristotelian, Platonic, and Ramist sources.

This study, therefore, reappraises the development of Reformed orthodoxy. In Polanus’s case, an older scholarship that read his theology as based on central dogmas or as an exercise of

rationalism will be set aside in favor of a more nuanced view of his sources and method. Within this larger framework, Polanus's use of the fathers builds on and confirms the Reformers's assumption of catholicity in the face of the detailed polemics of Robert Bellarmine as well as confirming the point that his approach to formulation was traditional and somewhat eclectic. Finally, the dissertation identifies the theological cohesion of the early orthodox Reformed model, as exemplified by Polanus's thought, especially in its method of drawing together of traditional materials from varied sources.

In short, the dissertation demonstrates the importance of the church fathers to the formulation of a Reformed orthodox and catholic theology in the context of showing, contrary to previous studies of Polanus's thought and contrary to the older stereotypes of "Calvinist" orthodoxy, that Reformed orthodoxy was neither a rigid monolith nor a matter of philosophical speculation but the product of a carefully conceived exercise in the compilation and assessment of biblical and traditional materials.

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1. Amandus Polanus and the Development of Early Reformed Orthodoxy

A significant question that remains to be answered in the scholarship on early Reformed orthodoxy concerns the way in which the intellectual and methodological eclecticism of the Reformed was able to establish a coherent “system” of thought capable of defense as not only confessional but also orthodox in its theology and broadly catholic, drawing both on the thought of the Reformers and on the recourses of the great tradition of Christian thought that extended back to the church fathers. This dissertation will investigate the work of Amandus Polanus, the eminent Reformed philosopher, biblical commentator, and dogmatician at Basel during the era of early orthodoxy, with a view to answering that question. Polanus was, clearly, one of the most significant framers of early orthodox Reformed theology, the author of a system, the *Syntagma theologiae*, that provided the Reformed tradition with one of the more cohesive and fully-developed theologies of the era.

In this dissertation, I will investigate several aspects of Polanus’s thought, as unified by his method, specifically by the methodological progress of his thought from an early statement of the framework of his theology, the *Partitiones theologicae*, through various other works, including his biblical commentaries, disputations, and his extended compilation of patristic sources into a systematic *Symphonia catholica*, to the final gathering of materials in his *Syntagma*. From a methodological perspective, Polanus’s development from the Ramistically-organized doctrinal framework of the early *Partitiones*,

through the increasingly detailed and specialized efforts of the commentaries, disputations, and *Symphonia*, indicates a fairly clear, concerted effort to build toward a detailed systematic presentation – and in fact, each of these earlier efforts provided as it were building-blocks that would be incorporated into the *Syntagma*. This constructive labor itself serves to set aside the claim that Polanus based his theology on a deductive principle.

The specific focus of the dissertation will be on the place and function of backgrounds and sources, traditional and contemporary, with particular emphasis on the place of the church fathers. Polanus's *Symphonia* and its eventual impact on his full systematic work, the *Syntagma*, provides a singular case, within the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, of the reformulation of patristic thought in a fully systematized form, suitable for combination with the results of biblical exegesis and contemporary doctrinal argumentation in the formulation of Reformed orthodox theology. This singularity of Polanus's work does not rest, moreover, on its doctrinal distinctiveness, given that Polanus is quite representative of the doctrinal views of developing Reformed orthodoxy.

This singularity or uniqueness of Polanus's work, instead, rests on the full picture of the work of a Reformed orthodox theologian that is documented in the progress of his work from the early *Partitiones* (1589) through a multitude of works in different genres to the *Syntagma* of 1609.¹ Polanus's use of patristic materials was integral to this process. One contribution, therefore, of this study will be an assessment of the claim of catholicity and orthodoxy by Reformed theology, demonstrating the formative function of patristic thought in Polanus's theology. Further, the study will illustrate the place of this

¹ The outlines of this trajectory of production are noted by not elaborated in Amy Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation: Ministers and Their Message, 1529-1629* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 140.

traditional exercise within the methodologically eclectic approach followed by Polanus (and, arguably, by other Reformed writers of his generation) as they created a theology that drew not only on Scripture and contemporary philosophical assumptions but also on patristic, medieval, Reformation-era, traditional Aristotelian, Platonic, and Ramist sources.

This study will, therefore, contribute to the reappraisal of the development of Reformed orthodoxy. In Polanus's case, an older scholarship that read his theology as based on central dogmas or as an exercise of rationalism will be set aside in favor of a more nuanced view of his sources and method. Within this larger framework, Polanus's use of the fathers will be seen to build on and confirm the Reformers's assumption of catholicity in the face of the detailed polemics of Robert Bellarmine as well as confirming the point that his approach to formulation was traditional and somewhat eclectic. Finally, the dissertation will identify the theological cohesion of the early orthodox Reformed model, as exemplified by Polanus's thought, especially in its method of drawing together of traditional materials from varied sources. In short, the dissertation will demonstrate the importance of the church fathers to the formulation of a Reformed orthodox and catholic theology and will do so in the context of showing, contrary to previous studies of Polanus's thought and contrary to the older stereotypes of "Calvinist" orthodoxy, that Reformed orthodoxy was neither a rigid monolith nor a matter of philosophical speculation but the product of a carefully conceived exercise in the compilation and assessment of biblical and traditional materials.

1.2. Polanus, Early Orthodoxy, and the Scholarly State of the Question

Research into the history of post-Reformation Protestantism before 1975 claimed a serious deviation of Reformed orthodoxy from the Reformation regarding doctrine, sources, and method and resulted in a caricature of Reformed orthodox theology as the highly speculative and rigidly predestinarian product of a return to medieval scholasticism. This claim has been dramatically set aside in the last three decades by two groups of scholars: 1) indirectly by Paul de Vooght, Heiko A. Oberman, Karl Reuter, David C. Steinmetz, and Susan E. Schreiner who have argued that it is impossible to draw a stark contrast between the theological results of medieval scholasticism and Reformation theology;² and 2) directly by Richard A. Muller, Willem J. van Asselt, Olivier Fatio, Eef Dekker, Antonie Vos, Carl Trueman, Lyle Bierma, and Jill Raitt who have argued for continuity and development in doctrine, sources, and theological method between the theologies of the Reformation and Protestant orthodoxy.³

² See Paul de Vooght, *Les sources de la doctrine chrétienne d'après les théologiens du XIV^e siècle* (Paris, 1954); Heiko A. Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966); idem, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967); idem, *Masters of the Reformation: Emergence of a New Intellectual Climate in Europe*, trans. Dennis Martin (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Karl Reuter, *Das Grundverständnis der Theologie Calvins* (Neukirchen, 1963); David C. Steinmetz, *Misericordia Dei: The Theology of Johannes von Staupitz in Its Late Medieval Setting* (Leiden: Brill, 1968); idem, *Luther in Context* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986); idem, *Calvin in Context* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Susan E. Schreiner, "Exegesis and Double Justice in Calvin's Sermons on Job," *Church History* 58 (1989): 322-338; idem, *The Theater of His Glory: Nature and the Natural Order in the Thought of John Calvin* (Durham, N.C.: Labyrinth Press, 1991); idem, *Where Shall Wisdom Be Found?: Calvin's Exegesis of Job from Medieval and Modern Perspectives* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).

³ Willem J. van Asselt, "The Theologian's Tool Kit: Johannes Maccovius (1588-1644) and the Development of Reformed Theological Distinctions," *Westminster Theological Journal* 68 (2006): 23-40; idem, *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius (1603-1669)* (Leiden: Brill, 2001); Willem J. van Asselt, P. L. Rouwendal et al. *Inleiding in de Gereformeerde Scholastiek* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1998); and the essays in Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker, eds., *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2001); Lyle D. Bierma, "Federal Theology in the Sixteenth Century: Two Traditions?" in *Westminster Theological Journal* 45 (1983): 304-21; idem, "The Role of

In his theological work, Polanus produced first a compendium of dogmatics, *Partitiones theologiae* (1590), which is almost exclusively grounded in Scripture. He formulated the previously largely unsystematic patristics of the sixteenth century in a fully systematized form, as is shown in *Symphonia catholica* (1607), which I would like to call a patristic Reformed dogmatics. He then combined both into the highly developed scholastic system of Reformed orthodox theology, *Syntagma theologiae christianae* (1609). Such a triplex dogmatics is most characteristic of Polanus's theology.

As Amy Burnett pointedly states,⁴ Polanus's dogmatics was not a simple collection of theological *loci* drawn from the grammatical and philological exegesis of biblical texts but, more distinctively, a comprehensively unified *syntagma* derived from Scripture and patristic thought with the instrumental aid of the rhetorical and dialectical tools of humanism and the Aristotelian-Ramist logic. Each doctrine of his theology, taking its proper place in his dogmatic system, consists of biblical interpretation, doctrinal analysis, patristic consensus, polemic demonstration, and practical application to the daily life of God's people. It may be said that the contribution of Polanus to the history of Reformed Protestantism is thus the product of a philosophical, exegetical, patristic, doctrinal, polemical, and practical dogmatics of Reformed orthodoxy. It is notable that Polanus uses

Covenant Theology in Early Reformed Orthodoxy," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 21/3 (1990): 453-462; Olivier Fatio, *Méthode et théologie: Lambert Daneau et les débuts de la scholastique réformée* (Geneva: Droz, 1976); Jill Raitt, *The Eucharistic Theology of Theodore Beza: Development of the Reformed Doctrine* (Chambersburg, PA., 1972); Richard A. Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009); idem, *PRRD*; idem, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003); idem, *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 Book House, 1991); the essays in Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark, eds., *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2007).

⁴ Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, 142, 271.

citations of the church fathers not just in his exegetical and dogmatic works but also in his philosophical writings.

Polanus's theology and his use of the fathers for his theology have been unduly neglected by modern scholars. His reputation, indeed, has paled in comparison to his more renowned contemporaries, such as William Perkins, Theodore Beza, and even Jacob Arminius. Yet there are some scholars such as Ernst Staehelin, Heiner Faulenbach, Max Eugene Deal, Richard A. Muller, Robert Letham, and Rinse H. R. Brouwer who tackle a variety of issues and subjects with respect to Polanus.⁵ Staehelin's study, *Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf* (1955), was mainly focused on the bibliographical description of Polanus, and Faulenbach's exhaustive work, *Die Struktur der Theologie des Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf* (1967), dealt with Polanus's theological method and his doctrines of God and Scripture, firmly following the outline of the outdated central dogma theory. As a representation of Barthian readings of the material, Deal's Ph.D. dissertation, "The Meaning and Method of Systematic Theology in Amandus Polanus" (1980), was developed around the basis of a systematic formulation of Christian doctrine in Polanus's *Syntagma*. Though acknowledging the Christological and biblical origin of Polanus's theological system and providing generally a sound reflection on Polanus' doctrine of Scripture with a far less Barthian sensitivity, Deal argues in dependence on Barth's

⁵ Ernst Staehelin, *Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf* (Basel: Verlag von Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1955); Heiner Faulenbach, *Die Struktur der Theologie des Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf* (Zürich: EVZ-Verlag, 1967); Max Eugene Deal, "The Meaning and Method of Systematic Theology in Amandus Polanus" (Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 1980); Richard A. Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009); Robert Letham, "Amandus Polanus: A Neglected Theologian?" *Sixteenth Century Journal* 21-3 (Autumn, 1990): 463-476; Rinse H. R. Brouwer, "The Conversation between Karl Barth and Amandus Polanus on the Question of the Reality of Human Speaking of the Simplicity and the Multiplicity in God," in *The Reality of Faith in Theology: Studies on Karl Barth Princeton-Kampen Consultation 2005*, eds. Bruce McCormack and Gerrit Neven (Bern: Peter Lang, 2007), 51-110.

understanding of a system that Polanus's Ramist method of analysis did "violence to the substantive doctrine" and caused him to depart from Calvin, losing the theological significance of "the intuitive and self-evident power of the Word to persuade the mind and convey the truth's meaning."⁶ Making a clear distinction between orthodoxy and scholasticism and arguing for the continuity and development between the Reformers and the Reformed orthodox both in content and method of Reformed theology, Muller's research of Polanus in his Ph.D dissertation, *Christ and the Decree* (1976), was dedicated to the doctrines of Christ and decree and their dogmatic relationship. In addition, Polanus is cited a great deal as one of the most important and representative Reformed orthodox theologians throughout Muller's *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* (2003).⁷ Brouwer exposed Barth's selective reception of Polanus and his 'environmentally effective misunderstanding' to surpass Polanus, drawing special attention to a contextual difference between Polanus and Barth in their understanding of divine simplicity and the multiplicity of its predications. Letham attempted, in his short paper, to offer a structural comparative study of *Partitiones* and *Syntagma*. However, there has been no one among modern scholars who has examined the reception and systematization of patristic thought in Polanus's theology.

⁶ Deal, "The Meaning and Method of Systematic Theology in Amandus Polanus," 5, 52, 220-228. Karl Barth defines a system as "a structure of principles and their consequences, founded on the presupposition of a basic view of things, constructed with the help of various sources of knowledge and axioms, and self-contained and complete in itself." See Karl Barth, *Kirchliche Dogmatik* (Zurich: EVZ, 1932-1970), I-2:963; henceforth: *KD* I-2:963 (in the English translation, *Church Dogmatics*, ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956-1975), I-2:861; henceforth: *CD* I-2:861).

⁷ For example, see Muller, *PRRD* 1:113-115, 1:158-164, 1:231-236, 1:243-247, 1:262-266, 2:155-157, 2:172-176, 3:159-161, 3:227, 3:381-384, 3:551-552, 4:84-88, 4:257-258, 4:326-327.

1.3. Reception and Use of the Church Fathers in Reformed Orthodoxy

Concerning the reception of the church fathers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,⁸ Muller has pointed out that both some Reformers and their Reformed successors sought to develop a catholic orthodoxy of Reformed Protestantism and identify the Reformed church as the true catholic church, with detailed recourse primarily to Scripture and secondarily to patristic sources.⁹ It follows that they had an increasing concern for continuity with the best of the church tradition, analyzing and appropriating patristic thought. In particular, the Reformed orthodox tended to use the citations or thoughts from the doctrinally orthodox fathers widely in discussing each doctrine of their theological systems. Accordingly, patristic thought became a doctrinally and structurally formative influence on their theology. Documentary evidence for this argument is provided by Polanus's systematic reception of the church fathers. The issue to be addressed is the nature of that influence.

There are a number of modern scholars such as Irena Backus, Peter Fraenkel, Hughes O. Old, Anthony N. S. Lane, Alfred Schindler, Scott Hendrix, Leif Grane, S. L. Greenslade, Hans-Ulrich Delius, E. P. Meijering, Luchsius Smits, W. N. Todd, and

⁸ On a most compendious and general description of patristics in the Reformation and orthodox eras, see Irena D. Backus, "Patristics," in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 223-227.

⁹ Richard A. Muller, *PRRD*, 1:40, 4:103; idem, *After Calvin*, 74; idem, *The Study of Theology: From Biblical Interpretation to Contemporary Formulation* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991), 102; idem, *Christ and the Decree*, 12; idem, "Scholasticism Protestant and Catholic: Francis Turretin on the Object and Principles of Theology," *Church History* 55 (June 1986): 193-205. On the continuity in the medieval thinkers' reception of the church fathers, see Burcht Pranger, "Sic et Non: Patristic Authority between Refusal and Acceptance: Anselm of Canterbury, Peter Abelard and Bernard of Clairvaux," ed. Irena D. Backus, *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol.1 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 165-193.

others¹⁰ who have investigated patristic scholarship in the Reformation era and the use of patristic writings by some particular figures of the era like Erasmus, Luther, Zwingli, Melancthon, Bucer, Calvin, Vermigli, and Turretin.

This scholarship, largely concerned with the reception of the fathers by sixteenth- and some seventeenth-century thinkers, has revealed patterns of reception and use much like the reception and use of traditional biblical interpretation associated with pre-critical exegesis and in many ways like the reception and use of various strands of ancient philosophy. The early modern editors and readers of the church fathers were able linguists, trained in the philological methods of the Renaissance, and engaged in the publication of

¹⁰ Irena D. Backus, "Irenaeus, Calvin and Calvinist Orthodoxy: The Patristic Manual of Abraham Scultetus (1598)," *Reformation & Renaissance Review* 1 (January, 1999): 41-53; idem, "Calvin and the Greek Fathers," in *Continuity and Change* (Leiden: Brill, 2000): 253-76; idem, "Calvin's Judgment of Eusebius of Caesarea: An Analysis," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 22 (1991), 419-37; idem, "Calvin's Knowledge of Greek Language and Philosophy," in *Calvinus Praeceptor Ecclesiae* (Geneva: Droz, 2004): 343-50; idem, "Erasmus and the Spirituality of the Early Church," ed. H. Pabel, *Erasmus' Vision of the Church*, Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies 33 (Kirksville: 1995): 95-114; idem, "Influence of Some Patristic Notions of Substantia and Essentia on the Trinitarian Theology of Brenz and Bucer (1528)," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 37/2 (1981): 65-70; idem, "Martin Bucer and the Patristic Tradition," in *March Bucer and Sixteenth Century Europe, Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (28-31 août 1991)*, eds. C. Krieger and M. Lienhard. *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought*, vol 52 (Leiden: Brill, 1993): 55-69; idem, "The Early Church in the Renaissance and Reformation," in *Early Christianity* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1991): 291-303; Peter Fraenkel, *Testimonia Patrum: The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melancthon*, *Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 27 (Geneva: Droz, 1961); Hughes O. Old, *Patristic Roots of Reformed Worship*, *Züricher Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte* 5 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1975); Anthony N.S. Lane, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999); Alfred Schindler, *Zwingli und die Kirchenväter, 147 Neujahrsblatt zum Besten des Waisenhauses* (Zürich: Stadt Zürich, 1984); idem, "Zwingli und die Kirchenväter," ed. Trutz Rendtorff, *Charisma und Institution*, (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1985): 393-404; some essays in *Auctoritas Patrum: Zur Rezeption der Kirchenväter im 15 und 16 Jahrhundert*, eds. Leif Grane et al. (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1993); some essays in Irena D. Backus, *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1997); E. P. Meijering, *Calvin wider die Neugierde: Ein Beitrag zum Vergleich zwischen reformatorischem und patristischem Denken* (Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1980); idem, *Melancthon and Patristic Thought* (Leiden: Brill, 1983); Luchsius Smits, *Saint Augustin dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin*, 2 vols. (Assen: 1956-58); W. N. Todd, "The Function of the Patristic Writings in the Thought of John Calvin" (Th.D. thesis: Union Theological Seminary. New York, 1964); Joseph McLelland, "Peter Martyr's Patristic Sources," in *The Visible Words of God: An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957), 267-271; Douglas H. Shantz, "Vermigli on Tradition and the Fathers: Patristic Perspectives from His Commentary on I Corinthians," in *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, ed. Frank A. James (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 115-138; David F. Wright, "Exegesis and Patristic Authority," in *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, ed. W. J. T. Kirby et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 117-132.

critical editions. Their work could be text critical. It was not, however, historical-critical and it read and used the fathers doctrinally. The context in which passages were read was more their literary than their historical context. In the specific cases of sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century writers like Polanus (or like his Roman Catholic opponents), the basic questions asked of the texts concerned the correspondence of their grammatical sense with the doctrinal standards of orthodoxy or, in the case of the Roman Catholic writers, where the fathers were used as a doctrinal development, notably concerning the doctrine of the Trinity, would arise later in the seventeenth century, but were not debated in Polanus's time.

Whereas the medieval reception of the fathers and, to a large extent, the early modern Roman Catholic reception, can be understood in terms of the method of "reverent exposition" (*exponere reverenter*) or "pious and reverent interpretation" (*pia interpretatione et reverenda*),¹¹ the Protestant approach differed. Specifically, the technique of reverent exposition, like the use of distinctions in scholastic argument, was designed to find or design a harmony of opinion so as not to imply disagreement or error among the major authorities. The Protestant approach, however, assumed that the fathers, the councils, and the later medieval doctors could err, even though particularly the fathers and the councils represented catholic orthodoxy. Protestant writers, including Polanus, were ready to appropriate patristic materials in order to demonstrate the catholicity of Protestantism, but they were not interested in the full appropriation of everything patristic.

¹¹ Marie-Dominique Chenu, *Toward Understanding Saint Thomas*, trans. A. M. Landry and D. Hughes (Chicago: Regnery, 1964), 144-149; Ulrich Leinsle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, trans. Michael Miller (Washington: CUA Press, 2010), 55-59.

These considerations also raise the issue of Polanus's meaning when he writes of the "apostolic" and "orthodox" fathers. The term apostolic is not used by Polanus in the modern sense as a reference to the Apostolic Fathers or writers of the so-called Post-Apostolic Era, namely, Ignatius of Antioch, Clement of Rome, Hermas, and others, who wrote between ca. 100 and 125 AD. Polanus's reference is to those theological ancestors who carried forward the apostolic message. He might, just as easily, have identified them as "evangelical fathers." Thus, "apostolic fathers," in Polanus's language references all of those theological ancestors in whose works the gospel's message of salvation was rightly transmitted to later generations in the church. This also means that the category of father or apostolic father was historically or chronologically open-ended. Polanus's references cover the entire patristic period and also include significant medieval predecessors, like Bernard of Clairvaux – and perhaps, given the kind of arguments and references found in Polanus's works, even Martin Luther. As to the use of the phrase "orthodox fathers," there is a similar difference from what a modern writer might mean. Of course, Polanus makes the expected distinction between an Athanasius as orthodox and an Arius as heretical, but he also assumes that orthodox fathers can err. His assumption appears to be that the orthodox fathers are in the line of teachers who carried forward the message of the gospel, focused on certain key doctrines like the Trinity and the person of Christ.¹² There is a sense, therefore, that Polanus's references to the orthodox fathers are as much references to particular texts or passages in the writings of the fathers that identify the line of orthodox teaching as they are references to the writers themselves.

¹² This is clearly the use of patristic referencing in Amandus Polanus, *Mellificium: In quo articuli praeipui symboli apostolici de dn. nostri Jesu Christi incarnatione, nativitate, passione...enarrantur: et perspicua methodo ostenditur, qua ratione...conciones ministris ecclesiae formare liceat* (Amberg.: Schönfeld, 1613).

With respect to the patristic scholarship of the sixteenth century, a provocative issue raised by modern scholars concerns the purpose of using history or the church fathers in that period. In his laudably ordered and cautiously documented dissertation on the use of history in the sixteenth century, *L'élément historique dans la controverse religieuse du XVI^e siècle*, Pontien Polman has argued that during the Reformation era both the Reformers and their adversaries had no interest in history for its own sake. Rather, they put it at the service of religious controversy, on the assumption that the principle of *sola scriptura* and an appeal to history in that age were mutually exclusive.¹³ In other words, the appeal of both Catholic and Protestant authors to the fathers was not directed at the truth, understood as the historical sense of the documents, but toward polemic ends. In opposition to this claim, positively, Backus has contended that both the Reformers and Roman Catholics also used history to construct and express confessional identity, although still without concern for the original historical sense of the documents.¹⁴

Directly related to the preceding is another issue: whether the Reformers' use of patristic writings started with a polemic purpose or for the sake of nourishing their theology. Against Pierre Imbart de la Tour's statement that the Reformers' use of the church fathers was an outcome of polemical and apologetic controversy with Roman Catholicism,¹⁵ Todd has argued that this was a later development, illustrating Calvin's first

¹³ Pontien Polman, *L'élément historique dans la controverse religieuse du XVI^e siècle* (Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1932), 539-543.

¹⁴ Irena D. Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation: 1378-1615* (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2003), 393-394. On the construction of confessional identity for the Church of England in the seventeenth century by using the church fathers, see Jean-Loius Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

¹⁵ Pierre Imbart de la Tour, *Les Origines de la Réforme IV* (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1935), 38-42.

real use of the patristic writings as occurring after his conversion and against a Protestant opponent.¹⁶ In order to make this argument, Todd appeals to Luchsius Smit's primary thesis that Calvin was converted to the Reformation under the influence of Augustine.¹⁷ Pointing out some weaknesses of Todd's argument, however, Lane insists, in accord with Pierre Imbart de la Tour, that Calvin's citation of the church fathers in his writings "starts and remains unashamedly and primarily polemical."¹⁸ Wisely combining the positions of Todd and Lane, Johannes van Oort suggests an eclectic viewpoint that Calvin read the fathers in keeping with the humanist principle of *ad fontes* even before 1536 but his primary purpose of using the fathers was polemical.¹⁹

These two interrelated issues above may also apply to the Reformed orthodox's use of patristic materials: Was the motivation or purpose of their massive use of the fathers to construct or defend Reformed faith, or rather to do something else? In answer, however, the study of patristic scholarship in the period of Protestant orthodoxy has not received due attention except from some modern Reformed scholars. Throughout his works, Muller draws a broad picture of the function and the theological significance of the church fathers in Reformed orthodoxy.²⁰ Meijering, in his interesting and thorough research, *Reformierte Scholastik und Patristische Theologie*, presents a structural analysis of the relationship between Reformed scholasticism and patristic theology, especially the influence of the

¹⁶ W.N. Todd, "The Function of the Patristic Writings in the Thought of John Calvin" (Th.D. thesis, Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1964), 57-67.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 67; Luchsius Smits, *Saint Augustin dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin*, 1:17-24.

¹⁸ Lane, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers*, 31-32.

¹⁹ Johannes van Oort, "John Calvin and the Church Fathers," in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, ed. Irena D. Backus, vol. 2 (Leiden-New York-Köln: E.J. Brill, 1997): 661-700.

²⁰ Muller, *After Calvin*, 52-53, 74, 125-126, 141-142, 144-145; *PRRD*, 3:340-344, 4:17-22.

church fathers on Turretin's doctrines of God and Christology.²¹ In a short essay, he also provides us with a concise description of the relation between Reformed dogmatic theology and patristic thought in Polanus, Wollebius, and Turretin.²² Backus, in her various articles, offers a more carefully documented account, not only of some orthodox patristic scholars such as Abraham Scultetus, Andreas Rivetus, Robert Cooke, and Thomas James, but also of Andrea Hyperius who himself is not a patristic scholar.²³ On the exegetical and ecclesiastical authority of the church fathers, Southgate shows how John Jewel used patristic literature to defend the English church in continuity with the true catholic church, while Luoma illustrates a debate between Thomas Cartwright and Richard Hooker on the use of the church fathers within the Protestant circle, taking up Cartwright.²⁴ Van Asselt examines the seventeenth-century debates between Protestants and Roman Catholics on the proper use of the church fathers in theological disputes by delving into Johannes Cocceius' thinking on the use of patristic literature.²⁵

Regarding the characteristics of Reformed orthodox patristic scholars, Backus points out that a new critical approach to patristic texts arose in the seventeenth century, but it

²¹ E. P. Meijering, *Reformierte Scholastik und Patristische Theologie: Die Bedeutung des Väterbeweises in der Institutio Theologiae elencticae F. Turretins unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Gotteslehre und Christologie* (Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1991), 16-17.

²² E. P. Meijering, "Calvinist Orthodoxy: Systematic Theology," in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, ed. Irena D. Backus, vol. 2: 867-887.

²³ Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation: 1378-1615*.

²⁴ W. M. Southgate, *John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962); John K. Luoma, "Who Owns the Fathers? Hooker and Cartwright on the Authority of the Primitive Church," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 8/3 (October, 1977), 45-59.

²⁵ Willem J. van Asselt, "Johannes Coccejus en de Kerkvaders: Een Fragment uit het Zeventiende-Eeuwse Debat tussen Protestanten en Rooms-Katholieken over het Juiste Gebruik van de Kerkvaders in Theologische Geschillen," in *De Kerkvaders in Reformatie en Nadere Reformatie*, ed. J. van Oort (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1997), 135-154.

was thwarted by the polemical needs of dogmatics and religious controversy.²⁶ Meijering observes that the Reformed orthodox tended to inconsistently use the church fathers as “testes veritatis,” often out of their historical and literary context. In addition, he argues that the approach of the Reformed orthodox to the church fathers was more speculative than that of Calvin and entailed a greater affinity to patristic and medieval scholastic thought than anything in the biblical theology of Calvin.²⁷ Implying the causal continuity between the Reformation and post-Reformation eras in patristic scholarship, Muller states that the Reformed orthodox’s use of the church fathers as ‘confessional’ models and secondarily as a ‘polemical’ norm should be understood as “the direct outgrowth of the great Reformers’ assumption that the Reformation was the catholic church, that Rome had fallen away, and that the best of the tradition not only could be appropriated by, but belonged by right to, the Reformation and its descendants.”²⁸

In order to see the varied approaches of the Reformed orthodox to patristic sources more closely, some further attention should be given to such writers of the Reformation and orthodox eras as Andreas Hyperius, Jean Crespin, Abraham Scultetus, Daniel Tossanus, Andreas Rivetus, Jean Daillé, and Johannes Gerhard, some of whom will be examined later in more detail.²⁹ In brief, Hyperius included a number of patristic manuals

²⁶ Irena D. Backus, “The Fathers and Calvinist Orthodoxy,” in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, ed. Irena D. Backus, vol. 2: 839-865.

²⁷ Meijering, “Calvinist Orthodoxy: Systematic Theology,” 867-887; idem, *Reformierte Scholastik und Patristische Theologie*., 361.

²⁸ Muller, *After Calvin*, 52-53, 74, 125-126, 141-142, 144-145; *PRRD*, 3:340-344, 4:17-22.

²⁹ Andreas Hyperius, *Methodi theologicae* (Basel: J. Oporinus, 1567); Jean Crespin, *Bibliotheca studii theologici ex plerisque doctorum prisci seculi monumentis collecta* (Geneva: J. Crespin, 1565); Abraham Scultetus, *Medulae theologiae partum Syntagma* (Ambergae, 1598); Daniel Tossanus, *Synopsis De patribus, sive praecipvis et vetustioribus ecclesiae doctoribus, nec non de scholasticis* (Heidelberg, 1603); Andreas Rivetus, *Critici sacri specimen* (Gotthard Voegelin, 1612); Johann Gerhard, *Patrologia, sive de primitivae*

in his theological method. Crespin provided a handy collection of patristic statements on some particular doctrinal issues. Tossanus gave a bibliographical survey of the church fathers. Scultetus, Rivetus, and Daillé provided Reformed patristic manuals in a similar way, focused on the authenticity issue concerning patristic works, which church father to be read, how to read patristic sources, and so on. With an emphasis on the doctrine of the confessional Lutheran Church as standing in agreement with true fathers of the church, Gerhard produced a patristic guidebook which deals with more than 500 thinkers of early church history from the Lutheran dogmatic standpoint and discussing major fathers among them under the headings, *vita*, *scripta*, *elogia*, and *errata*.

Unlike these patristic scholars, however, Amandus Polanus, not himself a patristic scholar in the sense of editing the works of the fathers, deserves to be identified as the patristic codifier of Reformed orthodoxy because his two writings, the *Symphonia catholica* and the *Syntagma theologiae*, together present the most systematically developed form of a patristic theology in formal harmony with the whole system of Reformed orthodox theology. Unfortunately, however, there is no modern scholar who has delved into Polanus's view of the church fathers in relation to the formation of Reformed orthodox theology.

Within the mainstream of Reformed orthodoxy into which Johannes J. Grynæus directed Basel, Polanus played a pivotal role not just in formulating the full system of Reformed orthodox theology but in more uniquely establishing its catholic orthodoxy on the basis of Scripture and the great tradition of the orthodox church fathers, especially by

ecclesiae christianae doctores vita ac lucubrationibus (Jena, 1653); Johannes Daillé, *De usu patrum ad ea definienda religionis capita quae hodie sunt controversa* (Genevae: P. Chouet, 1656).

highlighting the catholic-orthodox consensus in doctrinal truth between what Polanus would identify as the apostolic tradition and the Reformed churches. With the exception of Burnett, who does not examine Polanus's theology, the scholarship has not raised the issue of Polanus's precise place in the development of orthodoxy in Basel.

During the eras of the Reformation and orthodoxy, the majority of the Reformers and their Reformed successors had a concern for reading, analyzing, examining, receiving, and citing the patristic writings generally with the dual intention of establishing and defending the catholicity and orthodoxy of Reformed theology, mainly, in opposition to Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and anti-Trinitarians. It is interesting to note that, except Polanus, they did not devote sufficient attention to the issue of the systematic formulation of patristic thoughts, but remained content with the fact that the church fathers were an ocean of doctrinal wisdom and piety and that the orthodox fathers were the supporters of Reformed theology and faith. This is a considerable reason that Polanus should be given special attention in terms of his patristic enterprise.

The fundamental conviction of Polanus's theological thought is that every true Christian believes, as the insurmountable foundation of the church, in one and the same gospel of Jesus Christ as well as in one and the same Christ. Armed with such an enduring conviction, Polanus was eager to demonstrate that the Reformed churches of his age, not the Roman Catholic Church, were truly apostolic and catholic in faith and doctrine because of their theological consanguinity with the apostles of Christ under the guidance of the same Spirit, and thus that the Reformed churches stood in the catholic-orthodox consensus of doctrine in the line of the ancient apostolic church or tradition. To this end, Polanus would work to elicit a doctrinal consensus of the church fathers from all the patristic

writings of ancient orthodox fathers available at his time and reformulate patristic thought in a highly systematic manner, corresponding to nearly every single doctrine of Reformed theology. Accordingly, it is an aspect of the work of this dissertation to identify the specific meaning of Polanus's language of "apostolic," "fathers," and "orthodox," which carries with it connotations related to the identification of Reformed orthodoxy and rather different from our modern scholarly usages or these terms.

By making an inquiry into the reception of the church fathers in the works of Polanus, I will attempt to present in this dissertation the Protestants' use of the church fathers for expressing their confessional identity as a form of catholic orthodoxy. I will also examine the Reformed orthodox's polemical use of patristic writings as in the theology of Polanus as further evidence of continuity and development in patristic scholarship between the theologies of Reformation and Reformed orthodoxy. This dissertation also shows Polanus's preference for the orthodox doctrinal content of the patristic literature over issues of historical context and literary authenticity.

1.4. Proposed Method

The following study divides into three parts, designed to reveal the foundations and the progress of Polanus's theological method, with a focus on his appropriation of the Christian tradition, specifically as found in the works of the church fathers. Part I (chapter 2) examines Polanus's life with a view to its historical and theological context. Emphasis here falls on Polanus's training, most notably at Basel under J. J. Grynaeus, and his work as professor and successor to Grynaeus at Basel. Positive and negative or polemical influences are examined. On one hand, Polanus was positively influenced by the Reformed

theology of Grynæus and Beza; on the other hand, he was influenced by polemic with Lutheran and Roman Catholic writers of the era, particularly by the work of Robert Bellarmine.

Part II (chapters 3 and 4) examines Polanus's theological method. Chapter 3 deals with Polanus's approach to theology and its sources, namely, scripture, tradition, and philosophy. Reception of the fathers is quite significant to Polanus's approach to philosophy, inasmuch as the fathers offered considerable commentary on the ways in which the church could appropriate and use classical philosophy, as well as cautions against various philosophical problems inherent in the classical philosophical systems. Of particular importance to Polanus's use of the fathers is his careful division of tradition categories of doctrine and rite, perpetual and temporary, divine and human, written and unwritten. Unwritten traditions receive attention, given their problematic use by the Roman Catholics. Written tradition, however, notably that of the fathers, can be supportive of theological formulation, particularly by way of its confirmation of scriptural truths. Given Polanus's assumption that although Scripture is the final authority, tradition can provide some instruction in theology, chapter 4 takes up the examination of Polanus's exegetical practice, with specific attention to his referencing of traditional sources. Here, too, reception and use of the fathers along with other sources is an important element of Polanus's work. He clearly assumed that Reformed exegesis stood in accord with the long-standing interpretation of key passages in Scripture, particularly with reference to some of the more controverted doctrines, like predestination.

Part III (chapters 5 and 6) carries the argument forward by examining first Polanus's *Symphonia Catholica* as a topically collated patristic theology and then looking to his use

of the fathers in his *Syntagma Theologiae*. Polanus provides a list of all patristic writings, indicating their specific editions, that he used to formulate his systems of patristic theology and Reformed orthodox theology, namely, the *Symphonia* and the *Syntagma*. The research examines Polanus' patristic sources insofar as possible from the early modern editions that he used and assesses his use of those materials in the *Symphonia* and the *Syntagma*. These chapters then compare Polanus's several efforts at systematic construction – the *Partitiones*, the *Symphonia*, and the *Syntagma* – to analyze his theological development and the process of theological formulation. A comparative study of those works, in their chronological sequence, will offer insight into Polanus's method and show the interrelationship in Polanus's theology between biblical interpretation, doctrinal exposition, patristic thought, and Reformed orthodoxy. The study will examine the various functions of the church fathers in the formation of Reformed orthodox theology, surely including the justification of its orthodoxy and catholicity of Reformed faith.

For a contextual understanding of Polanus's use of the fathers, it is also necessary to know the academic milieu of his theological works, especially the theological atmosphere of Breslau and Basel where he grew up and studied; the theological interaction with his contemporaries such as Grynaeus and Bellarmine, who were most influential to him, either positively or negatively; and the patristic scholarship in his age, focused on the patristic works of some significant patristicans, like Daniel Tossanus, Abraham Scultetus, and Gaspard Laurent, who were the main representatives of the patristic scholarship in their time. A survey of their approach to patristics will be done mainly by reading and analyzing their writings in a conscious dialogue with secondary sources.

Part One: Amandus Polanus in Context

Chapter Two: Amandus Polanus in Historical and Theological Context

The extant scholarship on Polanus's theological method and the "structure" of his theology has, arguably, misread the impact of traditional philosophy on Polanus's thought, misinterpreted the place and importance of the divine decrees to the structure of Polanus's system, and as a result, has tended to ignore the various sources of his thought as well as its eclectic character.

Barth's dogmatically motivated suspicion of Polanus's bifurcated formulation of a theological system causing the dualism of theological content is also caused by his contextual neglect of Polanus's theology.¹ Barth considers Polanus positively as the "only one (*nur einen*)" of the orthodox dogmaticians who recognized and solved the problem of the *Deus nudus absconditus*²; at the same time, Barth views him negatively as "an extraordinary exception (*eine seltsame Ausnahme*)," who, unlike the fathers, distorted "the biblical view and concept of man."³ Barth's view of Polanus also demonstrates the lack of

¹ For a more detailed account of this issue, see Rinse H. R. Brouwer, "The Conversation between Karl Barth and Amandus Polanus," in *The Reality of Faith in Theology* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2007), 51-110; Robert Letham, "Amandus Polanus: A Neglected Theologian?" *Sixteenth Century Journal* 21 (1990): 463-476.

² The solution of the "Deus nudus absconditus" is also found in other Reformed orthodox. See Beza's analysis of Ephesians 1:5-6 in *Confessio christianae fidei* (London, 1575), iii.9-11; Zanchi's discussions of the Trinity and predestination, Bucanus' *Institutiones theologicae seu locorum communium christianae religionis* (Lausanne, 1602), ii and xxxvi; Scharpius' *Cursus theologicus* (Geneva, 1620), I:244-245; Keckermann's *Systema sacrosanctae theologiae* (Heidelberg, 1602), I.vi, III.i-ii; Perkins' *A Treatise of the Manner and Order of Predestination*, in *The Workes of... Mr. William Perkins*, vol. 2 (London, 1850-1853), 608; idem, *A Golden Chaine*, vol. 1, 105. Cf. J. K. S. Reid, "The Office of Christ in Predestination," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 1 (1948): 166-183 and Muller, *Christ and the Decree* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2009).

³ See Karl Barth, *KD* II-2:119, III-2:456-458; *CD* II-2:111, III-2:380-382. In order to evaluate Barth's view of the issue at hand, see Polanus, *Symphonia catholica seu consensus* (Basel, 1607), V.iv-v, VII.i-VIII.iii.

due respect for the historical and theological context in which Polanus attempted to inherit the best tradition of church and assimilate it into his theological works, a context that he shared it with his Reformed contemporaries, but rather reveals the tendency to impose “his [own] theology on the materials.”⁴ Arguably Barth’s problem of the *Deus nudus absconditus* is a pseudo-problem that never arose in the older Reformed theology.⁵

Faulenbach’s charge of Polanus with imposing rationalism into the whole of doctrinal system is largely due to his lack of respect for Polanus’s own theological and philosophical context, particularly a blend of the Aristotelian and the Ramist schemes that shaped the external frame of his dogmatic system.⁶ Assuming Polanus’s use of Aristotelian philosophy as “the very basis of his theological knowledge,” Deal likewise argues that “the method tends to govern the exposition,” especially in the doctrine of decree and, as a result, that Polanus departed from Calvin in his understanding of Scripture by emphasizing perspicuity as “a quality inherent in Scripture itself.”⁷ Deal’s argument fails to take into account the academic context of Polanus’s time in which the content and method of theology should generally be considered as distinct, and in which philosophy was neither necessarily repugnant to theology, nor coercive to its content. Deal also fails to palce Calvin’s understanding of Scripture into its sixteenth-century context. The result is a caricature of Polanus’s relationship to the theology of the Reformers.

⁴ For the more detailed account of this tendency in Barth, see Muller, *After Calvin*, 99-100.

⁵ See Richard A. Muller, “A Note on ‘Christocentrism’ and the Imprudent Use of Such Terminology,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 68 (2006): 253-260.

⁶ See Heiner Faulenbach, *Die Struktur der Theologie des Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf* (Zürich: EVZ-Verlag, 1967), 140, 313, 332.

⁷ See Deal, “The Meaning and Method of Systematic Theology in Amandus Polanus,” 182, 219, 224-228.

As a corrective to this reading of Polanus, I will provide in this chapter a contextual analysis of Polanus in the historical and theological milieu of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries to give a more balanced and contextualized account of Polanus's theology, with specific attention to his engagement with biblical exegesis, his extensive knowledge of patristic thought, his general and theological education, and his doctrinal correspondence with his contemporaries, including his theological opponents. For a close examination of patristic influence on the formation of Polanus's theology, careful attention should be given to Johannes Jacob Grynaeus, who was Polanus's theological supervisor and father-in-law. The theological relation between Polanus and Grynaeus illustrates the continuity of emphasis among the Reformed on the catholic harmony between their theology and the teachings of the ancient apostolic orthodox church. A more extensive exposition of these elements for Polanus's theological formulation, especially based on the investigation of his various philosophical, exegetical, patristic, and dogmatic works, will be treated in the third chapter. In this chapter, I will examine Polanus in context somewhat biographically, proceeding from his historical context to theological context.

2.1. Historical Context: the Life of Amandus Polanus

2.1.1. Learning the *summa* or summary of faith in Breslau

Born on December 16, 1561, at Troppau in Silesia, Amandus Polanus of Polansdorf entered the Elizabethan Gymnasium of Breslau in 1577. Breslau was the most important metropolis of "grandeur and elegance" in the province, and its citizens were most

honorable and generous.⁸ Faulenbach infers, without any documentary evidence, that Polanus had already adopted the Reformed perspective while in Breslau, since he, staying for a brief period at the University of Tübingen in 1583 where Lutheran theology was dominant at that time, turned out to be an opponent of the Lutheran perspective on the sacraments and a supporter of the Reformed doctrine of God's decree.⁹ It is true that Polanus, identifying his first theological work *Partitiones theologiae* (1589) as the summary of the whole of Christianity (*summa totius christianismi*), confirmed in its preface that he had learned the summary of faith (*summa fide*) at the Gymnasium.¹⁰ A question, therefore, arises about a theological climate of the Elizabethan Gymnasium in Breslau at the time when Polanus was a student there.

In order to grasp the theological atmosphere of Breslau in the second half of the sixteenth century, it is necessary to know some leading figures of the city, such as Johann Heß (1490-1547), Johannes Crato (1519-1585), and Petrus Vincentius (1519-1581). The ideas of the Protestant Reformation already reached Breslau in 1518, through some leading humanists of the city.¹¹ In 1524, the Lutheran faith of the city was publicly proclaimed by a successful disputation of Johann Heß,¹² the first Protestant reformer of Breslau, in

⁸ See Melchior Adam, *Vitae Germanorum medicorum* (Heidelberg, 1620), 261. For the general history of Breslau education during the Reformation era, see Gustav Bauch, *Geschichte des Breslauer Schulwesens in der Zeit der Reformation* (Breslau, 1911).

⁹ Faulenbach, *Die Struktur der Theologie des Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf*, 15. Cf. Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009), 130.

¹⁰ Amandus Polanus, *Partitiones theologiae* (London, 1591), praefatio A5.

¹¹ For this reason, Manfred P. Fleischer views the church reform of Breslau as "the prototype of a Lutheran reformation which was introduced without the aid and benefit of a local prince." See "The Success of Ursinus: A Triumph of Intellectual Friendship," in *Controversy and Conciliation: The Reformation and the Palatinate 1559-1583*, ed. Derk Visser (Pennsylvania: Pickwick Publications, 1986), 102.

¹² For Heß's protokol über die Disputation, see Carl A. J. Kolde, *Dr. Johann Heß, der schlesische Reformator* (Breslau: Ebuard Trewenbt, 1846), 110-121.

defense of the Reformation doctrines, which culminated in the council's edict that all pastors in the city should teach the Protestant faith.¹³ Thus, the establishment of Protestantism in Breslau was accomplished through a collaboration of humanism and Lutheranism in the early sixteenth century.¹⁴ Given the amicable temper of the citizens and Heß's lifelong fellowship with Melancthon, it is understandable that Lutheranism in Breslau of the early sixteenth century had a mild Melancthonian character.¹⁵

After a time under the dominion of two Catholic emperors, Charles V and Ferdinand I, who respectively sought a uniform reimposition of Roman Catholicism and eagerly supported its reform movement, Breslau became more peaceful, both religiously and politically, through the leadership of Ferdinand's heir, Maximilian II. This conciliatory emperor, though having once bestowed his approval on Protestant belief in 1555, identified himself neither as an evangelical nor as a Roman Catholic but just "a Christian" and advocated the tolerant policies for lasting reconciliation between the traditional faith and its evangelical branch.¹⁶ His religious tolerance was not just a product of political calculation but was part of his spiritual conviction.¹⁷ The emperor stood in accord with

¹³ Since 1511, Heß knew and followed Luther at Wittenberg, calling him "pater meus," and also had a close relationship with Melancthon up to his death, which made him have a somewhat mild character of Lutheranism.

¹⁴ Concerning the interplay of late humanism and Lutheranism in detail, see Manfred Fleischer, *Späthumanismus in Schlesien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze* (München: Delp'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1984); idem, "Humanism and Reformation in Silesia: Imprints of Italy—Celtis, Erasmus, Luther and Melancthon," in *The Harvest of Humanism in Central Europe: Essays in Honor of Lewis W. Spitz*, ed. Manfred P. Fleischer (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1992), 17-107.

¹⁵ See F. A. Gillet, *Crato von Crafftheim und seine Freunde*, vol. 1 (Frankfurt: H. L. Brönnner, 1860), 151ff.

¹⁶ On the religious tolerance in the European countries of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, see Joseph Lecler, *Histoire de la tolerance au siecle de la Reforme*, 2 vols. (Paris: Aubier, 1955).

¹⁷ "God is my witness," confesses Maximilian, "that no other matter is more dear to me, that I consider nothing else by day and night with more concern than how the grievous divisions and disputes can be overcome in order that the true teaching of the catholic and orthodox church flourish and spread everywhere,

Cassander's longing for the restoration of ecclesiastical unity between Catholics and Protestants. But he also held to the terms and assumptions of the Peace of Augsburg and viewed Lutheranism as the sole legitimate form of Protestantism. He was, therefore, intolerant of the Reformed advocates, identifying them as "the condemned, evil Zwinglian and Calvinist sect, apart, and excluded from the common religious and secular peace in the empire."¹⁸

Imbued with such an irenic spirit, the emperor took as his personal physician and religious advisor, Johannes Crato,¹⁹ a so-called "irenic crypto-Calvinist," and appointed him to the rank of imperial count palatine, heaping honors upon him.²⁰ In accordance with the religious irenicism of the emperor, Crato would promote ecclesiastical reconciliation but only within the Protestant circle, especially between the Lutheran and the Reformed. Notably, Crato's respected mentor was Melanchthon. The young Crato, though having boarded with Luther since 1534 and having had intimate conversations with him, was much more affected by Melanchthon, not just by his irenic temper but also by his threefold emphasis on the ideals of piety and eloquence, Protestant unity, and the importance of examining antiquity.²¹ For example, in his intervention to solve the problem of the Czech Brethren's precarious status and isolation caused by the threat of other factions, Crato

thus once more reestablishing the unity of the redeeming church." It is cited in Howard Louthan, *Johannis Crato and the Austrian Habsburgs: Reforming a Counter-Reform Court* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1994), 28. Cf. Paula S. Fichtner, *Emperor Maximilian II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 42-49.

¹⁸ Cited in Paula S. Fichtner, *Emperor Maximilian II*, 137. On the ecumenical endeavor of Cassander, see Maria E. Nolte, *Georgius Cassander en zijn oecumenisch streven* (Nijmegen: Dekker & Vegt, 1951).

¹⁹ For the biography of Crato, see F. A. Gillet, *Crato von Crafftheim und seine Freunde*, vol. 1 (Frankfurt: H. L. Brönnner, 1860).

²⁰ Howard Louthan, *Johannis Crato and the Austrian Habsburgs*, 4-9.

²¹ Howard Louthan, *Johannis Crato and the Austrian Habsburgs*, 7-11.

appealed to patristic authority, saying that “the holy fathers saw that a multitude and variety of confessions are the cause of the greatest evils and dissensions in the church.”²²

Like his teacher, Crato would continue to have a regular friendship with both the Lutheran and the Reformed circles and act as an intermediary between them.²³ As a representative of an irenic Melanchthonian-Calvinist orientation, the imperial physician returned to Breslau and struggled against the extremes of the Gnesio-Lutheran followers of Matthuias F. Illyricus and “rigid” Reformed advocates to solidify the tolerant character of the Protestantism in the city.²⁴ Under the reign of Rudolf, this mentally unstable emperor who was “addicted to the mysterious and the miraculous,” Crato was still a great favorite, as a psychological and religious counselor.²⁵

The religious temper of Breslau in the early second half of the sixteenth century, thus, was basically overshadowed by irenicism. In this atmosphere was the Elizabethan Gymnasium, the school where Crato had received his first formal education and, as an imperial count palatine since 1567, bestowed patents of nobility on some teachers of the school, among whom Petrus Vincentius²⁶ was most notable. Since 1538, Vincentius had studied under Luther and Melanchthon at Wittenberg and, through the intimate friendship with Crato and his advice, was appointed by the city council as the rector of the

²² Anton Gindely, ed., *Quellen zur Geschichte der Böhmisches Brüder* (Vienna, 1859), 374.

²³ Cf. F. A. Gillet, *Crato von Crafftheim und seine Freunde*, 283-285, 355.

²⁴ On the tolerant religious mood of Silesia, see Joachim Konrad, *Die Schlesische Toleranz: Geschichtliches Erbe und politische Idee* (Düsseldorf, 1953).

²⁵ For more on the religion of Rudolf, see R. J. W. Evans, *Rudolf II and His World: A Study in Intellectual History 1576-1612* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 84-115.

²⁶ For the notably detailed biography of Vincentius, especially in careful consultation with Melanchthon's letters in *Philippi Melanchthonis Opera quae supersunt omnia*, see Gustav Brauch, “Petrus Vincentius, der Schöpfer des Görlitzer gymnasiums und erste Breslauer Schulensinspektor,” in *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für deutsche Erziehungs- und Schulgeschichte*, vol. 19 (Berlin: A. Kofmann & Kom, 1909), 269-336.

Elizabethan Gymnasium and the inspector of schools in Breslau in 1569.²⁷ His most important work for the Gymnasium was to design its educational regulation, *Der Stadt Bresslaw Schul Ordnung* (1570), which, in Colmar's estimation, was the most outstanding product of the sixteenth century expected in this field, a regulation that was intended to build the foundation of Reformation teaching and humanistic ideal in Breslau.²⁸

Vincentius was a well prepared and experienced rector, since he had been a teacher and rector at Lübeck in 1552 and, after the failure of a mediation attempted between the followers of Flacius Illyricus and Melanchthon, he had left there to be a professor, teaching Greek and Latin classics, eloquence, dialectics, and the philosophy of law, based on the Melanchthonian ideal of instruction and at the end of 1560 as an intermittent rector at Wittenberg.²⁹ It is interesting that, in 1565 when he accepted the offer of the city council of Görlitz, Vincentius departed from Melanchthon's educational program in the liberal arts and exerted his own pedagogical impact to shape a humanistic, reformatory regulation of school and study program as the rector of the Görlitz Gymnasium. At the Elizabethan Gymnasium, however, he seemed to show sympathy with the Melanchthonian method of coupling piety and eloquence, a methodological approach that did not mean to diminish his own educational ideal.

²⁷ It is also through the suggestion of Crato that Carolus Clusius, a Calvinist from the Netherlands and a most distinguished scientist, was appointed in 1573 the prefect of the imperial medical garden to work for Maximilian. These cases illustrate Crato's political power. See Paula S. Fichtner, *Emperor Maximilian II*, 101ff.

²⁸ Petrus Vincentius, *Der Stadt Bresslaw Schul-Ordnung: Auff Eines Erbaren Rathes befehl und anordnung gestellet* (Breslau, 1570); Grünhagen Colmar, *Geschichte Schlesiens*, vol. 2 (Gotha: Friedrich A. Perthes, 1886), 88, 221.

²⁹ In his inaugural lecture as the rector delivered at Wittenberg, Vincentius calls Melanchthon a source of dignity and religious piety (*honoris & religiosae pietatis causa*). For more on Vincentius' praise of Melanchthon, see Petrus Vincentius, *Orationes dvae et epigrammata quaedam de initiis novae scolae* (Gorlic, 1565), B2-D.

The pedagogical spirit of Vincentius, very influential to the mindset of the young Polanus, is most illustrated by the testimony delivered in his inaugural lecture at the Görlitz Gymnasium. His point is that God was the *principium* and *finis* of all things useful for us and others, the author and preserver of our lives, so that all our thoughts and all activities and studies of our lives should refer to the glory and celebration of God.³⁰ The rector's desire is that God, as "the highest Rector (*Rector summus*)," will have the school devoted to the study of doctrines and knowledge of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, since He teaches us by His own Word, He is truth itself and *summum bonum* of all good things, and His Spirit illuminates our mind and heart.³¹ He, thus, claims that the instruction of pious and essential doctrines was not to be limited to the church of adults but also taught in schools of the youth.

In the same vein, Vincentius declares in his *Schul-Ordnung* of the Elizabethan Gymnasium that "it is through the beneficial study of the doctrine concerning God that He wills to seed the church, by which He will be eternally glorified and praised."³² The Christian school must plant the divine doctrines in the hearts of the students for the edification and preservation of the church and finally for the glory of God. For this pedagogical ideal, students must not just learn, interpret, and assimilate divine doctrines

³⁰ See Petrus Vincentius, *Orationes dvae et epigrammata quaedam de initiis novae scholae*, D2: "omnium rerum ... principium & finem constituendum esse DEVM, nimirum vt agnoscamus, eum & vitae nostrae autorem & conseruatorem esse, & successus in vita optatos ac felices ab eo solo peti & expectari oportere, & ad eius gloriam & celebratorem omnia consilia, omnes vitae nostrae actiones & studia referenda esse."

³¹ Petrus Vincentius, *Orationes*, D3: "oramus te, vt hanc nouam scolam studijs doctrinae & agnitionis veri Dei Patris, Filij & Spiritus sancti Tu denique o sanctissime & vere omnipotens, aeterne, & clementissime DEVS, quemadmodum vbique omnium es, ita & nobis sis Rector summus, doce nos verbo tuo, quod est veritas, & Spiritu sancto tuo accende mentes & corda nostra."

³² Petrus Vincentius, *Der Stadt Bresslaw Schul-Ordnung*, A.iii: "Das ist durch die heilsamen studia doctrinae de Deo, wird Gott eine Kirche samlen von welcher Er ewiglich gelobet und gepreiset werde."

into their hearts, but they need also to learn noble arts, speech, history, and all things that are necessary and useful to explain those doctrines.³³

The first and highest order of instruction for young people consists of *Tyrocinian artium, philosophiae, linguarum, and doctrinae ecclesiae*.³⁴ They also learned dialectic, rhetoric, Greek grammar, and arithmetic with Cicero's *Libri de Officijs* and *de Oratore*, as well as his letters and discourses with Livius, Vergilius, Ovidius, and Plautus. In order to learn the Greek grammar and language, they read not only Hesiodus, Homerus, Socrates, *Evangelia Graeca*, and *Epistolas Pauli* but occasionally *Orationem Demosthenis*, *Tragoediam graecam Sophoclis* or *Euripidis*, *Idillia Theocriti*, and some of *Paedia Cyri*.³⁵ For speech, some Latin and Greek poets and orators are included in the reading list.

Dialectic was taught with the epitome of moral philosophy from the philosophical works of Aristotle or Cicero. The theological instruction in the gymnasium consists of *lectiones, studia, and exercitia*. Lectures were given of the *evangelium* and the book of Matthew's Gospel in Greek, periodically Paul's epistles, Acts, and the Hebrew text of Isaiah. The *studia theologiae* involves students in reading, expositing, and reciting the articles of Christian doctrine and catechetical definitions from the *Examen theologicum Melanthonis*³⁶ or *Catechismi Chytraei*.³⁷ In addition, students were academically edified

³³ Petrus Vincentius, *Der Stadt Bresslaw Schul-Ordnung*, A.iiii.

³⁴ Petrus Vincentius, *Der Stadt Bresslaw Schul-Ordnung*, F.

³⁵ Petrus Vincentius, *Der Stadt Bresslaw Schul-Ordnung*, F.ii. G.

³⁶ Petrus Vincentius, *Der Stadt Bresslaw Schul-Ordnung*, F. Note the *Examen* was published first in German, *Der Ordinanden Examen* (1552) and later in Latin, *Examen eorum* (1554). For the considerable detail of the *Examen* analysis, see Christopher M. Croghan, "Melanchthon's 'Der Ordinanden Examen' and 'Examen Eorum': A Case Study in Pedagogical Method" (Ph. D. Dissertation, Luther Seminary, 2007).

³⁷ The full title of Chytraeus' *Catechesis* is *Catechesis seu summa theologiae christianae certa methodo comprehensa* (Johannes Crato, 1569). It is notable that the *Catechesis* consists of a short prolegomena, dealing with the definition of theology and theological method, and doctrines. Chytraeus defines theology as "doctrina de DEI essentia & voluntate ac beneficijs generi humano propter Christum mediatorem exhibitis, &

by learning physics, ethics, poetry, and music. Each of them was given an opportunity to present *studia et exercitia scholastica* in public on a weekly basis, an opportunity that entailed either approval or suspension of their academic accomplishment.³⁸

As described above, the regulation and curriculum of the Elizabethan Gymnasium was established on a blend of mild Lutheranism and the humanistic ideal.³⁹ Under the guidance of such regulation, the young Polanus was faithfully oriented in theology, philosophy, rhetoric, dialectic, and music.⁴⁰ Melchior Adam says that during the six years at the gymnasium, Polanus exercised his innate excellence in study and by so doing he was esteemed by the most famed teachers, Petrus Vincentius, Nicolaus Steinbergerus, and Casparus Brittmannus.⁴¹

Concerning Polanus's theological orientation, it is noteworthy that Melanchthon's *Examen*, which offers a clear outline of essential Christian doctrines necessary for salvation and faith in an orderly way, was used as a pedagogical textbook, and that it was applied by a didactic method of rhetoric and marked the transition of theological teaching from the Reformation era to the post-Reformation era.⁴² What is more important, the *Examen* shows a mild Lutheran view of the Lord's Supper as the communion of Christ's

cultibus ipsi vicissim debitis, patefacta in verbo DEI per Prophetas & Apostolos tradito, & illustribus testimonijs miraculorum confirmata, per quam Deus vere efficax est, & veram sui agnitionem, remissionem peccatorum, iustitiam & vitam aeternam credentibus imperitit."

³⁸ Petrus Vincentius, *Der Stadt Bresslaw Schul-Ordnung*, G.ii.

³⁹ Gustav Bauch, *Geschichte des Breslauer Schulwesens in der Zeit der Reformation*, 221.

⁴⁰ See Ernst Staehelin, *Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf* (Basel: Verlag von Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1955), 12; Faulenbach, *Die Structur der Theologie des Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf*, 114; Amy N. Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation: Ministers and Their Message in Basel, 1529-1629* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 139.

⁴¹ Melchior Adam, *Vitae Germanorum Theologorum qui superiori seculo Ecclesiam Christi voce Scriptisque Propagarunt* (Frankfurt: Johannes Georgius Geyder, 1620), 805.

⁴² See Andrea Stegmann, *Johann Friedrich König: Seine Theologia positiva acroamatica (1664) im Rahmen des frühneuzeitlichen Theologiestudiums* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 133-135.

body and blood in which, Melancthon writes, the Son of God (*Filius Dei*) is truly and substantially (*in qua vere et substantialiter*) present in its reception (*sumptione*) with faith (*cum fide*).⁴³ Here Melancthon did not use such terms, as *Christum in et sub pane et vino* any longer.⁴⁴ The *Examen*, because of its mild Lutheran character, was once forbidden to be taken as a textbook of theological instruction in the Elizabethan Gymnasium. In his inaugural lecture at the Gymnasium in 1558, Ursinus⁴⁵ laid emphasis upon the importance of catechetical instruction and recommended the memorial *Examen* as its best source since it provided a well-ordered summary of basic teaching about faith and love in Christ set forth in the brevity and perspicuity of clear language.⁴⁶ As Bauch reported, it was due to the Melancthonian teaching of the Eucharist included in the *Examen* that the “radical Lutheran” advocates (perhaps, semi-Roman church Lutherans or Gnesio-Lutherans)⁴⁷ of

⁴³ See Philip Melancthon, *Examen eorum* (Wittenberg: Seitz, 1554), K1: “Quid est Coena Domini? Est communicatio corporis & sanguinis Domini nostri IESV CHRISTI, sicut in uerbis Euangelij instituta est, in qua sumptione Filius Dei uere & substantialiter adest.” Also note Luther’s view of the Eucharist in *Luthers Werke*, 30-1:222: “Was ist nu das Sacrament des Altars? Antwort: Es ist der ware leib und blut des HERRN Christi inn und unter dem brod und wein durch Christus wort uns Christen befohlen zu essen und zu tricken.”

⁴⁴ See Melancthon’s *Disputatio de ecclesia et propria ecclesiae doctrinae*, in *Philippi Melancthonis opera quae supersunt omnia* 12:575, and David Chytraeus, *Catechesis*, 146: “COENA DOMINI est actio, a Filio Dei instituta, & ordinata, in qua sumto pane & vino, sumitur verum corpus & verus Sanguis Domini nostri Iesu Christi.”

⁴⁵ Ursinus was the most important influence of Melancthonian Calvinist who was financially sponsored by Crato during his study at Wittenberg and continued to be his life-long protege. For more on the relationship of Crato and Ursinus, see F. A. Gillet, *Crato von Crafftheim und seine Freunde*, 87-119; Derk Visser, *Zacharias Ursinus: The Reluctant Reformer, His Life and Times* (New York: United Church Press, 1983).

⁴⁶ See Zacharias Ursinus, *Oratio exhortatoria, ad doctrinae christianae studium*, in David Pareus, *Miscellanea catechetica seu Collectio eorum* (Geneva, 1616), 42-57. Especially note 57: “Nec aliud est catechismus, quam talium sententiarum breuis declaratio. At talis eum sit libellus Examinis, qui vobis proponitur, & autor proprio & perspicuo verborum genere, summa fide & dexteritate, Christianismi capita complexus sit, similem denique catecheseos formam in multis ecclesiis extare non paulum referat.”

⁴⁷ See Fred. H. Klooster, “The Priority of Ursinus in the Composition of the Heidelberg Catechism,” and Manfred P. Fleischer, “The Success of Ursinus: A Triumph of Intellectual Friendship,” in *Controversy and Conciliation: The Reformation and the Palatinate 1559-1583*, ed. Derk Visser (Pennsylvania: Pickwick Publications, 1986), 73-100; 101-115.

the school became suspicious of Ursinus and eventually he had to resign.⁴⁸ The two facts mentioned above imply that the theological propensity of the Elizabethan Gymnasium was once dominated around the early 1560s before Vincentius's appointment to its rector by the rigid Lutheran faith but later changed into a milder approach.

Nevertheless, it is certain that, though he must have been well aware of the mild Lutheran theology in his early life and there is no documentary evidence of his exposure to the works of any Reformed thinker, Polanus assumed Reformed doctrines between 1577 and 1583.⁴⁹ We do not have any recorded evidence of the exact time or of the person through whom he received the Reformed faith, or of what enabled him to say that he learned the basic summary of faith during the period. We may guess that, rather than Grynaeus, the so-called crypto-Calvinists Vincentius and Steinbergerus, who had correspondence with the Genevan Reformers like Calvin and Beza, instilled the Reformed faith into the heart of Polanus because Polanus's conformity to Reformed teaching was seen even before his first encounter with Grynaeus at Basel in 1583.⁵⁰

2.1.2. Theological Foundation in Basel

After further study, Polanus matriculated at the University of Tübingen on April 19, 1583, and in the same year pronounced his support for the Reformed position of Lambert Daneau based on Romans 9:11ff in a public disputation of predestination presided over by

⁴⁸ See Gustav Bauch, *Geschichte des Breslauer Schulwesens in der Zeit der Reformation*, 253-255.

⁴⁹ Cf. Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, 130.

⁵⁰ Rudolf Thommen, *Geschichte der Universität Basel 1532-1632* (Basel: Detloffs Buchhandlung, 1889), 132.

a Lutheran professor, Jacobus Andrea.⁵¹ For his advocacy of the Reformed view of predestination, Polanus, on the advice of Jacob Schegk,⁵² a pioneer of the Zabarellan idea of philosophy, left Tübingen and matriculated in Basel in July 1583⁵³ with the name “Amos Amandus Polanus,” living there with J. J. Gryneaus.⁵⁴ Recalling the time of leaving Tübingen for Basel, Polanus acknowledged that his stay at Basel was “the special providence of God’s mercy” because God maneuvered him to meet “the most sincere and faithful teacher of theological study and the most excellent and respectful man,” Johann Jacob Grynaeus, who was the professor of the Old Testament and later the New Testament in the University of Basel.⁵⁵ Identifying Grynaeus as both his father-in-law and academic father (*socer & pater meus*),⁵⁶ Polanus assigned to him the greatest amount of gratitude for his foundational instruction in theology and his very congenial hospitality at the time when

⁵¹ Melchior Adam, *Vitae Germanorum Theologorum*, 805-806. On the ubiquity of Christ’s body, Polanus also criticized Andrea by saying that his vicious syllogism entailed many errors in its conclusion. See Amandus Polanus, *Logicae* (Basel, 1599), 371-372. The pagination hereafter in this dissertation follows the 1599 Basel edition of the work, among its editions of Herborn 1590, 1593 and Basel 1598, 1599, and otherwise, I will indicate its specific edition.

⁵² Polanus did not agree with Schegk on the doctrine of Eucharist and criticized two of his errors on it. See Amandus Polanus, *Logicae*, 368.

⁵³ Polanus might have encountered Arminius who remained in Basel from August 1582 to the end of November 1583 and with whose significant achievement in theological study Grynaeus was so delighted, though ten years later disappointed in hearing Arminius’ discord with him on predestination. See Rudolf Thommen, *Geschichte der Universität Basel*, 131: “Arminius quidem nostris displicet collegis. Videtur enim de quibusdam praecipue religionis capitibus nobiscum non sentire de praedestinatione et quae his adhaeren.”

⁵⁴ Melchior Adam, *Vitae Germanorum Theologorum*, 806; Peter G. Bietenholz, *Basle and France in the Sixteenth Century: The Basle Humanists and Printers in Their Contacts with Francophone Culture* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1971), 162; Faulenbach, *Die Struktur der Theologie des Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf*, 24.

⁵⁵ Amandus Polanus, *Partitiones theologiae* (London, 1591), praefatio A5: “post Tubingam me contuli: inde singulari providentia misericordis Dei Baselm sum delatus, ubi sincerissimum & fidissimum studii Theologici ducem Reverendum & excellentissimum virum D. Iohannem Jacobum Grynaeum mihi dedit.”

⁵⁶ See Amandus Polanus, *Partitiones naturalis theologiae* (Geneva: Petrus Albertus, 1623), praefatio; idem, *In Daniele prophetam visionum amplitudine difficillimum, vaticiniorum maiestate augustissimum commentarius* (Basel, 1600), oratio, col. 8. Polanus also calls Beza “our father (*pater nostro*).” See Amandus Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachiae, aliquot praelectionibus Genevae proposita* (Basel: Waldkirch, 1587), 2.

Polanus stayed in the city. Polanus, as Clark pointed out, wholly set himself to the study of divinity in Basel.⁵⁷

The significance of Basel in the history of Protestant universities, indicates Burnett, lies in that it was “the only Protestant city outside of Wittenberg that had a university available to train its pastors as early as the 1520s.”⁵⁸ In addition, Basel, unlike other Protestant cities,⁵⁹ had a well established system of pastoral training and theological education. Basel’s ministers in the early sixteenth century were directed especially in theology by Johannes Oecolampadius,⁶⁰ a highly educated professor giving lectures on Scripture and the cathedral pastor in Basel. With the beginning of the first eucharistic controversy in 1525, this early Basel reformer had close ties with Zwingli supporting the metaphorical or symbolic interpretation of the Eucharist; both maintained “a spiritual eating, eschewing cannibalism,” but were open to Bucer’s effort to achieve eucharistic

⁵⁷ Samuel Clarke, *The Marrow of Ecclesiastical Historie, contained in the Lives of the Fathers, and other Learned Men and Famous Divines* (London, 1650), 450.

⁵⁸ Amy N. Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation: Ministers and Their Message in Basel, 1529-1629* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 11. Also note Ulrich Im Hof, “Die Entstehung der reformierten Hohen Schule. Zürich (1528) – Bern (1528) – Lausanne (1537) – Genf (1559),” in *Beiträge zu Problemen deutscher Universitätsgründungen der frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Peter Baumgart et al. (Nendlen: KTO Press, 1978), 243-262. For the history of Basel University in general, see Edgar Bonjour, *Die Universität Basel, von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart 1460-1960* (Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn Basel, 1960) and for its theology in particular, see 205-220.

⁵⁹ The ill-planned or poorly-funded structural and institutional systems of education in those cities are well depicted in Ian Green, “Reformed Pastors’ and Bons Cures: The Changing Role of the Parish Clergy in Early Modern Europe,” in *The Ministry: Clerical and Lay*, eds. W. J. Sheils and D. Wood (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), 249-286.

⁶⁰ Diane Poythress, *Reformer of Basel: The Life, Thought, and Influence of Johannes Oecolampadius* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage, 2011). For the biography and theology of Oecolampadius, see Wolfgang Capito, *De vita Oecolampadii* and Simon Grynaeus, *De J. Oecolampadii obitu*, included in Melancthon’s *A Famous and Godly History* (London, 1561); Salomon Hess, *Lebensgeschichte D. Johann Oekolampads, Reformators der Kirche in Basel* (Zurich: Ziegler und Söhne, 1793); Johann Jakob Herzog, *Leben Johannes Oekolampads* (Basel: Schweigerhaus, 1843); Theophil Staehelin, *Johann Oekolampad: Der Reformator von Basel* (Basel: Verlag christlicher Schriften, 1864); Ernst Staehelin, *Das theologische Lebenswerk Johannes Oekolampads, Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte* (Leipzig: Heinsius, 1939); I. Miller, “Oecolampadius: The Unsung Hero of the Basel Reformation,” *Illiff Review* 39 (September, 1982): 5-25; Thomas R. Fudge, “Icarus of Basel? Oecolampadius and the Early Swiss Reformation,” *Journal of Religious History* 21 (1997): 268-284.

reconciliation between Luther and the Swiss.⁶¹ The Reformation ordinance (1529) and the Basel confession (1534),⁶² both issued by the city council, were established on the basis of Zwingli's lifelong cohort. Oswald Myconius, Oecolampadius's successor as cathedral pastor in 1532, was also supportive of Bucer's efforts to reconcile Zwingli and Luther and went further to help draft and endorse the Wittenberg Concord⁶³ but with Bucer's interpretation⁶⁴ in 1536. Its marginal gloss shows that a clearly Zwinglian view of the Eucharist disappeared in the later editions of the Basel confession after 1547.⁶⁵ Thus, the mild Lutheranism of the Wittenberg Concord, which was intended to avoid the two hotly debated issues of oral manducation and the ubiquity of Christ's body, spread through the university and churches of the city during the later 1530s and 1540s. In addition, Simon Sulzer succeeded Myconius and, while more attracted to the Lutheran position, became a staunch supporter for Bucer's mediating view of the Lord's Supper, employing the wording of both the First Helvetic confession and the Wittenberg Concord.⁶⁶

⁶¹ Oecolampadius openly declared his adherence to Zwingli's view of the Eucharist in *De genvina verborum Domini, host est corpus meum, iuxta uetustissimos authores, expositione liber* (Strassburg, 1525). Note Amy N. Burnett, "It Varies from Canton to Canton: Zurich, Basel, and the Swiss Reformation," *Calvin Theological Journal* 44 (2009): 251-262.

⁶² Note Emil Dürr and Paul Roth, eds., *Aktensammlung zur Geschichte der Basler Reformation in den Jahren 1519 bis Anfang 1534* (Basel: Historische und antiquarische Gesellschaft, 1921-50), 3:383-409, 6:403-410.

⁶³ This Concord, designed to end such an interminable debate over the Eucharist between the two circles, was signed by both the Reformed (Bucer, Capito, Alber, Frecht, Otter, and Musculus) and the Lutherans (Luther, Melancthon, Bugenhagen, Jonas, Cruciper, Menius, Myconius, Rhegius, and Spalatin), though Bucer immediately modified it.

⁶⁴ Bucer's modification in the interpretation of the Wittenberg Concord underlines the reception of the heavenly element of the Eucharist only by believers and the distinction of the *indigni* and *impii*, as seen in his *Declaratio articulorum germanica*, in *Martin Bucers Deutsche Schriften*, vol. 6-1 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1960ff), 209-216.

⁶⁵ Note Karl R. Hagenbach, *Krische Geschichte der Entstehung und der Schicksale der ersten Baslerkonfession und der auf sie gegründeten Kirchenlehre* (Basel: J. G. Neukirch, 1827), 34-35; Amy N. Burnett, "Basel and the Wittenberg Concord," in *Archive for Reformation History* 96 (2005): 33-56.

⁶⁶ Note Amy N. Burnett, "Generational Conflict in the Late Reformation: The Basel Paroxysm," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32/2 (Autumn, 2001): 217-242. For Sulzer's biography, see Gottlieb Linder,

Since the early 1550s, however, Basel's endorsement of the eucharistic middle ground between the Lutherans and the Reformed was challenged for several reasons: the Lutherans' condemnation of Zwingli in 1557, the outbreak of plague in 1564, and the publication of the second Helvetic confession in 1566.⁶⁷ In 1571, Basel's clerical corps again subscribed to the Wittenberg Concord with Bucer's explanation. Just as in Silesia, then, the political and ecclesiastical leaders of Protestantism in Basel basically pursued in the first half of the 1570s a conciliatory policy to establish a theological alliance between the Lutherans and the Reformed, without exclusively endorsing a confessional identity of either party.⁶⁸

Sulzer's resignation from the chair in theology and the appointment of Johannes Jacob Grynaeus to his successor in the university of Basel in 1575 indicated a decisive change toward Reformed orthodoxy in the theological, educational, and pastoral climate of the city. An eminent Swiss Reformed theologian, Grynaeus had been educated at Basel and Tübingen under the four Lutheran sympathizers, Jacob Sulzer, Jacob Heerbrand, Erhard Snepf, and Jacob Andreae. Serving as professor of Old Testament at the university of the city (1575-84), he played a pivotal role in the reorganization of Heidelberg University (1584-86), and finally returned to the university of Basel, teaching the New Testament there from 1586 until his death.⁶⁹

Simon Sulzer und sein Antheil in der Reformation im Lande Baden sowie an den Unionbestrebungen (Heidelberg, 1890).

⁶⁷ See Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, 45.

⁶⁸ Burnett implies that a delicate situation of Basel in confessional identity might be occasioned by its "geographical location on the border between the Holy Roman Empire and the Swiss Confederation." See Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, 28-33.

⁶⁹ Regarding his life and works, see Melchior Adam, *Vitae germanorum theologorum*, 868-880; Sigismus Apinus, "Vita Iohannis Iacobi Grynaei," in *Joannis Iacobi Grynaei Epistolae familiares LXVI* (Norimbergae, 1720), a1-d2; F. Weiss, "Johann Jakob Grynaeus," in *Basler Biographien* (Basel: B. Schwabe, 1900), 159-

From 1559 to 1568, he advocated the Lutheran view of the Eucharist, holding the real and substantial presence of Christ's body and blood "in, with, and under bread and wine," and remained in the Lutheran camp in the early 1570s.⁷⁰ Before his election as Sulzer's successor in Basel, however, Grynaeus became a vigorous advocate for the Reformed understanding of the Eucharist. What caused his conversion? The traditional view⁷¹ is that his devotion to the Reformed faith resulted from the influence of Thomas Erastus, who had been in close association with Basel's Grynaeus clan and attacked the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity as a monstrosity.⁷² This view is grounded in the indirect witness of the epistolary correspondence between Grynaeus and Erastus.⁷³ A more careful examination of Grynaeus' *Exomologesis* would, however, provide us with a clue to the reason for his joining the Reformed tradition, that is, he had credited his rigorous advocacy

200; Max Geiger, *Die Basler Kirche und Theologie im Zeitalter der Hochorthodoxie* (Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1952), 40-45; Fritz Buri, "Johann Jakob Grynaeus," in *Der Reformation verpflichtet* (Basel: Christoph Merian Verlag, 1979), 55-58. The description of Grynaeus' personal character is most succinct in Samuel Clarke, *Marrow of Ecclesiastical History* (London, 1654), 900: "He was very dutifull to his parents, liberal to a poor brother which he had; temperate in food and apparel all his life long; courteous and affable to every man; respectfull to all degrees; studious of love and concord amongst the good, especially scholars, as his many epistles shew."

⁷⁰ See Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Devm opt. maximvm qve exomologesis*, in *Ioh Oecolampadii Dialogvs, quo Patrum sententiam de Coena Domini bona fide explanat* (Basel: Waldkirch, 1590), 273: "Ideo, si quidem opinionem illam de corporali praesentia corporis & sanguinis Christi, in, cum, sub pane & vino Coenae Dominicae, attendas, scrutator renum nouisti, mihi cum Augustino dicendum, Ab anno 19. vsque ad 28. seducebamur & seducebamus." For Grynaeus' biography, see F. Weiss, "Johann Jakob Grynaeus," in *Basler Biographien* (Basel: B. Schwabe, 1900), 159-200; Fritz Buri, "Johann Jakob Grynaeus." In *Der Reformation verpflichtet* (Basel: Christoph Merian Verlag, 1979), 55-58.

⁷¹ Weiss, "Johann Jakob Grynaeus," 164; Geiger, *Die Basler Kirche und Theologie im Zeitalter der Hochorthodoxie*, 40; Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, 135; Charles D. Gunnoe, *Thomas Erastus and the Palatinate: A Renaissance Physician in the Second Reformation* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 258-259.

⁷² Despite his close ties with Zwinglians on the matter of the Eucharist, Erastus maintained obstinate resistance to the Reformed polity of church discipline. An identification of Erastus as Reformed deserves further detailed study. Cf Gunnoe, *Thomas Erastus and the Palatinate: A Renaissance Physician in the Second Reformation*, 135-260, and Ruth Wesel-Roth, *Thomas Erastus* (Lahr, Baden: Verlag Moritz Schauenburg, 1954).

⁷³ For example, Gunnoe cited letters from Erastus to Grynaeus, Basel UB, G II 4, fol. 181, 187, 290, 297. See Gunnoe, *Thomas Erastus and the Palatinate*, 258-259.

to the Lutheran teaching of the Lord's Supper before the early 1570s to his ignorance of biblical authority and negligence of reading Scripture.⁷⁴ With regard to the spiritual manducation of Christ's flesh, Grynaeus acknowledged that he had not looked to Scripture but simply consulted Luther's writings, to whom he excessively credited more authority than all ancient works from the time of apostles. At that time, he continued, "all in me were testified and ruled by human authority and opinion that exerted their power over truth."⁷⁵

As to his theological conversion to the Reformed faith, however, Grynaeus put his primal emphasis on the authority of Scripture, and also on the simple doctrines of the ancient ecumenical creeds over the mysterious presence of two natures in one person of Christ and the clear distinction between *totus Christus* and *totum Christi*, a distinction that relies upon the noted phrase of John of Damascus, "*Totum* refers to nature, *totus* to hypostasis (Τὸ μὲν ὅλον φύσεως ἐστὶ παραστατικόν, τὸ ὅλος δὲ ὑποστάσεως)."⁷⁶

Grynaeus attributed the omnipresent character of Christ not to *totum Christi* but to *totus*

⁷⁴ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Devm opt. maximvm qve exomologesis*, 273: "Consulto, sed praepostero consilio, ruri agens, abstinebam a lectione Scriptorum, de spirituali manducatione carnis Christi: & sine iudicio grassabar per scripta Lutheri, quibus plus tribuebam quam toti antiquitati Ecclesiasticae, quae quidem Apostolorum tempora subsequuta est. Imo aequiore animo tulissem, si quis Petrum Apostolum lapsum dixisset, quam si quis Lutherum alicubi circa rem Eucharisticam errauisse affirmasset." It is notable that Gunnoe did not consider Grynaeus' own testimony in *Exomologesis* on the matter of his conversion.

⁷⁵ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Devm opt. maximvm qve exomologesis*, 275: "Sed humanae auctoritas & opinio vim faciens veritati, me totum ita sibi vendicabant & regebant."

⁷⁶ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Devm opt. maximvm qve exomologesis*, 276: "Articuli Symboli historici, de incarnatione & de exaltatione Christi, non sunt confundendi. Differentia specifica unionis duarum in Christo Naturarum, est unam constituere personam...Totus Christus est vbique, sed non totum Christi. Omne quod per os intrat, vadit inventrem. In Coena Domini agitur mentis, non ventris negotium"; idem, *De eucharistica controversia capita doctrinae theologicae* (Heidelberg, 1584), G3: "Totum denotat naturam, totus autem personam." Cf. John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa*, in *PG* 94, col.1012: "Ὁλος μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ θεὸς τέλειος, οὐχ ὅλον δὲ θεός (οὐ γὰρ μόνον θεός, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄνθρωπος), καὶ ὅλος ἄνθρωπος τέλειος, οὐχ ὅλον δὲ ἄνθρωπος (οὐ μόνον γὰρ ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλὰ καὶ θεός). Τὸ μὲν ὅλον φύσεως ἐστὶ παραστατικόν, τὸ ὅλος δὲ ὑποστάσεως, ὥσπερ τὸ μὲν ἄλλο φύσεως, τὸ ἄλλος δὲ ὑποστάσεως." Following Grynaeus, Polanus also makes a distinction between *totus Christus* & *totum Christi*: *illud enim personam, hoc naturam significat*, quoting the same text of Damascenus. See Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 235.

Christus. And then he declared his joyless antipathy toward the Formula of Concord and his ardent advocacy for the Reformed churches in both Heidelberg and Baden.⁷⁷ In this regard, Melchior Adam points out that the real impetus behind Grynaeus' theological conversion from the Lutheran to the Reformed position was, above all, the unfolding of Scripture and then consultation with the writings of the church fathers and his contemporaries.⁷⁸ His conversion in dependence on the biblical and patristic authority heavily affected Polanus' theological work and propensity.

Since Grynaeus' appointment to the chair of Old Testament in 1575 and later the antistes, this "born organizer and leader" became more influential in the intellectual and political nerve of the city and ventured to establish a purer Reformed tradition in Basel, while eliminating any vestige of Lutheranism.⁷⁹ Knowing that students were wasting too much time by excessively reading theological works and writing polemical works, while neglecting the study of Scripture and bypassing Christ's love of their neighbors, Grynaeus emphasized the theological importance of the study and proper understanding of Scripture itself that would hopefully be the key to make students more receptive to the Reformed teachings.⁸⁰ In addition to his scripture-centered approach to the reorganization of theological instruction for the firm establishment of Reformed faith in the university and

⁷⁷ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Devm opt. maximvm qve exomologesis*, 277: "... tu tamen nouisti, me ardentem diligere Ecclesias reformatas, quae sunt in Marchia Badensi, pro iis precari, vt conseruentur in Christo."

⁷⁸ Melchior Adam, *Vitae germanorum theologorum*, 871: "Interea autem dum Formula concordiae cuditur, ac variis obruditur, ipse Biblia inprimis diligenter evoluit: deinde veterum & neotericorum scripta contulit; & aliorum iudicia per literas atque coram cognouit."

⁷⁹ Hans R. Guggisberg, *Basel in the Sixteenth Century: Aspects of the City Republic before, during, and after the Reformation* (St. Louis, MO: Center for Reformation Research, 1982), 47.

⁸⁰ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Epitomes sacrorum biblion, pars prima, complectens veteris testamenti tum librorum tum capitum argument* (Basel: Henricpetri, 1577), a3; idem, *Devm opt. maximvm qve exomologesis*, 273. Cf. Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, 136.

church of Basel, Grynaeus' positive introduction of dialectic and rhetoric as the methodological tools for textual analysis in scriptural exegesis and theological instruction also characterized a decisive change in Basel's religious climate and educational system.⁸¹

When Polanus matriculated at Basel's university, the prevailing evangelical tradition in the city was still blended with Sulzer's personal leaning to Lutheranism, but the gradual influence of Reformed orthodoxy in the university was reflected, notably, in scriptural exegesis and lectures of theology through the enduring efforts of Grynaeus. Different from Sulzer, who theologically advocated the thoughts of Melanchthon and Bucer and methodologically showed a persistent preference for the grammatical and rhetorical analysis in biblical exegesis and a philological and discursive style in his lectures, Grynaeus put initial emphasis on "the holiest authority and highest perfection of God's Word" against the Roman Catholic approach and on the analysis of individual verses; he was eager to introduce the rhetorical and dialectical analysis of Scripture into the exegetical method and dialectical argumentation in theological instruction.⁸² But this does not mean that Grynaeus disregarded the importance of philological and linguistic skills in exegesis. Grynaeus' approach to the proper understanding of Scripture was outlined in his *Epitomes* which became not only a methodological model of rhetorical and dialectical analysis applicable to any biblical text for his students but also a guide for pastors in their immediate sermons, especially on the Old Testament.⁸³ His approach consists of four steps,

⁸¹ Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, 134-139.

⁸² Grynaeus, *Epitomes sacrorum biblion*, α3. Also note Burnett, "The Educational Roots of Reformed Scholasticism: Dialectic and Scriptural Exegesis in the Sixteenth Century," *Dutch Review of Church History* 84 (2004): 299-317.

⁸³ See Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, 136-138; Grynaeus, *Epitomes sacrorum biblion*, 1-18. Grynaeus did not publish a second part of the *Epitomes* about the New Testament, but provided the chronology of the New Testament and analysis of Paul's *Epistle to Romans*. See Johann Jacob Grynaeus,

an approach that theological candidates should consider in reading God's divine oracle: 1) didactical method and explanation of doctrines about Holy Scripture; 2) synopsis of all biblical books; 3) recapitulation of the facts in Scripture; and 4) discussion of *loci communes* elicited from Scripture and their application to the limited spatial-temporal field of life.⁸⁴

Regarding the nature of Scripture, Grynaeus suggested four premises which the students of theology must assume. The first premise is a kind of warning, that is, even an iota of divinely inspired Scripture should not be omitted or added. The second concerns the purpose and use of Scripture: the purpose is to make people wise for salvation through faith in Christ, and its uses consist in doctrine (teaching and rebuking) and moral life (correcting and training in righteousness). The third concerns a proper method. In order to investigate each book of Scripture, students should consider method first. Grynaeus preferred a synthetic method (*methodus synthetica*) in which students, by observing the external works of God from the beginning, reached and celebrated God's perfection and goodness in all things.⁸⁵ The excellency of this method, he averred, was most illustrated in the apostolic Creed which treats, in order, with the creation and perfection of God's work, corruption and destruction of the work and divine order, our redemption through Christ, church and its ministry, and the completion of our restitution. In examining each biblical book, students ought to consider four things: its author, its authority, the time when it was

Chronologia brevis evangelicae historiae: Logiciqve artificii in epistola apostoli Pavli ad Romanos (Basel, 1580).

⁸⁴ See Grynaeus' concise analysis of *loci communes* in his *Chronologia brevis evangelicae historiae*, 249-252.

⁸⁵ Grynaeus also used the analytic method. For his analytico-synthetic method, see his commentaries *Chronologia brevis evangelicae historiae*, *Thesium analyticarum, de epistola Pauli apostoli, ad Galatas* (Basel, 1582), and *Explanatio epistolae S. apostoli Pavli, ad Hebraeos* (Basel, 1586).

written, and its use for community and individuals. The fourth premise is about causes. The principal and efficient cause of Scripture is the Holy Spirit and its instrumental cause is the selected ministers of the Old and the New Testaments. The matter of Scripture consists in two kinds, Christ and his works. It is remarkable that scriptural testimonies of Christ are prophetic, typological, historical, and didactical. The formal cause is the demonstration of prophets and apostles in divinely inspired harmony and the final cause consists in the celebration of God's goodness as the unique author of all goods and our knowledge of Christ. Moreover, for the acquisition of erudite doctrines and the accurate teaching of Holy Scripture, Grynaeus advised his students to compose their own *Epitome* according to the approach.⁸⁶ His theological lecture was focused on the twofold process, the elicitation of theological doctrines from the analysis of biblical texts and the application of the doctrines to the Christian life.

Grynaeus' impact on the foundation of the Reformed tradition in Basel is well evidenced by the topics of 180 published theological disputations, divided into four categories: Protestant belief in general, Reformed doctrine, practical and exegetical issue, and polemical issue.⁸⁷ And the success of his efforts may be indirectly measured by the fact that John Casimir, an administrator of the Palatinate 1583-1592 who was eager to have all the Reformed churches of Europe reach a confessional unity, greatly admired and invited Grynaeus to help the reorganization of Heidelberg University into the academic

⁸⁶ Grynaeus, *Epitomes sacrorum biblion*, β3.

⁸⁷ For a good source on this issue, see Amy N. Burnett, "Preparing the Pastors: Theological Education and Pastoral Training in Basel," in *History Had Many Voices*, ed. Lee P. Wandel (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2003), 131-151.

center of Reformed faith, as well as to take care of churches and schools.⁸⁸ The extent of Grynaeus' effort to restore the university to a Reformed foundation may be demonstrated by the theme of his first lecture delivered to students, some electoral councils and scholars, a lecture "on the end of history (*de finibus historiae*)," that is, the reunion of science, family, church, and state in Christ.⁸⁹ Giving this lecture, he intended to promote the incorporation of those entities for the more stable establishment of Reformed faith in the university.⁹⁰

Thus, Polanus's exegetical, methodological, patristic, and dogmatic settlement at Basel was affected primarily by Grynaeus' omni-directional consolidation of Reformed faith in the city. However, it should be noted that Polanus was not just content with a basic appropriation of his advisor's theological concerns and method; instead, he developed them. This development will be discussed in the next four chapters.

2.1.3. Encounter with Beza

Though well versed in the Reformed theology in Basel, Polanus still sensed the uncertain and roving approach of his theological study and thus moved further to assume

⁸⁸ See Grynaeus, *Devm opt. maximvm qve exomologesis*, 280, and Adam, *Vitae germanorum theologorum*, 872. For Casimir's work of ecclesiastical union, see Jill Raitt, "The Elector John Casimir, Queen Elizabeth and the Protestant League," in *Controversy and Conciliation* (Allison Park: Pickwick, 1986), 117-145; Johannes Janssen, *General Conditions of the German People from the So-called Religious Pacification of Augsburg in 1555 to the Proclamation of the Formula of Concord in 1580, History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Age*, vol. 8 (London: Paul, 1905), 198-214.

⁸⁹ See Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Orationes duae, altera de symphonia prophetarum et evangelistarum de evangelio D. nostri Iesu Christi, altera de theorico et practico fine historiae* (Heidelberg, 1584), 12-21. Cf. Gustav A. Benrath, *Reformierte Kirchengeschichtsschreibung an der Universität Heidelberg im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Gesamtherstellung: Zehnersche Buchdruckerei, Speyer am Rhein, 1963), 11-13.

⁹⁰ At the outset, observes Adam, Grynaeus immediately (*statim*) enlivened the reinforcement of Reformed faith in the academy and churches of Heidelberg, with the advice of Daniel Tossanus and others. See Adam, *Vitae germanorum theologorum*, 872.

the various benefits of logic organizing a certain path and goal of study, not only in lectures and disputations but also in his personal meditation of Scripture. He characterized logic as consisting in three laws of homogeneity, brevity, and order.⁹¹ In his thought, the logic could enable him to circumscribe, observe, select, collect, and categorize definitions and distinctions, according to which the most important ones of instruction and knowledge could be most solidly positioned. Having this in mind, Polanus accompanied Grynaeus who was asked by Casimir to be a theology professor of the Heidelberg University for its Reformed reorganization. He also visited Geneva where, he recollected, “the clemency of the Lord Christ granted me to enjoy a great privilege of experiencing the lectures and disputations of the most accurate and sharpened theologian, Theodore Beza.”⁹² The degree of Polanus’s theological respect for Beza may be measured by his understanding of Beza as “the Irenaeus of our generation (*nostrae aetatis Irenaeus*)” and “our Teacher and father (*Praeceptore & patre nostro*).”⁹³ For a theological method, Polanus recommended to his theology students Beza’s most skillful manipulation and harmonizing of theology and logic as an efficient model of doctrinal debates against the Roman Catholics.

⁹¹ Amandus Polanus, *Logicae libri duo* (Herborn, 1590), 4r-5v.

⁹² Amandus Polanus, *Partitiones theologiae* (London, 1591), praefatio A5; Bonjour, *Die Universität Basel: von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, 215-219; Richard Gamble, “Switzerland: Triumph and Decline,” in *Calvinism in Switzerland, Germany, and Hungary* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1992), 79-95; Clarke, *The Marrow of Ecclesiastical Historie*, 450. On the relation of Polanus to Beza, there is no clear evidence for Faulenbach’s critique that Polanus took over Beza’s predestinarian theology. Polanus cited Beza along with Paul, Augustinus, Zanchius, Daneaus and Ursinus who supported his principal structure of the theology as consisting in faith and obedience. Note Polanus, *Partitiones naturalis theologiae*, praefatio; Faulenbach, *Die Struktur der Theologie des Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf*, 315ff; Letham, “Amandus Polanus: A Neglected Theologian?” 463-476.

⁹³ Amandus Polanus, *Partitiones naturalis theologiae* (Geneva, 1623), iiiii; idem, *Syntagma theologiae christianaе*, vol. 1 (Hanoviae, 1609), II.i.6 (841). Polanus identified Irenaeus as an author of the highest antiquity that defended the truth of God against the heretics of his day. See idem, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum, ad methodi leges conscriptarum et disputationibus Roberti Bellarmini* (Basel: Waldkirch, 1597), 443.

The Geneva and the Basel Reformed orthodox had a scholarly relationship in such a way that Beza, as a referee, read Polanus's thesis, *De notis essentialibus verae Eccelsiae* (1590), which Grynaeus sent him, and the thesis was held in high regard by Beza, who responded that "in respect of [your theses] most precious to me I thank you with the most pleasing duty, not only for the dignity of argument, but also because it was accomplished by you."⁹⁴ Right after writing a eucharistic thesis, *De controversii in Coena Domini* (1593), Beza gave Polanus one copy of the six copies of its first edition.⁹⁵ In his letters to Grynaeus, Beza often sent his warm greetings to Polanus.⁹⁶ In addition, Polanus, when teaching at Basel as "a professor ordinarius," was academically and theologically credited, and Beza requested him to give lectures about the entire book of Malachi at Geneva theological school.⁹⁷

Since his encounter with Beza, Polanus wrote that he did not stop (*non destiti*) scrutinizing and collecting a number of definitions and distinctions, especially preserved and handed over by Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin, Vermigli, Beza, Ursinus, Gryneaus, and Sohnius. Furthermore, he contemplated, constructed, and disposed those definitions and distinctions in a certain method (*methodo certa*).⁹⁸ It is remarkable that Polanus had no theological conflict but rather an intimate theological association with Beza, though he wrote *Syntagma logicum Aristotelico-Ramaeum*, a methodological blend of Aristotelianism

⁹⁴ See Beza's letter to Polanus in *Correspondance de Theodore de Beze*, tom xxxi, 1590 (Geneva: Droz, 2010), 200: "S. Heri, vir eximie, theses illas accepi, mihi abs te inscriptas, sed nullis adjunctis abs te literis; de quo pretiosissimo est, longe gratissimo munere ingentes tibi gratias ago."

⁹⁵ Note Beza's letter to Grynaeus in *Correspondance de Theodore de Beze*, xxxi:183-186 and xxxiv:100-101.

⁹⁶ Note Theodore Beza, *Correspondance de Theodore de Beze*, xxxi:220-222 and xxxiv:281-284.

⁹⁷ Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachiae*, 2-3.

⁹⁸ The result of these efforts was *Partitiones theologiae* (the first edition, 1589). See Stephanus Szegeidinius, ed., *Enchiridii locorum communium theologorum* (Basel, 1589), epistola.

with Ramism, and moreover made the Ramist method of bifurcation gain a firm foothold in Basel's theology faculty while Beza argued against the Ramism and expressed a preference for Christian Aristotelianism.⁹⁹ This demonstrates that the content of theology is not necessarily interlinked with its method and that the use of either Aristotelian philosophy or the Ramist method of bifurcation did not entail any significant change in content for Reformed orthodoxy.¹⁰⁰

2.1.4. Return to Basel: Ministry and Works

After a short stay in Heidelberg and Geneva, Polanus returned to Basel where he could learn from Grynaeus more about how to apply the dialectic method to theology and also become more acquainted with the ideas of Peter Ramus. At the University of Basel, the study of Ramism was not forbidden but rather advocated by such professors as Christianus Ursitius, Theodor Zwinger, and Johann L. Freigius.¹⁰¹ Grynaeus did not prevent his students from using the Ramist method, although he did not often use in himself. At the turn of the sixteenth century, the methodological influence of Ramism increased at the University of Basel and culminated in Polanus's passionate appreciation of it in his theological work. Notably, he did not dismiss Melanchthon's *supposedly*

⁹⁹ Cf. Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, 140. For the theological congruity in the doctrine of predestination between Beza and Perkins, who have methodological differences, see Richard A. Muller, "Perkins' *A Golden Chaine: Predestinarian System or Schematized Ordo Salutis*," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 9/1 (1978): 69-81.

¹⁰⁰ Regarding the concept of "Christian Aristotelianism," see Richard A. Muller, "Reformation, Orthodoxy, 'Christian Aristotelianism,' and the Eclecticism of Early Modern Philosophy," *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 81/3 (2001): 306-325. And for Ramus and Ramism, see Walter J. Ong, *Ramus, Method and the Decay of Dialogue* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958) and Howard Hotson, *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and Its German Ramifications, 1543-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007). Cf. Rinse H. R. Brouwer, "The Conversation between Karl Barth and Amandus Polanus," 55.

¹⁰¹ See Hotson, *Commonplace Learning*, 22-23.

speculative Aristotelian teaching method when he was actively assuming Ramus' praxis-centered philosophy, but he would keep the two philosophical approaches in harmony as the *best* method to more clearly express and more effectively defend Christian doctrine.¹⁰²

Polanus made short trips to the cities of Geneva, Heidelberg, and Namiest where he became the tutor of a young Bohemian nobleman, Dionysius von Zierotin, staying in his house and serving the community of Bohemian-Moravian Brethren, and returned to Basel.¹⁰³ Polanus, under the supervision of Grynaeus, received a doctoral degree of Divinity at the University of Basel on October 29, 1590, honored with the title of “a man most ornamented with nobility, piety, doctrines, and integrity of morals and also gifted with the linguistic knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin not to be dispised by any means (*vir nobilitate, pietate, doctrina morumque integritate ornatissimus necnon linguarum Hebraicae, Graecae, Latinae cognitione haud contemnenda praeditus*),” after his successful oral defense and discourse that the professor of Old Testament, Johannes Brandmüller (1533-1596), presided over.¹⁰⁴

During the next six years, Polanus, markedly popular among students at Basel, especially those who came from Bohemia and Moravia, went to Bohemia and spent time there teaching and preaching at the ecclesiastical center of the Moravian Brethren, Eibenschitz.¹⁰⁵ Well aware of Gryneaus' desire for him to be a colleague at Heidelberg,

¹⁰² Cf. Faulenbach, *Die Structur der Theologie des Amandus Polanus von Polandorf*, 19.

¹⁰³ The best source of Zierotin's biography is Peter R. Chlumecky, *Carl von Zierotin und seine Zeit, 1564-1615* (Brünn: A. Nitsch, 1862). Zierotin became an enthusiastic advocate of the Reformed faith by his intimate correspondence with Polanus, Beza, and Grynaeus. Polanus's dedication of his *Syntagma* to Karl von Zierotin shows their close relationship. See *ibid.*, 286.

¹⁰⁴ Adam, *Vitae Germanorum Theologorum*, 806. Cf. Staehelin, *Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf*, 20.

¹⁰⁵ Hans R. Guggisberg, *Basel in the Sixteenth Century* (St. Louis, MO: Center For Reformation Research, 1982), 48; Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, 130. In this regard, Joachim Bahlcke estimates that Polanus was “the most important mediator between the centres of Western European Calvinism and the Bohemian lands”

Polanus deepened his knowledge of Hebrew language during the six-year stay in Bohemia by studying with a rabbi and to enhance his credentials for the post in the Old Testament. In early 1596, his return from Bohemia to Basel was the perfect time to become a professor of Old Testament as the successor of Brandmüller. On August 24, he delivered his inaugural lecture on “*De Danielis prophetae libro magnificiando*” and married Grynaeus’s daughter Maria in October.

Polanus’s appointment to the theology faculty of Basel reinforced its attachment to the Reformed tradition.¹⁰⁶ Like Grynaeus, he placed a primary emphasis on the reading of Scripture as the foundation of theology. He also recommended a detailed study of Calvin’s *Institutes*,¹⁰⁷ from which the students, he expected, might learn and follow “not just an accurate treatment of *loci communes* but also eloquence and its form.”¹⁰⁸ From 1596 on, the responsibility of presiding over theological disputations at Basel was handed over from Grynaeus to Polanus. The emphasis of the disputations dating from 1596 to 1610 supervised by Polanus was firmly on the consolidation of Reformed faith in Basel.¹⁰⁹ In addition, for the benefit of theology students in theological study and scriptural exegesis,

by being a “travelling diplomat in Eastern Central Europe,” “which is characteristic of the private network of people and institutions in international Calvinism.” Joachim Bahlcke, “Calvinism and Estate Liberation Movements in Bohemia and Hungary (1570-1620),” *The Reformation Eastern and Central Europe*, ed. Karin Maag (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997), 81-83.

¹⁰⁶ Adam, *Vitae Germanorum Theologorum*, 806; Staehelin, *Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf*, 26-29; Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, 34.

¹⁰⁷ For Polanus’s rigorous citation of Calvin, see Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachiae, aliquot praelectionibus Genevae proposita* (Basel: Waldkirch, 1597), 17; idem, *Syntagma theologiae christianae* (Hanoviae, 1609-10), 205, 502, 503, 569, 1052, 1231, 2200, 2899, 2952, 2955, 3133, 3407, 4028; idem, *In librum prophetiarum Ezechielis commentarii* (Basel: Waldkirch, 1608), 302, 445, 714, 863, 894; idem, *De concionum sacrarum methodo institutio* (Basel: Typis Conradi Waldkirchii, 1604), 329, 331.

¹⁰⁸ See Polanus’s letter to Daniel Socinus at March 3, 1600: “In institutionibus non solum locorum communium accuratam tractationem habes sed etiam eloquentiam et eloquentiae formam quam imiteris.” Cited in Thommen, *Geschichte der Universität Basel 1532-1632*, 133.

¹⁰⁹ Note the table of disputation emphasis by each theological professor of Basel University as shown in Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, 282.

he strived to apply the topical invention and the Ramist division to the analysis of Scripture and the theological method, as well as the Ramist concern for the *usus* of doctrines derived from the scriptural texts to the Christian life.¹¹⁰

The influence of his method increased among his students and pastors in Basel,¹¹¹ among whom Johannes Heinrich Alsted identified Polanus with “the trustworthy teacher (*praeceptor optime meritus*)” of theology.¹¹² His theological fame was not limited to Basel but spread to other places. For example, a Reformed theologian of Bremen, Ludovicus Crocius, praised Polanus as “the great theologian among the Reformed (*magnus inter reformatos theologus*).”¹¹³ David Pareus, a Heidelberg Reformed thinker, though not a student of Polanus, commended the Basel theologian as one who combined splendid piety, humanity and erudition in glory as well as in the most friendly and faithful instruction, and he advised Zierotin to learn everything from Polanus.¹¹⁴ The English Reformed theologian,

¹¹⁰ Especially note Amandus Polanus, *De ratione legendi cum fructu autores* (Basel: Waldkirch, 1603) and *Syntagma logicum Aristotelico-Ramaeum, ad usum inprimis theologicum accomodatum* (Basel: Waldkirch, 1605).

¹¹¹ For example, see Georg Gross, *Theatrum Biblicum, Ex Scriptis Theologorum veterum atque recentium, maximam vero partem D. Amdandi Polani p.m. Concinnatum* (Basel: Ludwig Konig, 1614); Johannes Wollebius, *Compendium theologiae christianae* (Basel, 1626). Cf. Karl R. Hagenbach, *Die theologische Schule Basels und ihre Lehrer von Stiftung der Hochschule 1460 bis zu Dewette's Tod 1849* (Basel, 1860), 22-23.

¹¹² Johannes Heinrich Alsted, *Panacea philosophica* (Herborn, 1610), 4.

¹¹³ Ludovicus Crocius, *Duodecas dissertationum exegeticarum et apologeticarum syntagmatis sacrae theologiae* (Bremae, 1642), 405.

¹¹⁴ David Pareus, *Miscellanea catechetica, seu collectio eorum, quae catecheticis explicationibus prius sparsim intexta suerunt* (Heidelberg, 1612), 7: “Amandi Polani a plansdorff, s.s. Theologiae Doctoris, viri pietatis juxta & humanitatis ac eruditionis laude praeclari, mihi que amicissimi, fidelissima institutione, totum te tradere didicisti, accessionem & incrementa factorum esse magis ac magis haud poenitenda.”

Edward Leigh, also identified Polanus as “the ornament of the university of Basel” and one of the best commentators on Malachi, Ezekiel, and Daniel.¹¹⁵

From the first publication of *Analysis sex paralogismorum Jesuitae cuiusdam* (1589) until his death, Polanus produced many philosophical, patristic, positive doctrinal and polemic works, as well as biblical commentaries based on his lectures given at Basel between 1596 and 1610 (the exception is his commentary on Malachi originated with his lectures given in Geneva before taking up his position at Basel). His major works are *Partitiones theologiae logica methodo institutarum* (1589), *Logicae libri duo* (1590), *Analysis libelli Prophetiae Malachiae* (1597), *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione* (1598), *In Daniele prophetam ... commentarius* (1600), *Sylloges thesium theologiarum* (pars prima, 1597; pars secunda, 1601), *Analysis libri Hoseae prophetae* (1601), *De ratione legendi cum fructu auctores* (1603), *Das gantz Newe Testament unsers Herren Jesu Christi* (1603), *Syntagma logicum Aristotelico-Ramaeum ad usum imprimis theologicum accommodatum* (1605), *Symphonia catholica seu consensus catholicus et orthodoxus dogmatum* (1607), *In librum prophetiarum Ezechielis commentarii* (1608), *Syntagma theologiae christianae* (1609/1610).¹¹⁶ Even as an Old Testament professor, he translated the New Testament from Greek to German and published it in 1603. His copious publication was intended primarily for the theological benefits of divinity students and future pastors in understanding how to read and interpret Scripture and through their own preaching to deliver its essential messages and apply them to Christian life.

¹¹⁵ Edward Leigh, *A Treatise of Religion & Learning, and of Religious and Learned Men* (London, 1656), 295; idem, *A Treatise of Divinity Consisting of Three Books* (London, 1646), 58-59. Cf. Adam, *Vitae Germanorum Theologorum*, 806.

¹¹⁶ For the detailed bibliographical survey of Polanus, see Staehelin, *Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf*, 61-109.

Polanus died on July 8, 1610, at the age of 48, leaving behind his wife and three children, Susana, Salome, and Irene. The epitaph of Polanus, written by Grynaeus, describes Amandus Polanus as “the most academic Basel theologian who splendidly revealed the exceptional good of character and the gift of judgment by dexterously teaching and accurately writing.”¹¹⁷ Listed in the epitaph are the names of his theological fellows, Bartholomaeus Pitiscus, Theodorus Beza (1519-1605), Daniel Tossanus (1541-1602), Guilielmus Stuckius (1521-1607), Georg Sohnius (1551-1589), and David Pareus (1548-1622).¹¹⁸

2.2. Theological Context: Johann Jacob Grynaeus and Robert Bellarmine

Polanus’s encyclopedic erudition in theological method, biblical exegesis, patristic thought, and dogmatic system was not shaped in a vacuum. In addition to the broad historical and biographical context of Polanus’ work, his immediate theological context was also crucial to the formulation of his theology. Polanus did not simply assimilate the Reformed tradition but argued his advocacy of the orthodox-catholic Reformed faith. For this issue, there were two notable contemporaries of mutually contrasting theological nature who facilitated Polanus to devote himself to first studying Scripture and then exploring the best of church tradition in doctrinal harmony with the Reformed theology: Johann Jacob Grynaeus and Robert Bellarmine. This section mainly focuses the views of these two figures on the church fathers.

¹¹⁷ Adam, *Vitae Germanorum Theologorum*, 807: “Christo servat. sacrum. Amandus Polanus a Polansdorf, theologus Basileus. literatiss. qui dextre docendo, accurate scribendo, luculenter ostendit egregia ingenii bona, iudicii dona.”

¹¹⁸ Adam, *Vitae Germanorum Theologorum*, 806-807; Leigh, *A Treatise of Religion & Learning, and of Religious and Learned Men*, 295.

2.2.1. Theological Father: Johann Jacob Grynaeus (1540-1617)

Much of Polanus's approach to theology, with the significant exception of his Ramism,¹¹⁹ can be credited to his work with Grynaeus. In particular, Grynaeus's pedagogical approach to academic disputations consisting of theses or aphorisms, his method of exegesis as consisting in a thetical analysis, and his approach to the history of the church and, specifically, to the church fathers had an impact on Polanus. Grynaeus produced a vast number of theses, theorems, or aphorisms for academic disputation, both during his years at Heidelberg and during his time at Basel. Arguably, the terms thesis, theorem, and aphorism were used interchangeably, given the recurrence of phrases like "theses seu aphorismi" in Grynaeus's titles. The theses indicate several methodological approaches, including the Zabarellan distinction and use of synthetic (*a priori*) and analytical (*a posteriori*) patterns of reasoning. There is, however, little or no evidence of a Ramist influence in Grynaeus's work.¹²⁰ The theses are also consistently referenced to Scripture; church fathers, frequently to Augustine; and to the classical and philosophical traditions. Grynaeus's shorter *axiomata* are sometimes simply texts from Scripture, other times more elaborate explanations based on Scripture or developed with reference to historical texts or theological and philosophical problems to be resolved. This academic model would also be followed by Polanus. Grynaeus's interpretive methods, as illustrated by his works on Malachi and Galatians, among others, tended to examine the biblical text for its doctrinal *loci* and would sum up the theological points identified in the text in the

¹¹⁹ Cf. Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, p. 140.

¹²⁰ J. J. Grynaeus, *De Christianae doctrinae certitudine, Theses Demonstrativae: oppositae periculosae imaginationibus Academicis & Pyrrhonijs, eorum qui de ijs autem, D. Iohan. Iacobo Grynaeo Praeside, postridie Calend. Iunii, in Theologico Auditorio, Deo iuvante, respondebit Andreas Baudisius Vratislaviensis* (Basel: Oporinus, 1582), thesis 4.

form of sets of aphorisms or theses. The relationship of the method both to the academic exercise of disputation and to doctrinal formulation is clear.¹²¹ What Grynaeus' commentaries lack in comparison with those of Polanus' is detailed attention to the biblical texts in the original languages.¹²²

Grynaeus's approach to history and to the fathers deserved special notice. Polanus's special interest in the reformulation of patristic thought into a system of Reformed theology and his formative use of the fathers in constructing Reformed orthodoxy were stimulated by the conviction of his academic father, J. J. Grynaeus, that the Reformed church deserved to be called the true catholic apostolic church since it originated, both theologically and ecclesiastically, with the prescription of God's Word, Holy Scripture. A biographer of Grynaeus, Apinus, characterized Grynaeus as proficient both in theology and history.¹²³ Grynaeus' deep commitment to patristic orthodoxy is clearly attested in his first publication, *Monvmenta S. Patrum Orthodoxographa* (1569),¹²⁴ a massive collection of patristic texts, which he also named "the theologies of the eighty-five doctors of the more sacred and reasonable faith," selected for their antiquity, erudition, and their foundational role in Christian thought. His second publication was the *Ecclesiastica Historia* (1570), a newly collated and improved version of Eusebius'

¹²¹ Thus, e.g., J. J. Grynaeus, *Thesium analyticarum, de epistola Pauli apostoli, ad Galatas*, 3 vols. (Basel: Oporinus, 1582); idem, *Hypomnemata, in Malachiam prophetam: tradita in Basiliensi academia: quibus adjunctae sunt Theses analyticae, de epistola Pauli apostoli ad Galatas, de quibus in Scholis Theologorum disputatum fuit* (Basel: Leonhardus Ostenius, 1583); idem, *Analysis epistolae Pauli apostoli ad Galatas / in schola theologica Basiliensis academiae tradita, eo consilio, ut doctrina sana de Vocatione, de Iustificatione, de Ecclesiae gubernatione, et de Sanctificatione, illustraretur* (Basel: Bryllinger, 1583).

¹²² Cf. Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, pp. 138-139.

¹²³ Sigismus Apinus, "Vita Iohannis Iacobi Grynaei," b6. Indeed, Grynaeus was called by Casimir to give lectures on theology and history in Heidelberg. See Grynaeus, *Orationes duae*, praefatio.

¹²⁴ For a considerable analysis of this patristic collection, see Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation*, 253-270.

previously published *Ecclesiastica Historia*, augmented by Grynaeus' own *scholia* and Wolfgang Musculus' interpretation of Theodorus' *Historia ecclesiastica*.¹²⁵ Having a desire for all readers to obtain benefits from patristic sources, he also actively engaged in the revision and correction of the *Opera* of Origen and Irenaeus, the adages of Erasmus, and others.¹²⁶

His devotion to patristic study was indebted to Melanchthon. In his *Epitomes*, a Reformed manual of theology instruction, Grynaeus eulogized Melanchthon as “the most dignified man with the lasting benevolence of all good things (*uirum perpetua bonorum omnium benevolentia dignissimum*),” requiring his theological students to read the Bible along with *Glossa ordinaria* “from top up to toe (*a capite usque ad calcem*)” over and over again.¹²⁷ Melanchthon, in Meijering's phrase, was a “biblicist traditionalist” but in the sense that, as Fraenkel rightly notes, “for him Scripture and tradition were in fact not complementary sources of apostolic teaching, but different parts of the same line of doctrinal continuity from the original revelation down to the present.”¹²⁸ Melanchthon and, arguably, Grynaeus carried forward what Oberman identified as “Tradition I” in the medieval approach to the authority of Scripture.¹²⁹

¹²⁵ Sigismus Apinus, “Vita Iohannis Iacobi Grynaei,” d1.

¹²⁶ See Melchior Adam, *Vitae Germanorum Theologorum*, 871. Also note Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation*, 255.

¹²⁷ Grynaeus, *Epitomes sacrorum biblion*, α4-α5. Regarding the recently notable account for the *Glossa ordinaria*, see Lesley Smith, *The Glossa ordinaria: The Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

¹²⁸ Peter Fraenkel, *Testimonia Patrum: The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon* (Geneva: Droz, 1961), 361; E. P. Meijering, *Melanchthon and Patristic Thought* (Leiden: Brill, 1983), 11.

¹²⁹ See Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation*, pp.53-65.

The reason for Grynaeus's high regard of Melanchthon's view on the absolute authority of Scripture and the relative authority of the church fathers is well described in his *Ioh Oecolampadii dialogvs, quo Patrum sententiam de Coena Domini bona fide explanat* (1590).¹³⁰ This work is an expository compilation of patristic thought on the Eucharist in which Grynaeus included Oecolampadius' account of patristic thought, Zwingli's confession of faith on the Eucharist, and Melanchthon's conciliatory view of the controversy on the same issue. Grynaeus also presented his own confession on the Eucharist as an appendix, and advocated the eucharistic teaching of Oecolampadius, one of the founders of the Reformed church in Basel. According to Grynaeus, Oecolampadius had affirmed the catholic faith (*catholica fide*) and, using his exceeding erudition especially of the Greek fathers, rejected the corporeal presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper and advocated Zwingli's eucharistic thought "not in detail but in essence."¹³¹

Similarly, with reference to Augustine's theological conversion in the *Retractationes*, Grynaeus identified his own conversion to truth with that of Melanchthon who had once published "a little book containing illegitimate (νόθα) testimonies" of the Eucharist but later changed his views on the basis of Scripture as the perfect norm of faith with "consideration of erudite and orthodox antiquity."¹³² Implied in the reason for his admiration of Melanchthon, then, is that Grynaeus' primary adherence to Scripture was

¹³⁰ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Ioh Oecolampadii Dialogvs, quo Patrum sententiam de Coena Domini bona fide explanat* (Basel: Waldkirch, 1590).

¹³¹ Grynaeus, *Ioh Oecolampadii Dialogvs*, 288. Cf. Amy Burnett, *Karstadt and the Origins of the Eucharistic Controversy: A Study in the Circulation of Ideas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 96-98.

¹³² Grynaeus, *Ioh Oecolampadii Dialogvs*, 286: "Ediderat Philippus Melanchthon, Libellum continentem Testimonia, etiam νόθα, de Coena Domini. Idem, quod regetur Spiritu Christi, & esset veritatis amans ... sed cum Scripturis sanctis, perfectam fidei regulam continentibus, coniunxit eruditae et orthodoxae antiquitatis considerationem, & locum dedit sententiae verae, quam non agnitam antea non probarat, sed oppugnauerat."

neither separable from nor in conflict with his theological predilection for the orthodox fathers of church. It is noteworthy that Grynaeus was more interested in the orthodoxy of the patristic writings than their authenticity and that the definite endorsement of the incarnate Christ as such in Scripture, for him, was the criterion whereby to determine the orthodoxy of any human writings.¹³³ His careful approach to Christian antiquity is epitomized in Backus' pointed phrase that "he subordinates questions of authenticity, historical likelihood and textual accuracy to the principle of 'any text that elaborates on the content of the Bible is acceptable.'" ¹³⁴ Polanus would also take this approach.

The various benefits from reading the patristic literature, as Grynaeus listed in the preface to *Ecclesiastica Historia*, are Polycarp's passion to propagate Christian faith, Ignatius' unceasing enthusiasm of faith up to his martyrdom, Gregory Neocaesariensis' purity of faith, Origen's love of learning, Basil's eloquence, Gregory Nazianzus' theology, Didymus' erudition in all things of discipline in general and in holy scriptures, Jerome's expertise of languages, Chrysostom's zeal and eloquence, Athanasius' prudence and patient endurance, and Augustine's critical acumen in disputation and doctrine.¹³⁵ In addition, a study of the orthodox fathers would enable theologians, in his case, to discern and avoid Simon Magus' speculation (ἀισχροκερδεῖα), Cerinthus' coarse blasphemy, Tatianus' illegitimate matrimony (μεμψιγᾶμος), Paulus Samsata's doctrinal impiety in Christ, Arius' haughty slander and the imitators of such a false man, the anti-trinitarian

¹³³ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Monvmenta S. Patrum Orthodoxographa* (Basel, 1569), a3v-a4r. Cf. Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation*, 255-256.

¹³⁴ For the more detailed account of this issue, see Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation*, 261-262.

¹³⁵ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Eusebii Pamphili, Rvffini, Socratis, Theodoriti, Sozomeni, Theodori, Evagrii, et Dorothei Ecclesiastica Historia* (Basel, 1577), praefatio, α5.

heresy of the pneumatomachians (Πνευματομαχος) in Macedonia, and the conspicuous disgrace of other heretics. The greatest benefit of studying the church fathers or ecclesiastical history, according to Grynaeus, was to approach the theology of Jesus Christ (*accedit ad θεολογίαν Iesu Christi*) as the basis of the catholic church and the foundation of orthodox faith (*basis Ecclesiae catholicae, & fidei orthodoxae fundamentum*) in the whole history of the world, a theology which had been devastated by the abusive dominion and improper work of all the Roman Catholic bishops and priests.¹³⁶

A careful examination of Grynaeus' view on history leads to a better understanding of his zeal to the study of the church fathers.¹³⁷ His understanding of history was also in notable dependence on Melanchthon who emphasized a return to both biblical and patristic sources for the restoration of the spoiled theology in his day, with a belief that history is the key to all sciences including theology. For Melanchthon, there was only one kind of history, divinely ordained history, with the superiority of sacred history to the profane.¹³⁸

In his inaugural lecture, *De finibus historiae* (1584), delivered at his appointment as a professor of theology and history in Heidelberg, Grynaeus said that God's propitious providence alone was the everlasting and inexhaustible fountain of all good things and he defined history as "the most luminous reflection of God's work and providence" on everything. Thus, it is in light of divine providence that all persons, things, and

¹³⁶ Grynaeus, *Ecclesiastica Historia*, 1, 607.

¹³⁷ It is notable that Grynaeus' view on Christ-centered history was presented and defended by Polanus at a theological disputation held in the university of Basel in October 9, 1583, a disputation that was presided over by Grynaeus and its title was "*De Fine evangelicae historiae, de Jesu Christo, Domino nostro.*" Thus, the two Reformed Baslers were in agreement with the sense of Christ as the goal of evangelical history, a view that is very important as to why Polanus regarded the church fathers to be essential for the formulation of Reformed orthodox theology as the deliverers of the divine truth chosen and directed by the Holy Spirit.

¹³⁸ See Philip Melanchthon, "De corrigendis adol. studiis," in *Corpus reformatorum*: 11:15-25. For the study of Melanchthon's view of history in more detail, note Peter Fraenkel, *Testimonia Patrum*, 15-16, 60-61, and Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation*, 328-329.

circumstances in history ought to be understood and considered.¹³⁹ Grynaeus went further to declare that the *finis* of history is the glory of God, not different from the optimal goal of things (*finis optimum rei*) Aristotle held. In this vein, he claimed that it was necessary for rulers to be worshipers of God and the greatest virtue of rulers was to truly know God as their administrator and protector, to believe in Christ, and to be led by his Spirit.¹⁴⁰

The theological link of God's providence with history was already intended in Grynaeus' *Synopsis historiae humanis* (1579) and *De christiana fidei historia* (1582). In the former work, he made a fairly theological division of human history into four chapters: creation, corruption, renovation, and complete regeneration; these are the revelatory and redemptive works of God.¹⁴¹ He also described the Apostle's creed as delineating history in a marvelous compendium.¹⁴² In the latter work, he distinguished the history of Christian faith as the shaping of doctrines concerning God the Creator and the Redeemer.¹⁴³ This concept is much developed in his *De Symphonia evangelica Prophetarvm Evangelistarvm et Apostolorum* (1584). In the work, Grynaeus viewed the Bible as covering all of history and the Old and the New Testaments as unified in "the lovable, pious, and delightful

¹³⁹ Grynaeus, "De theoretico et practico fine historiae," 12: "Dei providentia propitia, quae sola omnium bonorum quibus vtimur fruimurque prerennis & inexhaustus fons est, fueris mactus: omni liberali contentione adhibita danda erit opera, vt quam ille tuus Xenagogus, fidum promptumque & promum & condum historiae agit...Quum Historia sit quasi quoddam lucidissimum speculum, Operum Dei & huius providentiae: vt quid Deus quidue homines agant, intelligatur, confiderari in ea debent Personae, Res, & Circumstantiae." Also note idem, *Ionae prophetae liber, cvm enarratione* (Oporinus, 1581), 133, 405-408.

¹⁴⁰ Grynaeus, "De theoretico et practico fine historiae," 13; idem, "De Symphonia evangelica Prophetarvm Evangelistarvm et Apostolorum," in *Orationes duae*, praefatio, 2-3. Cf. Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926), I.i-ii.

¹⁴¹ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Synopsis historiae hominis: sev, de prima hominis origine* (Basel, 1579), 23.

¹⁴² Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Synopsis historiae hominis*, 252-253.

¹⁴³ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *De christiana fidei historia* (Basel, 1582), I.iii: "Vocamus autem historiam fidei christianaе, formam doctrinae, de Deo Creatore & Redemtore."

symphony (*amabilis, religiosa & dulcis symphonia*).”¹⁴⁴ The *symphonia* of the two Testaments reaches its zenith in one and the same *evangelium*, whose magnificent *materia* or *argumentum* is Jesus Christ, the Author and Redeemer of the world in general and the whole catholic church in particular.

The conviction of “one and the same *evangelium*” as the *symphonia* of Scripture enabled Grynaeus to advocate more strongly the continuity of catholic and apostolic church in the whole history from the beginning of the world to its end, an advocacy that was most clearly reflected in the *Oratio de ecclesiae catholicae et apostolicae continuatione* (1589), presented and published by his pupil, Johannes Esychius, under his supervision.¹⁴⁵ In the very beginning of the *Oratio*, Esychius said that he would not have known the issue of true catholic and apostolic church if he had not obtained Grynaeus' theological safeguard and the abundance of his eminent academic benevolence. He closed his oration with a eulogy for Grynaeus as an ocean that caused his ship of theology to flow. The immediate reason that prompted the presentation of his *Oratio* was the constancy of the most durable faith (*firmissimae fidei nostrae constantiam*) and the nonsense of the Roman sophists (*sophistarum tricas*), whose darkness in both doctrine and practice destroyed the true catholic and apostolic church. The *Oratio* examined the magnificent eloquence of Grynaeus who said that the true catholic, apostolic, and orthodox church, having been propagated through the efforts of all intermediators since the age of apostles, was one and always harmonious with itself (*secum consentiens semper*) but never

¹⁴⁴ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, “De Symphonia evangelica Prophetarvm Evangelistarvm et Apostolorum,” in *Orationes duae*, 6: idem, *Chronologia brevis evangelicae historiae*, 26-48.

¹⁴⁵ A Bremen professor, Henricus Kreftingus, believes that on the last page of the *Oratio* earlier projected Esychius the great hope of his academic father (*patriae spes magna*), Grynaeus. See Johannes Esychius, *Oratio de ecclesiae catholicae & apostolicae continuatione ... a Cl. Theologo Ioh. Iac. Grynaeo ornaretur* (Basel, 1589), a1-2.

dissented from itself (*a seipsa dissentiens nunquam*). Indeed, the Roman Catholic right before the Reformation of Luther, Zwingli, and their Protestant fellows was not a true church that was in agreement with them.¹⁴⁶ This examination entailed the verdict that the tradition of the Roman Catholic Church was not connected with the continuation of the apostolic faith, perfectly and clearly explained by Holy Scripture, but with humanly manipulated superstition,¹⁴⁷ a conclusion crucial to Polanus's later debates with Bellarmine over the implications of patristic teachings.

With a distinction between invisible and visible churches, Esychius stressed that the invisible church was spread out not just in the whole sphere of the earth but also from the beginning of history to its end. The church of the elect standing on the solid foundation of God is eternal and immovable so that it always remains as a continuous flow of true faith in the visible catholic church (*continuum verae fidei fluxum in visibili ecclesia catholica*) from the time of apostles to the present time.¹⁴⁸ The sound bishops and church fathers took part in this flow of the catholic church. Esychius took from among them Cyprian as the foundation of his *Oratio* and stood in ecclesiastical agreement with him who had not felt a scruple in advising a departure from ecclesiastical custom when it suffocated or deviated from the scriptural truth of God, and a return to the origin of evangelical and apostolic tradition and the head of divine tradition, that is, Jesus Christ.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁶ Johannes Esychius, *Oratio de ecclesiae catholicae & apostolicae continuatione ... a Cl. Theologo Ioh. Iac. Grynaeo ornaretur* (Basel, 1589), a1-2.

¹⁴⁷ Johannes Esychius, *Oratio de ecclesiae catholicae & apostolicae continuatione*, b2.

¹⁴⁸ Johannes Esychius, *Oratio de ecclesiae catholicae & apostolicae continuatione*, c1-2.

¹⁴⁹ Johannes Esychius, *Oratio de ecclesiae catholicae & apostolicae continuatione*, c2: "Quoniam autem orationis meae fundamentum desumpsi ex Cypriano, in eodem concludam Si canalus aquae, qui copiose prius & largiter profluebat, subito deficiat, nonne ad fontem pergatur, ut illic defectionis ration noscatur, utrumne, arescentibus uenis, in capite siccauerit, an uero integra inde & plena procurrens in medio itinere destiterit? Quod & nunc facere Dei sacerdotes, praecepta diuina seruantes, ut in aliquo si mutauerit &

In addition to *Oratio*, the deep concern of Grynaeus for the catholicity and apostolic origin of the Reformed tradition is more comprehensively manifested in his *Διδασκαλία, de ecclesia catholica, quae est sanctorum communio; Θεωρήμα, de certissimis eiusdem ecclesiae notis; Προβλήμα, de iisdem notis in reformatis ecclesiis conspicuis*.¹⁵⁰ Grynaeus argued in this short disputation that the most manifest signs of God's true apostolic catholic church were most explicitly found in the Reformed church. Identifying the church with all the elected sons of God (*omnes electos Dei filios*), he regarded it as *catholica* because it might pertain to the church of both the Old and the New Testaments, all gentiles, and all successive generation of godly people who share the covenant of grace.¹⁵¹ Only the church of all the elect is καθολικὸν or *universalis* but not just an individual believer or an individual church.

Appealing to the canonical scriptures (especially, Mark. 1:15, Col. 2:5, Rom. 12: 6-7, 14:23, 1 Cor. 14:40), Grynaeus argued that there were two perpetual signs (τεκμήρια) of the true catholic church: order (*ordo*) and solidity of faith in Christ (*soliditas in Christum fidei*), which are never separated from each other.¹⁵² The former sign requires the accurate observation of the divinely instituted liturgy for the edification of church, sacraments, and disciplines according to the canonical scriptures. The latter means that faith, as the fountain of all good works, is interrelated with the gospel and never separated from love and hope

uacillauerit ueritas, ad originem Dominicam, & Euangelicam, & Apostolicam traditionem reuertamur, & inde surgat actus nostri ratio, unde & ordo & origo surrexit.” For the Cyprian passages cited by Grynaeus, see *Epistola S. Cypriani Ad Pompeium Contra Epistolam Stephani De Haereticis Baptizandis*, in *PL* 3. col. 1127.

¹⁵⁰ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Διδασκαλία, de ecclesia catholica, quae est sanctorum communio; Θεωρήμα, de certissimis eiusdem ecclesiae notis; Προβλήμα, de iisdem notis in reformatis ecclesiis conspicuis* (Basel, 1590).

¹⁵¹ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Διδασκαλία, de ecclesia catholica*, 1-2; idem, *De historia fidei christianae*, IV.vii.

¹⁵² Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Διδασκαλία, de ecclesia catholica*, 1-2.

in the sense that faith works with love and is bolstered by hope. A departure from the true catholic church, Grynaeus warned, would occur when the divinely ordained order is violated by means of addition, subtraction, and subvert, and when the boundary of Scripture is erased by the pretext of faith. Assuming that these signs should have their most clear appearance in the church, Grynaeus exhorted that the Reformed church must pay the greatest attention to a reversion to the archetype of the ancient apostolic church.¹⁵³

With the marks of the catholic church in mind, Grynaeus connected the sanctification of the true catholic church or the church of the elect spread over the world with such actions of the Redeemer from the creation as distinguishing, calling efficaciously, illuminating, gratuitously justifying, and sanctifying his elected people.¹⁵⁴ Sanctification is not the transformation of human substance but the change or innovation of human character by the renewal of the Holy Spirit. Its marks are two, internal and external. The internal mark refers to faith, hope, and love, while the external is divided into two: the first external work includes the pious listening to and observing of God's Word, the right use of two sacraments ordained by Christ and the proper exercise of ecclesiastical discipline, while the second external work refers to Christian ethics in life. In agreement with Augustine, he distinguished causes preserving the sanctity of the catholic church as

¹⁵³ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Διδασκαλία, de ecclesia catholica*, 4: "In reformatis nostris Ecclesiis, illa duo catholicae catholicae Ecclesiae τεκμήρια clarissime conspici, demonstrare, animus fert. Reformatas dicimus Ecclesias nostras, propterea quod ad primitivae Apostolicae Ecclesiae (a qua ad gentes sermon Dei profectus est) archetypum, diuinitus, sed tamen mediate, reuocatas esse, animaduertinus."

¹⁵⁴ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *De catholicae ecclesiae sanctificatione de mundo theses didascalicae* (Heidelberg, 1585), iiiii: "Sanctificatio Ecclesiae catholicae, est actio Dei redemptoris, inde vsque, ab initio Mundi, separantis a Mundo Electos suos, efficaci vocatione & illuminatione: gratuita iustificatione: specialique, sanctificatione." Also note idem, *De historia fidei christianae*, IV.iii-vii.

consisting in the chastity of body, the integrity of heart, and the veracity of doctrine.¹⁵⁵

This is grounded in his adherence to the sanctification of rational soul and body as inseparable and to the order and faith as the twofold mark of the true catholic church.

As indicated previously, Grynaeus identified the communion of the elect with the true catholic church. In this vein, he paid great attention in his discussion of election and effectual calling to *ecclesia catholica* by defining election as “the predestination of the catholic church to salvation” grounded in the counsel of God’s will, which is the irreversible foundation (ἀμετάπτωτου), the everlasting fountain, and the eternal and immutable decree of God beyond disputation.¹⁵⁶ He also liked to call Christian religion the sole catholic religion (*sola catholica religio*), since all highest and admirable things, such as the inenarrable majesty and glory of goodness and providence of the Father, the merit of Jesus Christ, and the virtue of the Holy Spirit, are resplendent in Christianity, and the whole catholic church is illuminated in the splendor of our good Savior. Another reason is that the altitude, profundity, latitude, value, and advantage of Christian religion is inestimable by means not just of earthly wealth but also of all lives in the world than which nothing is more precious.¹⁵⁷ Finally and most importantly, the author and ultimate *finis* of

¹⁵⁵ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *De catholicae ecclesiae*, xvi.6: “Augustinus de sanctorum adiunctis bene pronunciauit, dicens: Ista quae sanctitatis causa seruanda sunt, pudicitia corporis, castitas animae & veritas doctrinae.” For the Augustine passages cited by Grynaeus, see Augustine, *De mendacio*, in *PL* 40, xix.40.

¹⁵⁶ Grynaeus, *De historia fidei christianae*, V.ii; idem, *Theorema de ecclesiae catholicae electione, et problema de eiusdem efficari vocatione* (Heidelberg, 1585), iii: “Electionis, quae est praedestinatio catholicae Ecclesiae ad salutem, & basim ἀμετάπτωτου, & fontem perennem, esse hoc aeternum & immutabile propositum Dei, extra controuersiam est.”

¹⁵⁷ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *De prima et catholica religione* (Basel, 1586), a2-a3: “At in catholica nostra religione, omnia summa & admiranda conspiciuntur. Lucet enim in ea inenarrabilis maiestas & gloria bonitatis & prouidentiae aeterni Patris, meritorum Iesu Christi, virtutis Spiritus sancti: & tota catholica ecclesiae fulgore maiestatis & donorum Seruatoris collustratur...Religionis nostrae altitudo, profunditas, latitudo, pretium, vsus, vsque adeo est inaestimabilis, vt non terrenis tantum opibus, sed etiam vitae, qua nihil charius est, totique huic Mundo anteponi debeat.”

the Christian religion, rooted in the divine decree before the foundation of the world and the divinely inspired Scripture, which makes it not only canonical but also catholic, is God himself, so the Christian religion may deserve to be called the first unique genuine catholic of all religions.¹⁵⁸

According to Grynaeus, the Reformed church followed the analogy of faith, and invented nothing new of the Christian religion but rather rediscovered its true catholic doctrine of the prophets, apostles, the Apostle's creed, and the orthodox church fathers.¹⁵⁹ The criterion by which he determined the catholicity of any human religion appears in his conviction that "the unique argument of catholic religion is the crucified Christ and whatever does not follow Christ is not catholic."¹⁶⁰ For Grynaeus, only the proper cognition of Christ is the sole symphonic *argumentum* of the whole Scripture, and it justifies the Reformed church to be catholic. In this vein, he labored to exposit the patristic thought about Christ in relation to Reformed teaching. In response to the assertion of his theological opponents by way of appeal to the "norm" of the orthodox fathers that all things from God the Father were inherited to Christ in historical time only according to his human nature, Grynaeus argued that it was not the human nature of Christ but his whole

¹⁵⁸ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *De prima et catholica religione*, b.ii: "Cuiusque religionis Deus ipse actor & vltimus finis est: testes in scripturis sanctis, prophetae & apostoli: argumentum vnicum, Iesus Christus: vis tota in salutari agnitione & cultu Dei redemptoris posita." Also note idem, *De historia fidei christianae*, IV.ix.5.

¹⁵⁹ See Grynaeus, *Ecclesiastica historia*, 8.

¹⁶⁰ Grynaeus, *De historia fidei christianae*, III.viii; idem, *De prima et catholica religione*, b.iiij: "Catholicae religionis vnicum argumentum est Christus crucifixus 1. Cor. 2.2. ac quicquid non est secundum Christum, non est catholicum. Col. 2.8." For Grynaeus' belief in the canonical scriptures as the most certain norm and most perfect rule of all about faith and moral life, see Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *De unica & certissima fidei nostrae & morum regula, quae est Verbum Dei scriptum canonicum* (Basel, 1590), ii: "Tantum uerbum Dei scriptum canonicum certissima atque perfectissima regula est, secundum quam omnes de fide & moribus controuersiae diiudicari debent."

person (*tota persona*), or the λόγος, who assumed human nature, which the orthodox fathers truly meant in their norm.¹⁶¹

In summary, Grynaeus understood himself as a staunch advocate of the true catholic church which has its ground in the truth of the canonical Scripture, the primary author and ultimate end of which is God Himself. For him, the whole history of human beings from the creation of the world to its end proceeded as the revelation and formulation of the doctrines concerning God the Creator and Redeemer of the world in general and of the catholic church in particular. The concept of Christ as the unique *argumentum* of the Old and the New Testaments covering the whole human history in a grand *symphonia* made Grynaeus strive to rediscover the original doctrines of prophets, apostles, and orthodox church fathers and associate them with those of the Reformed church. Arguably, Grynaeus' spirit of biblical and patristic *symphonia* moved Polanus to go further to reformulate the orthodox doctrines of the ancient church fathers into a fully systematized form of theology, whose result was the *Symphonia catholica* (1607). This work showed a catholic harmony of the doctrines between the orthodox apostolic church and the Reformed church and was assimilated, both doctrinally and polemically, into his final dogmatic work, *Syntagma theologiae christianae* (1610).

2.2.2. Theological Opponent: Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621)

As the English Reformed Whitaker observed, no one appeared at any time (*vnquam*) more sagacious or better prepared and armed for striking the truth than the Jesuits, who excelled all other available societies of that kind in numbers, in reputation, and in

¹⁶¹ Grynaeus, *Explanatio epistolae S. apostoli Pavli, ad Hebraeos*, 28.

audacity.¹⁶² Among Jesuits, he continued, Robert Bellarmine¹⁶³ is the most prolific and outstanding Catholic champion for the theological controversies of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries with the Protestant church.¹⁶⁴ The reason why Bellarmine was placed in the first rank among the Jesuit controversialists was that he produced the most comprehensive attempt to refute Protestant theology, the *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos* (1587-93). Before Bellarmine, there had been numerous other Roman polemicists, such as Johannes Eck, Ruard Tapper, William Lindanus, and Josse Clinchtove. Their doctrinal and polemic theses, however, were assimilated and elaborated in the *Disputationes de controversiis*.

In his preface to this dogmatically systematized work, Bellarmine argues the chronological rise of *heretical* attacks against the Roman Catholics, following the order of the Apostle's Creed and, defining Berengarians, Waldenses, Albigenses, Wyclifites, Hussites, Lutherans, Zwinglians, Calvinists, and Anabaptists as heretics of his day. He reduced all the theological controversies to the ninth and tenth articles of the Apostle's Creed that concern the true catholic church, the communion of saints, and the forgiveness

¹⁶² William Whitaker, *Disputatio de sacra scriptura, contra huius temporis Roman churchas, inprimis Robertvm Bellarminvm* (Cantabrigiae, 1588), epistola.

¹⁶³ For the best biographical account of Bellarmine, see James Brodrick, *Robert Bellarmine: Saint and Scholar* (London: Burns & Oates, 1961), and for the study of Bellarmine based on the complexities of post-Reformation Catholicism, see Stefania Tutino, *Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010). Among those who wrote counter-arguments against the *Disputationes* in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are William Whitaker (*Disputatio de sacra scriptura*, 1588), Sibrandus Lubbertus (*De principiis christianorum dogmatum*, 1591), Franciscus Junius (*Animadversiones*, 1600-9), Amandus Polanus (*Sylloge thesivm theologicarvm*, 1597 and *Syntagma theologiae christianae*, 1609-10), Johannes Scharpius (*Cursus theologicus*, 1620), William Ames (*Bellarminus enervatus*, 1628), William Twisse (*Vindiciae gratiae potestatis ac providentiae Dei*, 1632), Johannes Gehardus (*Confessionis catholicae*, 1634-37), Luis Cappel (*Syntagma thesivm theologiarum*, 1664), Anthony Tuckney (*Praelectiones theologicae*, 1679), Franciscus Turretinus (*Institutio theologiae elencticae*, 1679), and Johann Heinrich Heidegger (*Tumulus Tridentini concilii*, 1684).

¹⁶⁴ See William Whitaker, *Disputatio de sacra scriptura*, praefatio.

of sins, which he thought were the actual targets of the heretics of his time.¹⁶⁵ In light of this emphasis on the two creedal articles, Bellarmine also treats God's Word, Christ, the pope, the authority of ecumenical councils, sacraments, divine grace, free will, justification, and good works. The major doctrinal opponents Bellarmine cited most frequently in the *Disputationes* are Calvin, Chemnitz, Luther, Mattias Flacius, Melancthon, and Vermigli.

Bellarmino argues the orthodoxy of Roman catholicism and condemns the 'heterodoxy' of Protestantism, based on a great number of biblical and patristic quotations and, when necessary, listing the names of the Reformers. In the *Syntagma theologiae christianae*, Polanus debated against Bellarmine on nearly all the doctrinal points treated in the *Disputationes*. Polanus's use of patristic literature had continual polemical connection with that of Bellarmine.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁵ Robert Bellarmine, *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos*, vol. 1 (Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1586), praefatio.

¹⁶⁶ Polanus's disputation against Bellarmine over all theological doctrines of Christianity was posthumously summarized, collected, edited, and published in the *College anti-Bellarminianum* (1613) by Johann Georg Grossius.

Part Two: The Theological Methodology and Exegetical Theology of Amandus Polanus

In Part 1, the historical and theological background of Amandus Polanus was discussed in close connection with his theological inclination toward the staunch advocacy of the doctrinal orthodoxy and catholicity of Reformed church as consentaneous with the sound teachings of the orthodoxical church fathers. His strong concern to delve into patristic thought, however, was not generated in independence from the larger desire of early orthodoxy (1565-1640) “to create a theological system suited to the successful establishment of Protestantism as a church in its own right, catholic in its teaching, capable of being sustained intellectually against its adversaries, and sufficiently technical and methodologically consistent to stand among the other disciplines in the university.”¹ The increasingly doctrinal systematization and institutionalization of the early orthodoxy period was, arguably, brought to its zenith in Polanus’s all-encompassing formulation of theology in the *Syntagma*. His work is characterized by an attempt to integrate philosophical tools, exegetical results, reference to the orthodox writers of previous eras, Reformed doctrine, and pious *praxis* or use of doctrine into a comprehensively unified dogmatic system. Polanus’s emphasis on use, together with his bifurcatory style, is an indication of the impact of Ramism.² Accordingly, in order to understand in balance the significance and function of the church fathers in the formulation of Polanus’s Reformed orthodox theology, it is necessary to investigate that general way in which Polanus formulated his theology into the most developed dogmatic system of his day. Part 2 devotes itself to the

¹ Muller, *PRRD*, 1:62.

² Cf. Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, 140.

methodological and exegetical consideration of Polanus's formulation of Reformed theology, still in careful relation to the significance and function of the church fathers in relation to his theological method and his biblical exegesis.

Chapter Three: Theological Methodology

3.1. Polanus and the construction of an early orthodox Reformed theology

3.1.1. Introduction

An academic method does not by necessity entail any specific theological or philosophical content. In other words, a severance of a theology from any theological tradition of the past is not necessarily caused by or accompanied with its use of any method in theological formulation, a method that is different from a method of the time. But there are still some notably problematic issues concerning theological methods, betraying such a simple axiom above and largely resting on the dogmatic and philosophical assumptions of nineteenth- and twentieth-century theologians, and central to both the reappraisal of Reformed orthodoxy and a dogmatized refutation of it: 1) the insufficient attention to God and Scripture understood as *principia theologiae* and as the basis for identifying and elaborating the issues in theological system; 2) the improper identification of scholasticism, humanism, and Ramism or semi-Ramism not with an academic method but with a specific theological or philosophical content; 3) the tendency to see Reformed scholasticism as a rationalistic or metaphysical theology governed by a central dogma without giving historical evidences; and 4) the entrenched misunderstanding of the Reformed orthodox as ignoring, or even abandoning, the doctrinal tradition in excessive preference for the spirit of *sola scriptura*, while assuming the functional preference of reason to faith in theological formulation.¹

¹ Note Alexander Schweizer, *Die Glaubenslehre der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt*, 2 vols. (Zürich: Orell, Füssli, 1844-47); Heinrich Heppe, *Die Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantismus im sechzehnten Jahrhundert*, 3 vols. (Gotha: Perthes, 1857); Hans Emil Weber, *Die*

Some of these distorted understandings of the early Reformed theological method have been made by modern scholars specifically with regard to Polanus's theological method. For instance, concerning the placement of predestination in Polanus's theological system, Barth argues that, like Gomarus and Wollebius, Polanus "placed the doctrine of predestination at the very head of the dogmatic system" and by so doing broke and reversed the Reformed tradition in which Calvin, following Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura, and Huldrych Zwingli, made the doctrine of predestination subordinate to that of

philosophische Scholastik des deutschen Protestantismus in Zeitalter der Orthodoxie (Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer, 1907); Paul Althaus, *Die Prinzipien der deutschen reformierten Dogmatik im Zeitalter der aristotelischen Scholastik* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1914); Paul Jacobs, *Prädestination und Verantwortlichkeit bei Calvin* (Neukirchen: Moers, 1937); J. K. S. Reid, *The Authority of Scripture: A Study of Reformation and Post-Reformation Understanding of the Bible* (London: Methuen, 1962), 36-45; Charles S. McCoy, "Johannes Cocceius: Federal Theologian," in *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 16 (1963), 352-370; Ernst Bizer, *Frühorthodoxie und Rationalismus* (Zurich: EVZ Verlag, 1963); Otto Gründler, *Die Gotteslehre Girolami Zanchis und ihre Bedeutung für seine Lehre von der Prädestination* (Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1965); Basil Hall, "Calvin against the Calvinists," in *John Calvin: A Collection of Distinguished Essays*, ed. Gervase Duffield (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966), 19-37; Johannes Dantine, "Das christologische Problem in Rahmen der Prädestinationslehre von Theodor Beza," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 77 (1966): 81-96; Brian G. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth Century France* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969); Walter Kickel, *Vernunft und Offenbarung bei Theodor Beza* (Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1967), 136-146; Holmes Rolston III, *John Calvin versus the Westminster Confession* (Richmond: John Knox, 1972); James B. Torrance, "Strengths and Weaknesses of the Westminster Theology," in *The Westminster Confession*, ed. Alisdair Heron (Edinburgh: Saint Andrews Press, 1982), 40-53. These methodological misunderstandings have been significantly challenged in Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic, and Humanist Strains* (New York: Harper & Row, 1961); W. Fred Graham, ed., *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives* (Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1994); Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark, eds., *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reappraisal* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1999); Willem J. Van Asselt and Eef Dekker, *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2001); Willem J. Van Asselt, "Scholasticism Revisited: Methodological Reflections on the Study of Seventeenth-century Reformed Thought," in *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion*, eds. Alister Chapman, John Coffey, and Brad S. Gregory (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press 2009), 154-174; Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), and idem, "Reassessing the Relation of Reformation and Orthodoxy – A Methodological Rejoinder," in *American Theological Inquiry* 4/1 (2011): 3-12; idem, "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition: A Historiographical Introduction," in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates Within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, eds. Michael G. A. Haykin and Mark Jones (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 11-30; Maarten Wisse et al., eds., *Scholasticism Reformed: Essays in Honour of Willem J. van Asselt* (Leiden: Brill, 2010). This list largely depends on Muller, *After Calvin*, 208 n. 15. For the more detailed exposition of this issue, see Muller, *ibid.*, 63-102.

providence.² With regard to Polanus's distinction between *theoria* and *praxis*, Barth also warns that this separation would make his dogmatics incur "the grave suspicion [of] being no more than an idle intellectual frivolity."³ Sympathetic with Barth's thoughts on Polanus' doctrine of predestination, Faulenbach makes a rather extreme observation that "the question of cause and effect determines the thought of Polanus" and moreover "this rational empiricism marks the theological bondage of the time with the methodology of the prevailing Aristotelianism that shapes all the sciences."⁴ In the same vein, Faulenbach, pointing out the theo-centrality in Polanus's theology, alleges a sort of rationalism to be sensed in Polanus, based on his opinion that "the logical and rational elements which entail the decline of the doctrine prevail especially in the doctrine of God."⁵ He goes on to assert that "for Polanus the understanding of Scripture is a matter of human cognitive ability."⁶ Deal, in a similar manner, argues that in operating outside the reality of the Trinity Polanus "must finally use Aristotelian philosophy as the very basis of his theological knowledge," based on his assumption that "the 'method' tends to govern the exposition" of theological doctrines.⁷

² Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics II/2: The Doctrine of God*, eds. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, trans. H. Knight et al. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1957), 45-47, 77. However, Barth rejects the central dogma theory by saying that "there can be no historical justification for taking the concept 'central dogma' to mean that the doctrine of predestination was for the older Reformed theologians a kind of speculative key – a basic tenet from which they could deduce all other dogmas. Not even the famous schema of T. Beza was intended in such a sense."

³ Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics I/2*, 787.

⁴ Heiner Faulenbach, *Die Struktur der Theologie des Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf* (Zurich: EVZ Verlag, 1967), 332.

⁵ Heiner Faulenbach, *Die Struktur der Theologie*, 140.

⁶ Heiner Faulenbach, *Die Struktur der Theologie*, 313.

⁷ Max Eugene Deal, "The Meaning and Method of Systematic Theology in Amandus Polanus" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1980), 182, 219.

A close examination of Polanus's writings in terms of methodology would reveal that those views of Polanus's theological method mentioned above are untenable. With this in mind, I will explore in this chapter Polanus's theological methodology, still mindful of patristic influence on the issue but more bending our attention to the characteristics of Reformed dogmatics. It is crucial to our discussion that Polanus identifies the following priorities regarding the theological and methodological authority: biblical testimonies (*divina testimonia*), and human testimonies such as the universal consent of all people (*universalis consensus omnium populorum*), the testimonies of God's church (*ecclesiae Dei*), and true reason (*rationes vera*).⁸ This set of priorities both argues against the claims of Faulenbach and Deal and also establishes the place of the tradition, specifically of the church fathers, in Polanus's methodology. Our discussion will first examine the earlier works written or supervised by Polanus and used by him as more basic formulations of theology preliminary to the *Syntagma*, and second, examine his method, proceeding from theological prolegomena, Scripture and tradition, to theology and philosophy.

3.1.2. Polanus's Theological Works and the Construction of Reformed Theology: An Overview

Before Polanus either compiled his summary of patristic theology, the *Symphonia catholica* or wrote his massive *Syntagma theologiae*, he produced several models for the exposition of theology in the form both of a Ramistically organized summary or synopsis of theology, the *Partitiones theologicae* (1589) and of academic theses debated under his

⁸ Amandus Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae christianae* (Hanoviae, 1610), 6, 80-85. His chief opponent, Robert Bellarmine, presents his doctrinal discussions according to the same pattern in *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei*.

supervision at the University of Basel. The *Partitiones*, which appeared initially as an appendix to the Marlorat-Feguernekinus *Enchiridion locorum communivm theologorum*, and were later published separately, are perhaps Polanus' earliest attempt at writing a theological system, written before his Basel doctorate of 1590 and before he engaged in the supervision of theses in the university.⁹ The *Partitiones* are of considerable significance to Polanus' theological development inasmuch as their basic structure would be maintained, albeit with some refinement and rearrangement, in the structural *Synopsis* prefaced to his *Syntagma theologiae* and, by way of the *Synopsis*, the *Syntagma* itself.

Whereas the *Partitiones* are referenced nearly entirely to passages in Scripture, the theses for disputation, which date from 1590 to 1600, evidence broader sources and resources. In these works, particularly following 1596, Polanus regularly references church fathers, patristic debates, early heresies, and medieval theologians, notably Lombard. One set of theses in particular, a *Synopsis SS. theologiae* (1598), covers in short form all of the theological *loci* and evidences a significant increase in interest in the church fathers, citing Jerome, John of Damascus, the Athanasian Creed, Augustine, Justin Martyr, Fulgentius, Ambrose, Irenaeus, Basil, Leo, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Hilary, and Origen. The order and arrangement of the theses is much like that of the earlier *Partitiones* and the later *Syntagma*, but the significant development of patristic citation points toward the later development of Polanus' thought.¹⁰

⁹ *Enchiridii Locorum Communium Theologicorum, Rerum, Exemplorum, atq; Phrasium sacrarum; ex Avg. Marlorati Thesauro, & Christ. Obenhenii Promptuario, ab Isaaco L.Feguernekino, Ungaro, collecti, Editio secunda, priore melior. Acceßit Gemmula Partitionum Theologicarum, auctore Amando Polano à Polansdorf* (Basel: Konrad Waldkirch, 1589)

¹⁰ Amandus Polanus, *Synopsis SS. theologiae, paucis thesibus comprehensa ... praeside ... Amando Polano a Polansdorf ... pro solenni, doctoratus, testimonio ad disputandum publice proposita a Luca Stöckle Spirensi. Ad diem II. Maii* (Basel: Conrad Waldkirch, 1598)

A further development is evident in the disputations collected in Polanus's *Sylloge thesium theologiarum* (1598), a substantial series devoted primarily to the refutation of Bellarmine.¹¹ The disputations do not cover a full series of theological topics and do not follow a systematic order. They are largely referenced to Scripture. The patristic references are few and do not offer any indication of what was to come in the *Symphonia catholica*, whereas the polemical focus on Bellarmine and other Roman Catholic opponents looks directly toward the issues to be confronted in the *Symphonia*.

The Ramist framework for theology provided by the *Partitiones*, taken together the various theses and disputations over which Polanus presided offer evidence of a program of theological formulation similar to the programs that were developing among Polanus's Reformed contemporaries in other universities and academies. Keith Stanglin has argued this point quite effectively in his analyses of the published theses and disputations presented at Leiden University from the 1580s onward.¹² In Basel, at the time of Polanus's early theological formation, his mentor, Grynaeus published an extensive set of theses on a wide variety of theological topics (although not in systematic order).¹³ These theses, together with the sets of *aphorismi* and *theoremata* produced under Grynaeus could be easily used in the construction of a large synopsis of theology. Further evidence for this movement from topically organized disputations toward theological system can be seen, after Polanus' time, in William Ames's *Medulla theologiae*, which evidences both a

¹¹ Amandus Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum, ad methodi leges conscriptarum et disputationibus Roberti Bellarmini praecipue oppositarum* (Basel: Conrad Waldkirch, 1598)

¹² See Keith Stanglin, *Arminius and the Assurance of Salvation: The Context, Roots, and Shape of the Leiden Debate, 1603-1609* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2007), 36-68; idem, *The Missing Public Disputations of Jacobus Arminius: Introduction, Text, and Notes* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2010), 7-100.

¹³ J. J. Grynaeus, *Theologica theoremata et problemata, de quibus in ... Basiliensi Academia Syze-te-seis institutae fuerunt, editae a Iohanne Iacobo Grynaeo*, 3 vols. (Basel: Sebastian Henricpetrus, 1588).

Ramist organization and the gathering of a full set of disputations into a systematic model.¹⁴ Polanus's process of formulation, however, included elements not found either in the several series of Leiden disputations or in Ames's *Medulla*, namely, the extensive work as a biblical commentator and the gathering of patristic resources in the *Symphonia*. The incorporation of portions of these materials into the *Syntagma theologiae* resulted in a far more detailed theological work and one in which exegetical work and patristic citation are prominent.

As already indicated in the description of Polanus's *Partitiones* as following a Ramist model, the contemporary resources used by Polanus in the construction of his theology included Ramist logic. In Polanus's case, this logical component was his own approach to logic, the slightly modified Ramism of his own *Logicae libri duo*, which in its later editions, included theological applications.¹⁵ The logical apparatus is evident in Polanus's manner of formulation and the generally Ramist approach can be seen in his bifurcatory patterns of exposition and also perhaps less directly in his tendency to develop his conclusions as aphorisms. Although the use of aphoristic argumentation was typical of various Ramist writers, it is not the case either that aphorisms were not deployed by non-Ramist writers of the era or that the use of aphorisms by Polanus should be explained as a direct impact of Ramus's own thought. Polanus's mentor, Grynaeus, who was not particularly inclined toward Ramism, used aphorisms throughout his works, notably in his explanations of Scripture and in various of the disputations over which he presided. The

¹⁴ William Ames, *Medulla ss. theologiae, ex sacris literis, earumque interpretibus, extracta, & methodicè disposita* (Amsterdam, 1623; London: Robert Allott, 1629).

¹⁵ Amandus Polanus, *Logicae libri duo: iuxta naturalis methodi leges conformati: Accedit brevis admonitio de usu logicae, et de vera facillique imitatione auctorum* (Herborn: Christophorus Corvinus, 1590, 1593; Basel: Conrad Waldkirch, 1598, 1599).

aphoristic approach is evident both in the commentaries and in the *Partitiones* and, of course, via the use of the *Partitiones* as a model, in the final *syntagma* as well.

3.2 *Prolegomena* and *Principia Dua*: the Foundations of Polanus's Theological Method

Polanus did not, of course, place predestination at the head of his theological system, but only came to it after his prolegomena and his doctrines of Scripture and God—presenting the doctrine only in book 4 of the *Syntagma*, following on a discussions of the works of God in general and of the personal and essential works of the Godhead, a full 1528 columns after the beginning of the *Syntagma* in the 1608 edition. In other words, Polanus's system begins with lengthy expositions of prolegomena and his two *principia*, Scripture and God. As Muller notes,¹⁶ a proper understanding of prolegomena and two *principia*, God and Scripture, provides us with the best way of entering into the Reformed orthodox theology of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, since the considerable development of prolegomena indicates most the distinction of the Reformed orthodoxy from the Reformation theology mainly in terms of organization or form. Thus, an examination of Polanus's prolegomena would lead us to a more balanced understanding of his formulation of Reformed theology in the academic context of his era. In prolegomena, Polanus deals mainly with the definition of theology and Scripture as the theological *principium* which I will, thus, discuss in this subsection.

3.2.1. What is Theology?¹⁷

Polanus defines *theologia*, not as a science, but as the wisdom of divine things ($\theta\epsilon\omicron\sigma\sigma\omicron\varphi\acute{\alpha}$, *sapientia rerum divinarum*), a wisdom which is the most precious and excellent among all things of the visible world. It was the standard definition of theology already introduced by Franciscus Junius. Heavily dependent on Junius, who appealed to

¹⁶ Muller, *PRRD*, 1:43.

¹⁷ On the more detailed discussion concerning the definition of theology in the era of orthodoxy, see Muller, *PRRD*, 1:221-269.

just the authority of some orthodox fathers (*orthodoxis patribus*) to verify his sapiential definition of theology, Polanus still differentiated himself from Junius by grounding the same definition in the absolute authority of scriptural testimonies, especially Job 12:13, Romans 11:13, Deutronomy 4:6, and 1 Corinthians 2:6.¹⁸ Merging traditional language with the methodological tools of Aristotelian metaphysics, he pointed out that God, traditionally identified as the fountain of all wisdom and pure wisdom itself, is also rightly seen as the efficient Cause and Author of original Christian Theology. The *instrumentum* of Christian theology must be Scripture divinely inspired (θεόπνευστος). Its *materia*, by which theology is firmly established, is the principles and commands that have predominated every method of human reason and otherwise would not be recognized without divine revelation. The internal and essential *forma* of theology is truth, which is divine, holy, just, perfect, eternal, immutable, and which is the idea of theology that is to be the imitator in God and sanctifies us. The principal *finis* of theology is the glory of the immortal, most wise God and the secondary is human beatitude, which is not taught in a proper sense by philosophers but by God, and which is revealed and presented to all the elect and means our communion with God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, who is the eternal *Summum Bonum*. In this manner, Polanus, depicting the *Syntagma theologiae christianae* as the catholic symphony (*symphonia catholica*) of interpretations of the Old and the New Testaments with the ancient orthodox fathers, and the other “optimal writers”

¹⁸ Franciscus Junius, *Tractatus De Vera Theologia*, in *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, (Amsterdam, 1882), i: “Theologia aut sermonem Dei ipsius, aut de Diuinitate sermonem.... Theologiae appellatione: quemadmodum etiam orthodoxis Patribus, θεοσοφία, Sapientia rerum diuinarum fuit appellata”; Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, I.ii: “Theologiam veram esse, probatur tum ex testimonijs, tum rationibus. Ex testimonijs tum divinis, tum humanis. Divina testimonia sunt: Job 12:13 Si est sapientia rerum diuinarum, est & Theologia. At sapientiam rerum diuinarum esse, testatur Scriptura. Ergo & hanc esse testatur.”

retaining great insights of truth,¹⁹ manifests that the purpose of the *Syntagma* is to propagate the glory of the eternal God (*propagandi gloriam Dei aeterni*) and to promote the love of God's church (*amor Ecclesiae Dei*).²⁰ It is notable that, as the pious fathers intended to establish theology, though with a polemic style, ultimately for the sake of God's glory and the benefits of the church, Polanus did not intend the *Syntagma* to be just polemical but ultimately constructive or doctrinal.

Repeatedly using the Ramist method of division and heavily depending on Junius, Polanus makes first a formal distinction of theology into *vera* and *falsa* and then the true theology into *archetypa* and *ectypa* (ἀρχέτυπος & ἔκτυπος). Asking if there exists true theology, Polanus gives a positive answer on the ground of the witnesses of Scripture, the ancient fathers, and human reason.²¹ The archetypal-ectypal division is not substantial but analogical (*analogica*): archetypal theology is one declared principally, while ectypal theology is one said consequently and according to the similitude of archetypal theology. Between the two theologies, there is no substantial difference in such a way that the archetypes of wisdom, goodness, justice, power, and quality of certain things created by

¹⁹ On Polanus's pursuit for the catholic symphony of theology, see Ernst Staehelin, *Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf* (Basel: Verlag von Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1955), 98-99; Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, epistola.

²⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, epistola, g.3-4: "Qvemadmodum in toto hoc visibili mundo nihil est excellentius homine, in homine nihil praestantius anima, in anima nihil exquisitius ratione, in ratione nihil praeclarius intellectu, in intellectu nihil pretiosius sapientia: Ita certissimum est, nullam sapientiam quaequidem in hominis intellectum cadit, esse praestabiliorem & nobiliorem sapientia rerum divinarum, quam appellamus Theologiam Christianam Causa efficiens atque autor Theologiae Christianae princeps est Deus ipse fons sapientiae, & in quo est archetypa Theologia ac sapientia. Instrumentum Theologiae est Scriptura θεόπνευστος Materia ex qua Theologia constan, sunt principia ac praecepta modum rationis humanae longissime superantia, nec aliter nisi per revelationem divinam cognita ... Forma ejus interna atque essentialis est veritas divina, sancta, justa, perfecta, aeterna, immutabilis, ideae Theologiae quae in Deo est imitatriz; veritas nos sanctificans Finis ejus primarius est gloria Dei immortalis & sapientissimi Secundarius ejusdem finis est Beatitudo nostra ... non quam Philosophi docuerunt, quae verius miseria est, sed quam Deus patefecit & omnibus electis suis exhibet, quae est communio illa cum Deo Patre, Filio & Spiritu Sancto, quae sola aeternum beatos facit."

²¹ The issue of Polanus's calling for human reason as a theological witness is discussed later in the sections of *Principia theologiae* and of *Theology and Philosophy*.

God in rational creatures resides in God (*in Deum*), and that the archetype of image and likeness in human beings is His divinity (*Deitas*).²² Polanus regards the *theologia ectypa* as ideated (*ideatur*) and articulated (*exprimitur*) from *theologia archetypa* so that the former ought to harmonize with, correspond with, and thus be similar to the latter in substance.²³

The *theologia archetypa* is defined by Polanus as “the uncreated wisdom of divine things residing in God and essential to him (*Sapientia rerum divinarum, in Deo residens, essentialis ipsi & increata*).”²⁴ This definition, however, is not an invention of Reformed orthodoxy but, as Junius and Quenstedt testified, is grounded in some biblical testimonies (1 Cor. 3, Matt. 9:27 and 1 Cor. 2:10-11.) and is very traditional. Polanus traced historical vestiges of this notion back to a Jewish philosopher, Philo, who says that “God is the archetype of rational nature, and the human is its true image and effigy,” and to the church fathers like Clement of Alexandria, Theodoretus, and Basil the Great who declare the same thing.²⁵ And Polanus recited Clement’s citation of Phytagoras who said in *De fortuna* that the Creator, in his creation of human beings, took himself as “an exemplar” and later that their bodies were made of the same material and fashioned by the most outstanding

²² Cf. Johann Andreas Quenstedt, *Theologia didactico-polemica, sive systema theologicvm* (Lipsiae: Fritsch, 1702), 4: “Theologia ἀρχέτυπος non solum in Deo est, sed & ipse Deus.”

²³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 13: “Theologia archetypa est prima idea Theologia, a qua ideatur (ut hac voce ut ar) & exprimitur Theologia ectypa: sicuti veritas & bonitas essentialis in Deo est archetypa & prima idea veri & boni, a qua omne creatum verum ac bonum ideatur. Theologia archetypa est exemplar: ectypa est exemplum, quod exemplari convenire, respondere & simile esse debet.”

²⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 9-12; Richard A. Muller, *PRRD*, 1:231; Franciscus Junius, *De Vera Theologia*, iii: “Theologia ἀρχέτυπος essentialis est naturae Dei, & pars (vt ita dicamus) scientiae illius infinitae, quae in Deo essentialis est.” On the meaning of this distinction, see Willem J. van Asselt, “The Fundamental Meaning of Theology: Archetypal and Ectypal Theology in Seventeenth-Century Reformed Thought”, *WTJ* 64 (2002): 319-335

²⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 9-11; Philo, *De eo, quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat*, in *Opera omnia: Graeca et latine*, vol. 2 (August Friedrich Pfeiffer, 1786), 198: “ἀρχέτυπον μὲν φύσεως λογικῆς ὁ θεός ἐστι, μίμημα δὲ καὶ ἀπεικόνισμα ἀνθρώπου”; Junius, *De Vera Theologia*, iv; Quenstedt, *Theologia didactico-polemica*, 4.

Artificer who, creating a human being, took himself as “the archetype.”²⁶ Theodoretus, likewise, witnesses that “you have heard the voice but not seen its shape so that you might not establish its figure whose archetype you have not known.”²⁷ Assuming Basil as the author of the *Adversus Eunomium*, Polanus takes a quotation from his exposition of Colossians 1:15: “the image exists by virtue of the fact that the archetype exists: the image is not formed by imitation, since the whole nature of the Father is manifest in the Son as in a seal.”²⁸ Polanus, thus, bases his identification of *theologia archetypa* on biblical and patristic thought.

According to Polanus, ectypal theology is defined as “the wisdom of divine things, which are formulated by God and expressed from his own archetype through his gracious communication for the sake of his own glory.”²⁹ The conception and rightness in this definition is based on Psalm 36:10 and the patristic testimonies which Polanus quotes from John of Damscus and Clement of Alexandria, especially the latter of whom described three things in *vox*: 1) names which are primarily signs of those which are cognized in mind and, by consequence, signs of subjects, 2) ideas which are cognized, the references and

²⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 9-11; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, in *PG* 9, col. 52: “τὸ δὲ σκᾶνος τοῖς λοιποῖς ὁμοιον, οἷα γεγονὸς ἐκ τᾶς αὐτᾶς ὕλας, ὑπὸ τεχνίτα δὲ εἰργασμένον λῶστω, ὃς ἐτεχνίτευσεν αὐτὸ ἀρχετύπῳ χρώμενος ἑαυτῷ.”

²⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 11; Theodoretus, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, II, in *PG* 83, col.844: “Φωνῆς ἀκήκοας, εἶδος δὲ οὐχ ἐώρακας· μηδένα οὖν τύπον κατασκευάσης, οὗ τὸ ἀρχέτυπον οὐκ ἐπίστασαι.”

²⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 11; Basilii Magnus, *Adversus Eunomium*, II.xvi, in *PG* 9, col. 605: “συνυπάρχουσιν καὶ παρυφειστηκυῖαν τῷ πρωτοτύπῳ ὑποστήσαντι, τῷ εἶναι τὸ ἀρχέτυπον, οὐσαν, οὐκ ἐκτυπωθεῖσαν διὰ μιμήσεως, ὡσπερ ἐν σφραγίδι τινι τῆς ὅλης φύσεως τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐναποσημανθείσης τῷ Υἱῷ.” Polanus used Beza’s translation of Basil’s *Adversus Eunomium* in Latin, included in Athanasius’ *Dialogi V de sancta Trinitate* (Geneva, 1570), 307.

²⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 12: “Theologia ectypa, est sapientia rerum divinarum, a Deo ex archetypo ipsius expressa atque informata per communicationem gratiosam ad gloriam ipsius.” Cf. Junius, *De Vera Theologia*, v: “Theologia ἔκτυπος siue simpliciter (vt vocant) siue secundum quid considerata, est sapientia diuinarum rerum a Deo ex archetypo ipsius informata per communicationem Gratiae ad gloriam ipsius.”

impressions of the subjects, and 3) the subject-matters which are impressed in ideas.³⁰ It is interesting that Polanus conceptualized the conceptualization of “ectype” as formulated from archetype or prototype, also in dialogue with an ancient Roman, Pliny the Younger.³¹

The *theologia ectypa* is divided into two: *theologia ectypa in se* and *theologia ectypa in creaturis rationalibus*. Ectypal theology as considered in itself is the whole wisdom of divine things communicable with rational creatures, according to the mode of communicating God’s wisdom in this life and in the future.³² Ectypal theology in rational creatures is the wisdom of divine things communicated with rational creatures, the wisdom modified by their manner or ability that they may rightly recognize and love God from their heart, with whom the human beatitude eternally resides and who is glorified because of it.³³ Ectypal theology as considered in rational creatures is divided into that of Christ (*Christi*, John 1:16, 12, 13, 32; Col 2:3), the head of God’s church according to His humanity, and of his members (*membrorum Christi*).³⁴ The *theologia ectypa christi*, which is called the theology of union (*theologia unionis*) because Christ had humanity by the hypostatic union with his divinity, is the whole wisdom of divine things communicated with Christ by way of the personal union of divinity and humanity (θεανθρωπῶ) through

³⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 12; John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei orthodoxae*, I.xiii, in PG 94, cols. 849-860; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, VIII.viii, in PG 9, cols. 587-590: “Τρία ἐστὶ περὶ τὴν φωνήν· τὰ τε ὀνόματα σύμβολα ὄντα τῶν νοημάτων κατὰ τὸ προηγούμενον, κατ’ ἐπακολούθημα δὲ καὶ τῶν ὑποκειμένων, δεύτερον δὲ τὰ νοήματα ὁμοιώματα καὶ ἐκτυπώματα τῶν ὑποκειμένων ὄντα ὅθεν ἅπασιν καὶ τὰ νοήματα τὰ αὐτὰ ἐστὶ διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑποκειμένων ἅπασιν ἐγγίνεσθαι τύπωσιν, οὐκέτι δὲ καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα διὰ τὰς διαλέκτους τὰς διαφορούς· τρίτον δὲ τὰ ὑποκείμενα πράγματα, ἀφ’ ὧν ἡμῖν τὰ νοήματα ἐντυποῦνται.”

³¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 13; Plinius, *Naturalis historiae* (Lugdunum, 1563), XXXVII.x.676.

³² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 14.

³³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 14: “Theologia ectypa considerata ut est in creaturis rationalibus, est sapientia rerum divinarum cum creaturis rationalibus communicata pro modo seu captu ipsarum, ut illae Deum recte agnoscentes, & ex animo diligentes, cum eo beate in aeternum vivant, ad eum glorificandum.”

³⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 62-63. It is noteworthy that Polanus treats with the theology of Christ in the realm of the rational creatures. Cf. Junius, *De Vera Theologia*, v-vi.

the Holy Spirit being poured out into Christ's humanity without measure for its perpetual beatitude or for all elucidation of those, with whom Christ is linked as Head.³⁵

Polanus continues to make more distinctions concerning theology, based on Scripture, the church fathers, medieval doctors, contemporary Reformed thinkers, and logical argumentations. Notable here is his scholastic (not strictly patristic!) analysis of the meaning of "theology." As the wisdom of divine things coming from Christ, which is communicated with his members for the glory of God and their perpetual salvation, the *theologia membrorum Christi* is considered either of the blessed (*beatorum*) or of the pilgrims or us (*viatorum seu nostrum*). The *theologia beatorum* is the wisdom of divine things, coming from Christ, communicated with the blessed in heaven by the clear vision or the intuitive knowledge of God through the Holy Spirit for the sake of God's glory.³⁶ The *Theologia beatorum* is divided into the theologies of blessed Angels (*theologia Angelorum beatorum*) and of blessed humans (*hominum beatorum*). Our theology or the theology of pilgrims (*theologia viatorum seu nostra*) is the wisdom of divine things which, coming from Christ by the gracious inspiration of the Holy Spirit, is communicated with human beings living on earth that they may by the light of *intellectus* contemplate God and His own divine things and justly worship Him until they reach the clear and perfect vision of Him in heaven for His glory (2 Cor 13:9, 12; Eph 4:11, 12, 13; 1 Pet 1:8).³⁷ The reason

³⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 63. Cf. Junius, *De Vera Theologia*, vi: "Theologia, quam vnionis appellamus, tota sapientia rerum diuinarum communicata cum Christo θεανθρώπου, id est, qua sermo Caro factus est, secundum humanitatem eius."

³⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 64.

³⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 67: "Theologia viatorum, est sapientia rerum diuinarum a Christo per Spiritum Sanctum cum hominibus hic in terra degentibus per gratiosam inspirationem communicata, ut lumine intellectus contemplantur Deum, & res diuinas ipsius per sua incrementa, Deumque recte colant, donec in caelo claram & perfectam ejus visionem consequantur, ad gloriam ipsius."

this theology is called *theologia viatorum* and the inspired theology of revelation (*theologia inspirata revelationis*) is because it is revealed to human beings living on earth in their “pilgrim” state, capable of knowing God, not by sight, but only by revelation, and only when the mind has been inspired or illuminated by the Spirit.³⁸ Theology of pilgrims is again considered either absolutely (*absolute*) or relatively (*secundum quid*). These distinctions made above are not traceable to the patristic writings; rather they reflect the late medieval background, specifically as drawn into the Reformed tradition by Franciscus Junius. Polanus here relies heavily on Junius.³⁹

Before dealing with these two theologies (*theologia viatorum absolute and secundum quid*), Polanus makes a distinction between *naturalis* and *supernaturalis* to manifest the necessity of revealed theology (*theologiae revelatae necessitatem*), without which people cannot recognize the genuine truth about God (*sincera veritas de Deo*) or worship Him in a proper way. *Theologia supernaturalis* is the divine wisdom that proceeds from superior principles, that is, revelation, illumination, and conviction beyond the mode of human reason (*supra humanae rationis modum*), according to its own notion through the light of knowledge (*scientiae lumine*) poured out into human souls by the celestial inspiration of divine will.⁴⁰

³⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 68: “Vocatur Theologia via, seu viatorum, quia nobis hominibus hic in terra revelata est: Item Theologia inspirata & revelationis, quia Prophetis & Apostolis in terra degentibus immediate inspirata & revelata est, & per illos aliis fidelibus manifestata.”

³⁹ Cf. Junius, *De theologia vera*; Muller, *PRRD*, 1:113-115; van Asselt, “The Fundamental Meaning of Theology,” 319-335.

⁴⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 69. Concerning Polanus’s understanding of philosophy, it should be noted that, to him, *scientia* is not just knowledge but knowledge of divine character connected with the divine will of God.

Theologia naturalis, interestingly, is not viewed as divine wisdom in a strict sense but is called a philosophical theology, the first philosophy, or metaphysical theology, because its efficient cause is “the nature and natural light of our intellect (*natura & lumen naturale intellectus nostri*).” This theology concerns some of divine things that can be known by natural light (*lumine naturalis*), but in part properly and in part improperly.⁴¹ This natural theology is, however, not capable of arriving at the perfection of grace by itself, just as nobody has perfection and indeed cannot. But it does not necessarily mean that natural theology is contrary to supernatural or revealed theology. This issue belongs to the relation of theology and philosophy, an issue that I will treat later in this chapter. But it is worth noting here that the concept and distinction of *theologia naturalis* and *supernaturalis* was not based on the fathers but on issues raised in the course of Protestant encounter with late medieval and Renaissance thought.

Polanus then defined “the theology of pilgrims as considered absolutely according to their nature” as “the wisdom of divine things, which are inspired from God according to divine truths and through His enunciated word delivered in Christ to his servants and authenticated in the Old and the New Testaments by the prophets, apostles, and evangelists, for the glory of God and the good of the human elect” (Gal. 1:11, 12, 15, 16; Eph. 3:10).⁴² Finally, he identified “the theology of pilgrims considered in themselves or relatively (*theologia viatorum quatenus est in ipsis vel secundum quid*)” with “the wisdom of divine

⁴¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 70: “Differt autem primo genere, seu secundum genus: nam Theologia supernaturalis, est sapientia: Theologia autem naturalis, non est sapientia...theologiae vero naturalis subjectum sunt res divinae, partim proprie, partim improprie & secundum opinionem humanam sic dictae.”

⁴² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 73: “Theologia viatorum absolute dicta & secundum naturam suam considerata, est sapientia rerum divinarum secundum veritatem divinam a Deo inspirata, & per enunciativum sermonem ipsius, in Christo commissa servis ejus, atque in Testamento vetere & novo per Prophetas, Apostolos & Evangelistas consignata, quantum ejus in hac vita hominibus expedit revelari ad gloriam Dei & electorum hominum bonum.”

things communicated with human beings residing in this life by God through His word, modified according to this human reason so that the wisdom of divine things is more in some and less in others (2 Pet 3:15).”⁴³ With an indication of “our theology” as obscure with respect to the theology of the blessed, Polanus emphasizes humility in studying and doing our theology, affirming *theologia nostra* as one, eternal and immutable in essence, because it is by necessity true, holy, and perfect according to God.⁴⁴

With the distinction of our theology into *infusa* and *acquisita* in terms of its efficient cause, Polanus discussed the *theoria-praxis* issue, arguing that *theologia nostra infusa* is theoretical and *theologia nostra acquisita* is practical, both of which stand on human disposition (*habitus*).⁴⁵ In this regard, he asserts that *theologia nostra* is not only *speculativa* but also *practica*.⁴⁶ The point echoes Ramus who maintains the substantial unity of “faith” and “actions of faith” in such a way that the latter is the necessary effect of the former and that “the true faith is unable to be in any place without honest and agreeable

⁴³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 75: “Theologia viatorum quatenus est in ipsis, est sapientia rerum divinarum cum hominibus in hac vita versantibus communicata a Deo per verbum, pro ratione eorum hominum quibus inest modificata, sic ut in alio plus, in alio minus sapientiae illius insit.” This definition is what Polanus uses as the notion of our theology in the rest of the *Syntagma*.

⁴⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 75.

⁴⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 88: “Theologia nostra infusa est, quatenus est salvifica Dei cognitio & Servatoris nostri Christi aliarumque rerum divinarum ad salutem necessariarum, ac proinde etiam quo ad salutem intelligentiam principiorum fidei & bonorum operum, a solo interno lumine Spiritus sancti manantem, quae principia fidei justificante creduntur esse a Deo nobis revelata, ut sint potentia Dei instrumenta ad salutem cuiusvis credenti ... Acquisita vero est, ut includit fidem acquisitam & habitus acquisitos evidentes tam propositionum, quam consequentiarum, quam etiam actus comprehensivos complexorum & incomplexorum, hoc est, ut clarius dicatur, Theologia nostra acquisita est quo ad cognitionem propositionum & conclusionum ex principiis deductarum perceptarumque; assiduo labore, operatione, industria & exercitatione per Verbi Dei scripti religiosam, attentam & decentem meditationem ad recte colendum Deum.” It is notable that Polanus appeals to Duns Scotus as a medieval witness to justify the identification of theology as *infusa* and *acquisita*. See Ibid, 89; Johannes Duns Scotus, *Ordinatio: Prologus*, in *Joannis Duns Scoti doctoris subtilis, ordinis minorum opera omnia*, vol. 8 (Paris, 1891), 37.

⁴⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, synopsis; I.xiii. It is notable that Polanus derives the distinction of theology into theoretical and practical, from the notions of *infusa* and *acquisita* in *theologia viatorum seu nostra secundum quid*.

activity to God (*vera illa fides absque honesta Deoque grata actione consistere nequaquam potest*),⁴⁷ Polanus tries to harmonize faith and good works, by arguing that faith is not just a speculative *habitus* and that *theologia infusa* ought to be called super-speculative because it holds speculation and practice together in an eminent manner (*eminenter*).⁴⁸ Moreover, arguing that the *finis* of theology is not contemplation alone and that contemplation is not nobler than activity,⁴⁹ Polanus goes further to declare, on the basis of biblical texts, that “the end of theology is not theory but practice (*Theologiae finem non esse theoriam, sed praxin*, 1 Tim 1:3-5, 4:7; 1 Joh 3:18, 4:21; James 1:21; Prov 8:32 Apoc 22:14)”⁵⁰ and activity is more excellent (*praestantiolem*) than every single work of speculation.⁵¹ In addition to the biblical testimonies, Polanus makes the patristic and medieval attestations, especially from Justin Martyr and Augustine and Duns Scotus,⁵² by saying that “the fathers and sounder scholastics realized this.”⁵³

⁴⁷ Peter Ramus, *Commentarium de religione christiana* (Francofurtum, 1576), 96.

⁴⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 92: “fides non sit habitus speculativus, ut nec credere sit actus speculativus; nec visio sequens ipsum credere est visio speculativa, sed practica. Quapropter statuerunt alii infusam Theologiam non tam speculativam, quam superspeculativam vocari debere, quae eminenter continet & Speculativam & Practicam.” On this, Thomas Aquinas is a sole medieval witness of this argument whom Polanus quotes. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, I.i.5.

⁴⁹ Cf. Barckley, *Summum bonum*, 564-569: Franciscus Turretinus, *Institutio Theologiae Elencticae* (Edinburch, 1847), I.vii.3.

⁵⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 90. Muller defines *theoria & praxis* in the sense of medieval and reformation age that “*theoria* is synonymous with *contemplatio* or *speculatio*,” which is deeply connected with “*visio Dei* and the ultimate enjoyment of God (*fruitio Dei*) by man, and *praxis* is an activity that leads toward an end.” Muller, *PRRD*, 1:341. Cf. Johann Scapula, *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum novum* (London, 1637), 633.

⁵¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 92-93: “Praestantissima scientia finis est contemplatio; Theologia est scientia praestantissima; Ergo finis ejus est contemplatio. Propositionem majorem probant, quia contemplatio nobilior sit actione ... Sed cum Theologiae finem asserimus esse operationem, intelligimus actionem praestantiolem omni opere mechanico, praestantiolem omni speculatione, nempe glorificationem Dei & beatitudinem nostram sempiternam; haec actio est perfectissima. Contemplatio autem nuda & mera est actus imperfectus.”

⁵² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 91-92: “Justinus Martyr Paraenesi ad Graecos...*Non in dictis, sed in factis res nostrae religionis consistunt*. Johannes Duns Scotus in Prolog. Sentent...*cum primum objectum Theologiae sit ultimus finis & principia in intellectu creato sumta a fine ultimo sint principia practica: igitur*

Here we find a continuity between patterns in patristic thought, medieval thought and early Reformed thoughts in the theological emphasis on *praxis*. Ramus' definition of theology as the doctrine of living well had distinct medieval precedent. It reflects the Franciscan emphasis on theology as practical and, as Muller pointed out, "in Aquinas' short exposition of the Apostles' Creed and, accordingly, it had the effect of linking Reformed theology (notably, the theology of Fenner, Perkins, and Ames) to a tradition of definition that emphasized the practical aspect of the discipline."⁵⁴ In this regard, it is of interest to note that Polanus did not cite Aquinas or Ramus but rather Augustine and Scotus. Yet, Polanus does not ignore Thomas's emphasis on the identification of theology as *supraspeculativa* for holding speculation and practice together. Moreover, Polanus closes his discussion of *theologia theoretica et practica* by referring to Thomas's ordering of authority in theological argumentation: Scripture, necessity, orthodox fathers, philosophers, and the reasoning of natural reason not for approving faith but for manifestation.⁵⁵ For theological formulation, thus, Polanus consults both the Scotist and the Thomist thoughts in an eclectic manner.⁵⁶ From this, it may be said that there is no sharp contrast in substance, but in emphasis, between the Franciscan and the Dominican

principia Theologiae sunt practica: ergo & conclusiones sunt practicae...Augustini: Credere in Deum est amando tendere in ipsum."

⁵³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 91-92. Meijering argues that the reluctance of Luther and Calvin over against the "speculation" of the church fathers is not found in the Reformed scholastics like Turretin, and that especially the free will and immutable nature of God was made subject to speculation by their acceptance of the Aristotelian logic and the Platonic concept of God. Polanus, however, would counter Meijering's charge of the Reformed orthodox with more speculation than the Reformers as untenable. Cf. Meijering, *Reformierte Scholastik und Patristische Theologie*, 23, 361ff, 417. See Meijering, *Reformierte Scholastik und Patristische Theologie*, 23, 361ff, 417.

⁵⁴ Muller, *PRRD*, 1:150-151, 183; Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 82, 89.

⁵⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 95; Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, I.i.8.

⁵⁶ In this sense, it is not exclusively true that Deal calls Polanus a Scotist. See Deal, "The Meaning and Method," 64.

understandings about the relationship between the theoretical and the practical sides of theology.⁵⁷

In a typical Ramist method of division, Polanus, assuming Scripture as the first principle of our theology and faith,⁵⁸ divides the content of *theologia nostra* into two parts: concerning faith (*de fide*) and concerning good works (*de bonis operibus*).⁵⁹ The doctrine of faith consists of two aspects: God (*de Deo*) and the Church (*de Ecclesia*).⁶⁰ The doctrine of faith in God is considered in two parts: the essence of God (*de essentia Dei*) and his own works (*de operibus ipsius*). These bifurcations are not to be seen as separable but merely distinguishable. The relationship between *de fide & de bonis operibus*, or between *de Deo & de Ecclesia*, is to be viewed in such a way that the most perfect goal of theology is the glorification of God and our perpetual beatitude, and yet the former is the *causa* of the latter.⁶¹ Hence, the structure of Polanus's theology emphasizes a harmonious relationship between *theoria* and *praxis* as neither separable or contradictory.⁶² This represents Polanus' theological affinity to Vermigli's system of theology.⁶³ Unlike

⁵⁷ See Muller, *PRRD*, 1:94, 341; Sprunger, "Ames, Ramus, and the Method of Puritan Theology," 136-137.

⁵⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 96; Muller, *PRRD*, 1:126-127. It is notable that his *Partitiones theologiae* begins with the doctrine of Scripture (*Verbum Dei*).

⁵⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, II.i. With reference to the first part of Ramus' impact on Reformed orthodoxy, who defines theology as "the doctrine of living to God (*doctrina vivendi Deo*)," Karl Reuter argues that Polanus organizes, just as Ames and Mastricht do, his doctrinal structure of the *Partitiones* and *Syntagma* in two parts: faith and obedience. Muller, *PRRD*, 1:150-158, 183-184, 208; Reuter et al., *William Ames*, 181.

⁶⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, II.ii.

⁶¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 93.

⁶² Cf. Francis Turretin, *Institutio*, I.i.7: *Ad quos accedimus, censemusque Theologiam nec esse simpliciter Theoreticam, nec simpliciter Practicam; sed partim Theoreticam, partim Practicam, utpote quae simul conjungit theoriam veri et praxim boni; magis tamen esse practicam quam theoreticam.*"

⁶³ Muller, *PRRD*, 1:341, 354: "the discussion of theology as theoretical and practical has definite roots in earlier Reformed theology, especially, in the writings of Peter Martyr Vermigli...the balance of theoretical or contemplative elements with the practical side of theology The contemplative or speculative aspect of

Vermigli,⁶⁴ whose theology was formed under the influence of the Dominican and Augustinian tradition,⁶⁵ however, Polanus claimed throughout all his writings that *praxis* is prior to *theoria* in terms of importance (although in terms of place or order *theoria* precedes *praxis* as Vermigli asserted).⁶⁶ Polanus's theology, thus, was not be limited to any specific tradition of medieval theology, but took some features from several lines of theological traditions in an eclectic manner.

The harmony of theory and practice in almost every theological doctrine, even including that of divine attributes – *simplicitate Dei, perfectione Dei, infinitate Dei, immensitate Dei, immutabilitate Dei, vita Dei, sapientia Dei, voluntate Dei, and immortalitate Dei* – is illustrated by Polanus's duplex exposition of them: 1) axioms (*axiomata*) derived from Scripture; and 2) the use of attributes (*usus hujus attributi*). Every Christian doctrine, at least in Polanus's theological discussion, is not completed just by its understanding but is necessarily followed by its pious practice. This dual emphasis of

theology is, therefore, foremost in place and importance"; John Patrick Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 18, 24, 27, 47-48, 202, 204.

⁶⁴ Vermigli asserts that Scripture and philosophy are agreeable in a way that they are both practical and contemplative (*practicam & contemplativam*), but different with regard to their priority in that "in philosophy πρακτικόν proceeds θεωρητικόν, for we cannot contemplate either God or nature by human strength, unless first our affections be at quiet but in the holy scriptures speculation takes the first place (*in philosophia πρακτικόν antecedit θεωρητικόν, quia ... neq; Deum neq; naturam possumus contemplari humanis viribus, nisi prius affectus nostri pacati fuerunt. At in sacris literis priori loco Speculativum occurrit.*)" (1583). Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Loci Communes* (London: Thomas Vautrollerius, 1583), II.iii.9.

⁶⁵ Muller, *PRRD*, 1:354: "Thomist theology, characterized by a doctrine of the primacy of the intellect, was virtually bound to argue the priority of the theoretical or the contemplative. Scotist thought, by way of contrast, with its radical sense of the priority of the will, defined theology as essentially *praxis*. The Reformed, following the more traditional Augustinian line, balanced intellect and will with an emphasis on the activity of the regenerate will in "living to God" or "living blessedly forever." Cf. on Vermigli and Augustinian theology, see Frank A. James III, *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination: the Augustinian Inheritance of an Italian Reformer* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

⁶⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma*, I.xiii, II.1: "Theologia infusa sub altiori lumine considerat in Deo rationem finis ultimi, consequendi per media practica ... quum doceat Theologia, Deum esse sapientissimum & justissimum & omnium habere providentiam: consequenter etiam docet, eum esse timendum, illi esse fidendum & similia, quae omnia ad praxin spectant Theologiae Christianae sunt partes duae: prima de fide, altera de bonis operibus." In this regard, Turretin exactly follows Polanus. Turretin, *Institutio*, I.vii.2-3.

Polanus's theology between *theoria* and *praxis* is reflected not just in doctrines of divine attributes but also, throughout the *Syntagma*, in the structural distinctions of *de fide* and *de bono operibus*, of *de Deo* and *de ecclesia*, and of *de essentia* and *de operibus*. It is still to be remembered that this should always be considered in respect of God as the *Summum Bonum* prior to any *locus* of our theology. On the one hand, the first truth (*prima veritas*) or the ultimate goal of all things (*ultimum finem omnium*) is the highest *theoria* that God is *Summum Bonum*.⁶⁷ On the other hand, the end of theology is the most perfect *praxis*, the glorification of God, which is practical *Summum Bonum*.⁶⁸ For Polanus, thus, *summa theoria* and *summa praxis* are united into *Summum Bonum* as the ultimate perfection of theology.⁶⁹

3.2.2. *Principia Theologiae*

The Reformed orthodox reference the term *principium* as philosophical in its etymological origin but used it in a more theological sense with thematic modification based on the scriptural truth and ancient fathers' theological usage of the term. Polanus granted the term *principium* and its philosophical sense as borrowed from the Greek philosophers, such as Simplicius, Hippolytus, and Anaximander, the oldest Greek prose-writer and the earliest philosophical author,⁷⁰ who was the first person (πρῶτος αὐτός) to

⁶⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 93. The true vision of God (*vera visio Dei*) is to know God as *Summum Bonum*.

⁶⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae, Synopsis*: “primarius & summus est glorificatio Dei tanquam summi boni.”

⁶⁹ Cf. Muller, *PRRD*, 1:352: “The conjunction of the theoretical and the practical can be developed in terms of the object, subject, ground (*principium*), form, and goal of theology”; Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 95-96.

⁷⁰ In Anaximander's concept of ἄπειρον, Eduard Zeller infers that “Anaximander either expressly distinguished his ἄπειρον from all definite substances, or, what is probable, that he gave no detailed

identify the nature (φυσίς) of things or *infinitum* (ἄπειρον) as the Greek word ἀρχή.⁷¹ In this regard, Aristotle agreed with⁷² Anaximander's view of ἀρχή but developed it in a way that infused the concept of cause (αἴτιον) into ἀρχή,⁷³ defining a principle of all things (ἀρχή πάντων) as one from which a thing is produced (τὸ ἐξ οὗ γίγνεται).⁷⁴ This definition led him to the conclusion that “It is a common property of all principles (ἀρχῶν) to be the first point from which a thing either exists, come into being, or is known (ὅθεν ἢ ἔστιν ἢ γίγνεται ἢ γινώσκειται).”⁷⁵ In addition to the term ἀρχαί, Polanus remarks the philosophical origin of *principium* in Euclid's phrase κοινὰ ἔννοιαι (common conceptions) and a Stoic term προλήψεις (preconception).⁷⁶

Having this philosophical origin of *principium* in mind, Polanus conceptualizes the axioms of *principium* in his *Logicae* (1599), starting with the definition of *norma iudicandi de rebus* as that principium of truth according to which what may be true or false

explanation of its nature.” Eduard Zeller, *Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy*, ed. Wilhelm Nestle and trans. L. R. Palmer (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), 28. According to Clement, Anaximander, who eagerly sought after something nobler and infinite, placed Mind above infinity (τὸν νοῦν ἐπεστησάτην τῇ ἀπειρίᾳ), while Justin says that “the infinity is the first principle of all things; for that from this indeed all things are produced, and into this do all decay (τὸ ἄπειρον ἀρχὴν πάντων ἔφησεν εἶναι· ἐκ τούτου γὰρ δὴ τὰ πάντα γίνεσθαι καὶ εἰς τοῦτο τὰ πάντα φθείεσθαι).” Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus*, in *PG* 8, v; Justin Martyr, *Cohortatio ad gentiles*, in *PG* 6, iv.

⁷¹ Heinrich Ritter et al., *Historia Philosophiae Graecae*, 16-17: “Ἀναξίμανδρος—ἀρχὴν ἔφη τῶν ὄντων φύσιν τινὰ τοῦ ἀπείρου ... ἐκκρίνεσθαι φύσιν Ἀναξίμανδρος, πρῶτος αὐτὸς ἀρχὴν ὀνομάσας τὸ ὑποκείμενον”; Bavinck, *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek* I, 209-210. Probably, Thales, who believes “water is the principle of all (Ἀρχὴν δὲ τῶν πάντων τῶν ὕδωρ),” is the first person to have used the word “ἀρχή.” Diogenes, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, I.27; Justin Martyr, *Cohortatio ad gentiles*, in *PG* 6, iv.

⁷² Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, V.i: “φυσίς ἀρχή.”

⁷³ Aristotle insists that “all causes are principles (πάντα τὰ αἴτια ἀρχαί).” Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, V.i.

⁷⁴ Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, I.iii.

⁷⁵ Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, V.i. Cf. Muller, *PRRD*, 1:430-450.

⁷⁶ Polanus, *Logicae*, 210.

(*secundum qua judicatur, quid verum sit vel falsum*) is judged.⁷⁷ He makes a distinction of the *principium* into the natural and the supernatural: the former is “what nature reveals and provides us with,” while the latter is “what is divinely revealed in particular.” The natural *principium* of truth is subdivided into *principia* originated within us and universal experience: the former is the “universal norms engendered and marked in the nature of all human beings which are necessary to the certain and immovable truth,” while the latter is “the perpetual use of things in which all sane humans test and recognize to have the same things always in the the same manner.”⁷⁸ The natural *principium*, according to him, is also called the light of nature (*lux naturae*) and right or sound reason (*recta seu sana ratio*).

Polanus presents some axioms of the natural *principium*, most of which are taken primarily from ancient philosophers like Aristotle and Proclus, aligned with medieval modification.⁷⁹ First, every individual science depends upon certain principles, beyond which it is not allowed to move upward because there is no science of infinite inquiries.

⁷⁷ Polanus, *Logicae*, 210. The comprehensive inquiry of logic in relation to theology will be done later in the section 3.4.

⁷⁸ Polanus, *Logicae*, 211: “Principia nobiscum nata, sunt universales regulae, omnibus hominibus ratura ingenitae & notae; quae sunt tam necessariae, cerae & immotae veritatis Experientia universalis, est perpetuus rerum usus, quo omnes sani, rem eandem eodem modo semper se habere experti sunt & cognoverunt...Experientiae universalis gradus sunt quatuor...hoc est: sensus, obervatio, inductio, & experientia.”

⁷⁹ Polanus, *Logicae*, 210: “1. Scientiae singulae nituntur certis principiis, supra quae non liceat ascendere. Quod is liceat, infinita fiet disquisitio, ac propterea nulla futura est scientia: nam infinitorum nulla est scientia. 2. Principia sunt, quae ex se fidem atque auctoritatem habent, quae probationes quibus confirmantur aut demonstrationes non desiderant.... 3. Contra negantes principis non est disputandum. 4. Principia debent esse notiora conclusionibus. 5. Principia gignunt demonstrationes seu Syllogismos apodicticos, hoc est, demonstrativos et necessarios.” Note Johannes Duns Scotus, *Joannis Duns Scoti doctoris subtilis, ordinis minorum opera omnia*, vol. 16 (Paris, 1894), 93-96; Thomas Aquinas, *Expositio libri posteriorum analyticorum* (Textum Leoninum Romae, 1882), II.ii, xiii, xx. For the diverse meanings of *principium* in the sixteenth century, see Johannes Altenstaig, *Lexicon theologicum* (Antwerp: Petrus Bellerus, 1576), 263-264. Here it is notable that, Polanus, being called a rigorous Ramist, accepts the axiomatic method of Aristotle and Proclus, whereas Ramus himself rejects it. See Hermann Schüling, *Die Geschichte der Axiomatischen Methode im 16. und beginnende 17. Jahrhundert* (New York: Georg LOMS Verlag Hildesheim, 1969), 103f.

The second axiom, as quoted from Proclus' criticism on Euclid,⁸⁰ is that *principia* are ἀναπόδεικτα (the unproven) and αὐτόπιστα (the self-authenticating) which have by themselves credibility and authority, thus not requiring any demonstration or approval but just assumption. The third axiom is that there is no disputation, contrary to those who are denying *principia*. The fourth axiom is that the *principia* ought to be more known than the conclusions. The fifth axiom is that the *principia* generate demonstrations or demonstrative and necessary syllogisms. It is remarkable that these axioms, with universal experience as the second natural norm of truth, have their place not just in liberal arts but also in theology.⁸¹

For the theological modification and use of the word ἀρχή or *principium*, Polanus must be aware of patristic examples, notably from Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, and Augustine, and some medieval doctors, using them sometimes without citation. Justin Martyr contrasted Aristotle with Plato in the way that the first principle of all things for Aristotle is God and matter (θεὸν καὶ ὕλην), but for Plato, it is God, matter, and form (εἶδος).⁸² Even though acknowledging that it is quite impossible to learn anything true concerning religion from philosophers,⁸³ Justin asserted that Plato's true knowledge came from Moses, on the ground of Plato's paraphrase of Moses's text that "the first principles

⁸⁰ Polanus, *Logicae*, 210.

⁸¹ Polanus, *Logicae*, 213.

⁸² Justin Martyr, *Cohortatio ad gentiles*, in *PG* 6, vi-ix. Moreover, Justin criticizes the inconsistencies of Plato, who adds the fourth principle, the universal soul (τὴν καθόλου ψυχὴν), to these three principles.

⁸³ Justin Martyr, *Cohortatio ad gentiles*, viii: "Οὐκοῦν ἐπειδήπερ οὐδὲν ἀληθὲς περὶ θεοσεβείας παρὰ τῶν ὑμετέρων διδασκάλων."

of these again God knows, and whosoever among human beings is beloved of Him.”⁸⁴ Justin’s positive reception of philosophy in his theology occurs the same way. Likewise, blaming the pagan philosophers for their ignorance of God, Clement acknowledged the philosophical view of *principium* by identifying the unbeginning God (τὸν ἀναρχον θεόν) as the great first principle (ἀρχοντα), the Maker of all things (τὸν πάντων τοιητῆν), the Creator of all first principles (τῶν ἀρχῶν αὐτῶν δημιουργόν), the first principle of the department of action (ἀρχὴ τοῦ φυσικοῦ τύπου), and reasoning and judgment (τοῦ λογικοῦ καὶ κριτικοῦ).⁸⁵ In addition, he insists that Timaeus’s true opinion, as derived from Deuteronomy 4:4, is that “there is one first principle of all things, unoriginated (ἀγέννητος).”⁸⁶

Augustine’s *De doctrina christiana* (396-426) is like a compendium about *principia* that consists of three parts; *prologus*, *res*, and *signa*. The *De doctrina christiana* is possibly divided into prolegomena, the doctrine of God (*res*), and the doctrine of Scripture (*signa*).⁸⁷ Defining *res* as those things that are never employed as a sign of anything else, Augustine declares that *res* is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, namely, the Triune God, who alone is not only one and the highest thing (*una quaedam summa res*) but also the cause of all things (*rerum omnium causa*) so that all things are from Him, through Him,

⁸⁴ Justin Martyr, *Cohortatio ad gentiles*, xxiv-xxviii: “τὰς δὲ ἔτι τούτων ἀρχὰς ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν ἄνωθεν καὶ ἀνδρῶν ὃς ἂν ἐκεῖν φιλῶσι.” In this regard, Justin also asserted that Plato’s addition of εἶδος as *principium* to God and matter does not come from anywhere else but Moses (οὐκ ἄλλοθεν ποθεν ἀλλὰ παρὰ Μωϋσέως).

⁸⁵ Clement, *Protrepticus*, v; *Stromata*, IV.xxv. Muller reports that it was found in Origen’s *περὶ ἀρχῶν* or *De Principiis* and Jerome’s *Vulgata*. Muller, *PRRD*, I:431. Cf. Justin Martyr, *Cohortatio ad gentiles*, in *PG* 6, iii; Theophilus, *Ad Autolyicum*, in *PG* 6, II.x: “οὗτος λέγεται ἀρχή, ὅτι ἄρχει καὶ κυριεύει πάντων τῶν δι’ αὐτοῦ δεδημιουργημένων.”

⁸⁶ Clement, *Stromata*, V.xiv.

⁸⁷ Augustine, *De doctrina christiana libri quatuor*, in *PL* 34, I.ii.2: “omnis doctrina vel rerum est vel signorum.”

and in Him.⁸⁸ God the Trinity, for him, is the foundation of existence (*principium existentiae*). In a different way from *res*, defining *signum* as that through which *res* are signified,⁸⁹ Augustine divides *signa* into two: the natural one (*alia naturalia*) or nature and the conventional one (*alia data*) or Holy Scripture. Augustine's orderly understanding of *res* and *signa* was followed in the Middle Ages by Peter Lombard, who believed that the doctrine of the holy and indivisible Trinity should be considered first before (*antequam*) the discussion of Scripture or *signa*.⁹⁰ Even so, John Hus began his discussion of theology with the premiss at the beginning (*inceptio*) of his commentary on the *Sentences* that the uncreated Trinity Himself (*Increata Trinitas ipsa*) is the *principium* of all produced things (*productarum*), which are from, through, and in the Trinity; and that Scripture, given to humans by grace alone as the highest wisdom and knowledge, is the perfect teacher or "master."⁹¹

Polanus's approach to *principia* stands in a clear relation to the thought of his Reformed predecessors and contemporaries, especially Calvin, Junius, Lubbertus and Keckermann. Although specific reference to a *principium* is not found in the theological system of Calvin, he believed in Scripture as the rule of faith and our religion (*fidei &*

⁸⁸ Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, I.v.5: "Res igitur, quibus fruendum est, pater et filius et spiritus sanctus eademque trinitas, una quaedam summa res communisque omnibus fruentibus ea, si tamen res et non rerum omnium causa, si tamen et causa ... trinitas haec unus deus, ex quo omnia, per quem omnia, in quo omnia."

⁸⁹ Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, I.ii.2: "res per signa discuntur"; II.i.1: "Signum est enim res praeter speciem, quam ingerit sensibus, aliud aliquid ex se faciens in cogitationem venire."

⁹⁰ Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, in *PL* 192-2, I.i.1-11.

⁹¹ See John Hus, *Super IV. Sententiarum, Mag. Jo. Hus Opera omnia*, tom. II (Osnabrück: Biblio-Verlag, 1966), ii.2-7: "Increata Trinitas, unde, quia ipsa est principium omnium rerum productarum, igitur dico in principio, quod increata Trinitas est Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus unus Deus ... ex quo omnia, per quem omnia, in quo omnia...utrum increata Trinitas sacram scripturam que est sapientia et scientia dignissima, donat solum ex gracia hominibus, ut perpetue sint salvati Scriptura sacra est omnium aliarum scienciarum doctrix optima et magistra." But Polanus does not mention the name of John Hus.

religionis nostrae regula), which should be first (*premièrement, principio*) discussed before all other doctrines.⁹² This assumption is particularly evident in two passages: “a human being is unable to obtain even the minutest portion of right and sound doctrine without being a disciple of Scripture,” and “the first step in true knowledge is taken, when we reverently embrace the testimony which God has been pleased therein to give of himself.”⁹³ Calvin identifies Holy Scripture as the guide and teacher (*duce et magistra*) to draw us near God.⁹⁴ In the spiritual governance (*in spirituale regimen*) of the world, he would not accept any other doctrine than obtained in Scripture without its addition and subtraction.⁹⁵ Thus, it would be more feasible to say that Calvin viewed Scripture as a single *principium* of theology, without excluding his assumption that theology is not possible without the presupposition of God’s existence.⁹⁶

⁹² John Calvin, *Confessio Dei* (CO V, CO XXII), col. 355: “Principio [Premierement], pro fidei et religioni nostrae regula, nos unam scripturam sequi velle profiteamur.”

⁹³ John Calvin, *Institutio christianae religionis 1559* (CO II), I.vi.2: “nec quemquam posse vel minimum gustum rectae sanaeque doctrinae percipere, nisi qui scripturae fuerit discipulus. Unde etiam emergit verae intelligentiae principium, ubi reverenter amplectimur quod de se illic testari Deus voluit.”

⁹⁴ Calvin, *Institutio 1559*, I.vi.

⁹⁵ Calvin, *Confessio Dei*, col. 355: “neque aliam in spirituale regimen, doctrinam amplectimur, quam quae ab eo verbo sumpta fuerit: ita ut nihil addatur, nec detrahatur, quemadmodum docemur Dei interdicto.” Cf. Beza, *Vita Calvini* (CO XXI), cols. 132-133: “igitur ut ad historiam redeamus, simul atque in urbem rediit, memor illius sententiae (Matth. 6.33) quaerendum esse primum regnum Dei ut caetera adiiciantur, nihil habuit antiquius, quam ut ecclesiasticae politiae leges verbo Dei consentaneae senatus consensu perscriberentur...Sed has difficultates vicit Calvinus constantia cum insigni moderatione coniuncta: qui quum ex sacris literis non doctrinae modo verum etiam administrationis ecclesiasticae petendam esse rationem demonstrasset.”

⁹⁶ Hyperius designates the Holy Scripture as the proper and sole (*proprium et solum*) *principium* of theology, without which all teachings of religious doctrine (*omnia dogmata doctrinae religionis*), including the doctrine of God (*de Deo*), and all instruments of true piety (*omne instrumentum verae pietatis*) in this world and of consequent salvation (*consequendae salutis*) in the next world ought not to be produced (*depromi debent*). Cf. Andrea Hyperius, *Methodi theologiae, sive praecipuorum christianae religionis* (Basil: Ioannes, 1567), I, 24-25: “Quando igitur Deus ipse adeo perspicue iubet, non ex pythonibus, ullis ue divinatoribus, non ex oraculis deorum, non ex responsis mortuorum, non denique alia ulla ex re, sed tantum ex suo verbo, sive scriptura sacra, tanquam certissimo principio, cui solo niti tutum sit, omnium rerum theologiarum cognitionem petere: merito sane priusquam de Deo, vel de ecclesia, vel de alio quouis loco theologico disseramus, nonnulla de verbo Dei, eiusque; dignitate exponemus.”

Without any citation of Augustine's *De doctrina christiana* but in accordance with his *De civitate Dei* and the pattern of *res* and *signa*, Junius identified theology as the wisdom of divine things (*sapientia rerum divinarum*),⁹⁷ defining *res* as God, who is the *principium* of all things and their goodness in nature and all things acknowledged by the light of nature.⁹⁸ In the discussion of Scripture, he proclaimed that God the Creator (Father, Son, & Holy Spirit) is the Author of Holy Scripture, which is the divine instrument of sacred and true theology.⁹⁹ For Junius, the proper and highest subject (*proprium summumque subiectum*) of Scripture and theology is God. But he does not provide any clear definition of *principium* and its philosophical or patristic origin, but deals first with the doctrine of Scripture and then that of God. This order of discussion is also followed by Polanus.

Following Aristotle, however, Sibrandus Lubbertus and Keckermann indicate that philosophy requires two foundations or principia in all forms of sciences, namely, an essential and a cognitive principle.¹⁰⁰ In other words, there needs to be a thing or subject

⁹⁷ Franciscus Junius, *De vera theologia*, in *Opuscula theologica selecta*, ed. A. Kuiper (Amsterdam: F. Muller, 1882), i. It is curious why Junius, even though considering *res* and *signa* and their relationship, does not mention Lombard's *Sententiae* or Augustine's *De doctrina christiana*.

⁹⁸ Franciscus Junius, *De vera theologia*, i, xii: "consensus omnium populorum docent: Res; nam & Deus est, & idem principium est omnis boni in rerum natura, & loquitur, & agit Deus. Consensus: nam omnes its esse agnoscunt naturae luce ... infinitum Deus: qui universale principium est, & exemplar, & finis rerum omnium."

⁹⁹ Franciscus Junius, *Theses theologicae*, in *Opuscula*, I.i, II.i (291, 296): "*Scriptura sacra est divinum instrumentum sacrae Theologiae ... Est igitur Scripturae sacrae & verae illium Theologiae autor, vel causa efficiens sua vi atque absoluta, Deus Creator omnium Pater, Filius, & Spiritus sanctus, essentia unus, personae tres in unitate essentiae*"; Cf. Muller, *PRRD*, 3:226-228; Franciscus Gomarus, *Disputationes theologicae*, in *Opera theologica omnia*, vol. 2 (Amsterdam, 1644), II.xii-xiv, xl. According to Gomarus, theology, revealed from God, is the wisdom of God (*sapientia de Deo*) and its efficient cause and fountain (*causa efficiens & fons*) is God (*disputationes*, I.xviii, xix). For him, all the canonical scriptures are the instrumental and unique *principium* of Christian theology (*theologiae christianae principium organicum atque unicum*).

¹⁰⁰ Sibrandus Lubbertus, *De principiis christianorum dogmatum libri VII* (Franecker, 1591), I.i: "Philosophia dicitur principium essendi & cognoscendi"; Keckermann, *Systema s.s. theologiae*, I.ii.

(*res*) to be known and a means of knowing it. *Principium* for Lubbertus is “the cause of all doctrines in Christian religion (*causa omnium dogmatum in christiana religione*)”: it is through principle (*per principium*) that Christian doctrines come into being (*sunt*) and makes known (*cognoscuntur*) as true or false.¹⁰¹ In dispute against Bellarmine’s inclusion of the Apocrypha in the canon of Scripture, he maintains that the orthodox *principium* of Christian doctrines is all the books of the Prophets and Apostles alone (*omnes & solos*) as the certain and stable norm of faith.¹⁰² It is noteworthy that the Reformation spirit of *sola & tota Scriptura* is well reflected in his understanding of *principium*.¹⁰³ In a somewhat different way, Keckermann, dividing the whole system of theology into *principium* and *partes*, distinguishes the *principia* of theology into *res* or constitution and *notitia* or cognition.¹⁰⁴ With the distinction between the essential and the cognitive *principia*, he demonstrates that God is the first and highest principle (*principium primum & summum*), quoting the patristic and medieval testimonies from Augustine and Lombard.¹⁰⁵

In accord, therefore, with his Reformed contemporaries, Polanus confirms that the Word of God or Scripture alone is the supernatural *principium* of truth, ἀναπόδεικτον and αὐτόπιστον, and the unique *principium* of theology and all theological discussions and disputations. All the precepts of physics, philosophy, ethics, economics, and politics that

¹⁰¹ Sibrandus Lubbertus, *De principiis*, I.i.: “Nam propter haec principia, christiana dogmata necessario vera sunt. Cognitionis, Nam propter eadem principia, scimus christiana dogmata vera esse.”

¹⁰² Sibrandus Lubbertus, *De principiis*, I.ii-xiv: “Orthodox vero dicunt omnes & solos propheticos & Apostolicos libros esse principium Christianorum dogmatum, vel esse certain & stabilem regulam fidei.”

¹⁰³ Cf. Muller, *PRRD* I:433.

¹⁰⁴ Keckermann, *Systema s.s. theologiae*, 17: “Principium theologiae Rei sive constitutionis, DEUS vel Notitiae sive cognitionis.” Cf. Lucas Trelocatius, *Scholastica et methodica*, I.i: “Duo enim sunt principia; Rei & Cognitionis. Illa ex quibus alia producuntur; Haec ex quibus aliorum pendet cognitio.”

¹⁰⁵ Keckermann, *Systema s.s. theologiae*, 17. Mastricht designates that the *principium* of theology is Scripture alone as the perfect standard of living to God (*perfecta regula vivendi Deo*). Petrus van Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia* (Amsterdam: Pontano, 1715), I.i.46, I.ii.3.

are established according to the natural norm, thus, ought to be counted as true only if they are harmonized with this supernatural *principium*.¹⁰⁶ Arguably then, although in his *Syntagma theologiae christianae* (1610) Polanus references philosophical definitions of *principium*, this does not entail the subordination of his theology to rationalistic philosophy. He identifies that “the efficient, proximate, and immediate cause (*causa*) of our theology is the Word of God (*Verbum Dei, Dominus dixit* or *Deus dixit*) which is then the *principium* of theology,” implying that every *causa* is a *principium*.¹⁰⁷ The Word of God is unique and simple in substance but double in its mode of revelation: internal and external. The former is the word that God speaks in human beings by the Holy Spirit, or the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit in a human heart (Heb. 8:11), while the latter is the word that God speaks to humans in public proclamation, namely, the external testimony of the same Holy Spirit in Holy Scripture. The internal word in our heart spoken by Holy Spirit and the external word written in divine scriptures are “absolutely one and the same (*prorsus unum & idem*)” in essence. On the one hand, without internal Scripture and superior light, there could be no salvific faith in us, even if we have the external Scripture.¹⁰⁸ On the other hand, provided that “God could not be understood but through Himself (*non potest Deus nisi per Deum intelligi*),” Polanus insists that all the prophets and the apostles call us back together to the *principium* alone that the whole Scripture (*tota Scriptura*) testifies.¹⁰⁹ There cannot

¹⁰⁶ Polanus, *Logicae*, 213.

¹⁰⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 96. Bavinck says that “every *causa* is a *principium* but every *principium* is not a *causa*,” but Polanus did not remark that every *principium* is not a cause. Cf. Herman Bavinck, *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek* I, 210: “alle *causa* is *principium*, maar niet alle *principium* is *causa*.”

¹⁰⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 100: “Ex sola Scriptura externa, separata a Scriptura interna & superiore lumine, nulla in nobis potest esse fides salvifica.”

¹⁰⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 96-97. Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, 531-534. Polanus tried to quote so many ancient fathers as much as he could.

be any conflict or separation but always entire agreement and necessary association between the external Scripture and the internal illustration of the Spirit, because the same God teaches us through both the internal and the external words.¹¹⁰ It is notable that the unity of the two Testaments and of the internal and the external words in essence is grounded in God who is their same author.

Polanus proposes eight axioms of theology and faith that function as an authoritative boundary for any doctrinal discussion and polemic argumentation in his theological enterprise. These axioms concern authority, necessity, authentic edition, translation into vernacular languages, reading, perspicuity, interpretation, and the perfection of Scripture:

The holy Scripture is truly divine; it is the most certain and infallible canon and norm of faith and good works; it is now necessary to us; the Hebrew edition of the Old Testament and the Greek edition of the New Testament alone are authentic; it should be entirely translated into vernacular languages; it should be read by all humans of all classes; it is in itself perspicuous and clear; the genuine sense and use of it must be investigated and adjudicated by itself, or the holy Scripture is its own interpreter; the same Scripture is perfect or contains all doctrines necessary for eternal salvation.¹¹¹

With these axioms or *principia* in mind, Polanus remarks that while “these *principia* ought to be trusted by themselves and at least require assent,” “the malicious consider them in doubt or darken because of the devil’s clever stratagem who is an adversary to God,

¹¹⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 99: “ita in cognitione rerum divinarum semper conjungimus Scripturae facem foris, & illustrationem Spiritus Sancti intus, sic ut Deus & per internum, & per externum verbum nos doceat.”

¹¹¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 102: “Sacram Scripturam esse vere divinam: esse Canonem & regulam certissimam & infallibilem fidei & bonorum operum: esse nunc necessariam nobis: solam Hbraeam editionem veteris Testamenti & Graecam novi esse authenticam: omnino transferendam in linguas vernaculas: esse legendam & cognoscendam ab omnibus omnium ordinum hominibus: esse in se perspicuam & claram: sensum ejus genuinum & usum esse investigandum & dijudicandum ex ipsamet, seu Scripturam Sacram esse interpretem sui ipsius: eandem esse perfectam seu continere omnia dogmata ad salutem aeternam necessaria.”

Scripture, and the church.”¹¹² And he claims, first, that the authority of Scripture as the supernatural *principium* of theology must not be grounded on church in any manner (*nullo modo*) and, second, that the authority even of natural *principium* in philosophical sciences and arts does not depend on any human testimony or authority of any person, even if he is the most ingenious, most acute, and most erudite on earth.¹¹³ The former claim depends on the self-authenticating of Scripture, and the reason for the latter claim is because the true *principium* cannot be known by philosophical assertions but by the stable reason that the *principium* has in itself and that is credible by itself. But, on the one hand, Stapleton complains that “the principles of sciences are in themselves indemonstrable with respect to what things are, but concerning us they may be demonstrated on account of our great dulness, by a demonstration showing the reason for its existence: such is the case of Scripture.”¹¹⁴ On the other hand, Zabarella, in accord with Averroes’s exposition of Aristotle, said that the principles of correct reasoning could not be demonstrated in their own art but made known by themselves or received from a different field of discipline.¹¹⁵

Against both complaints, Polanus endorses the rational argument of Aristotle on cognition of the *principia* of liberal arts: the cognition of principles cannot be produced by any antecedent intellectual cognition but by principles made known by a singular or sensitive induction, and thus the cognition of principles does not concern science but

¹¹² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 102-103.

¹¹³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 207.

¹¹⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 208. Cf. William Whitaker, *Disputatio de sacra scriptura contra huius temporis Roman churchas* (Cantabriga, 1588), 258; Johann Gerhard, *Loci theologici*, vol. 1 (Berolini: Schlawitz, 1863), 28. Their quotations of Stapleton are all slightly different from what he demonstrated. See Thomas Stapleton, *Principiorvm fidei doctrialivm demonstratio methodica* (Basel: Michaelis Sonnius, 1579), 337.

¹¹⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 208; Cf. Jacobus Zabarella, *De methodis*, in *Opera logica* (Strasbourg: Lazarus Zetzner, 1608), 199-201.

intelligence. And then he argues that, if the principles of sciences do not need demonstration, how much more self-authenticating are scriptural *principia* whose certainty is greater than that of philosophical *principia*.¹¹⁶ In this vein, Polanus makes a syllogistic argument: 1) regulation does not receive its authority from what is regulated; 2) Scripture is certainly the regulation of the church; therefore, 3) Scripture does not receive any authority from the church.¹¹⁷ With numerous similar arguments and disputations, he endeavors to confirm that the authority of Scripture as the first supernatural principle of judging all theological doctrines and all philosophical precepts of all other sciences by reason does not require any demonstration of human authorities or testimonies, even of the church, tradition, the church fathers, or right reason. On this issue, notably, Polanus keeps in dialogue with the pious fathers like Ambrose, Augustine, and Chrysostom, and the medieval doctors like Aquinas as supportive of his arguments.¹¹⁸

In short, Polanus acknowledged and used the philosophical origin and conception of the *principium*, obviously taken from the Greek philosophers, and Aristotle in particular, but he also tried to differentiate his theological *principium* from them by articulating the theological content of *principium* based on the concept of the *tota Scriptura* along with the testimonies of the church fathers and the methodological tool of right reason. He also insisted on the supremacy of Scripture as the first principle of theology and faith over all secondary authorities of the church, tradition, the church fathers, and other sciences, still in agreement with the patristic and medieval testimonies. And the eight axioms of scriptural

¹¹⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 209: “Cognitio principiorum non acquiritur ratione, sed est principium rationis. Jam si principia scientiarum demonstratione non egent, tum nec Scripturae Sacrae, quarum major certitudo quam principiorum philosophicorum.”

¹¹⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 210.

¹¹⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 215-227.

supremacy as quoted above are amply reflected and concretely materialized in Polanus's discussion on the relation of Scripture and tradition.

3.3. Scripture and Tradition

Considering the sixteenth-century polemic as the clash between the Reformation principle "*sola scriptura*" and the counter-Reformation principle "*scriptura et traditio*," Oberman makes a delicate distinction of tradition into two: "the instrumental vehicle of Scripture which brings the contents of Holy Scripture to life in a constant dialogue between the doctors of Scripture and the church"; and "the authoritative vehicle of divine truth, embedded in Scripture but overflowing in extrascriptural apostolic tradition handed down through episcopal succession."¹¹⁹ Having this in mind, he proposes that the Reformers and their medieval forerunners did not reject tradition as such but an abuse of tradition, either extrabiblical in truth or ecclesiastical in interpretation, as a source of equal authority to the scriptures. In light of this, Luther's declaration, "Unless I would be convinced by the testimony of scriptures or by evident reason...I cannot recant nor do I want whatever...is neither secure nor integral," should not be understood as his absolute rejection of tradition in itself,¹²⁰ while Augustine's renowned manifesto, "I would not

¹¹⁹ See Heiko A. Oberman, "Scripture and Tradition: Introduction," in *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), 53-66. For the study of the relation between Scripture and tradition in an ecumenical view, see E. Flesseman-van Leer, *Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1955); F. W. Dillistone, ed., *Scripture and Tradition* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1955); R. C. Hanson, *Origen's Doctrine of Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1954); idem, *Tradition in the Early Church* (London: SCM, 1966); Yves Congar, *Tradition and Traditions* (New York: MacMillan, 1967).

¹²⁰ Martin Luther, *Schriften 1520/21*, WA 7, 838b (hereafter WA 7:838b): "Nisi convictus fuero testimoniis scripturarum aut ratione evidente (nam neque Papae neque conciliis solis credo, cum constet eos et errasse sepius et sibiipsis contradixisse), victus sum scripturis a me adductis et capta conscientia in verbis dei, revocare neque possum nec volo quicquam, cum contra conscientiam agere neque tutum neque integrum sit. Ich kan nicht anderst, hie stehe ich, Got helff mir, Amen." In the same vein, Congar argues that Luther

believe in the gospel, unless the authority of the catholic church (*catholicae Ecclesiae auctoritas*) would move me,” is not offering an unqualified authorization of the supremacy of catholic church over Scripture.¹²¹

Oberman’s argument may be applied, with some adjustment, to the case of early Reformed orthodoxy.¹²² The advocacy to the authoritative supremacy of Scripture over tradition and the positive reception of sound tradition by the Protestants, as Muller points out, was “the trademark of a Protestant theology that claimed catholicity for itself.”¹²³ Such is the case in Polanus’s view of the relationship between Scripture and tradition, which I examine in this section in a twofold sense: theological and methodological.

3.3.1. Theological Sense of Tradition

Polanus raises the issue of tradition in at least three places, his *De traditionibus* (1597), his *Sylloge thesium theologiarum* (1597), and his *Syntagma theologiae*.¹²⁴ He starts the discussion of tradition with the etymological definition of its Greek term,

was “completely Catholic” insofar as he strongly held “the absolute primacy of Scripture over all other authority.” See Yves M. J. Congar, *Tradition and Traditions: An Historical and Theological Essay* (New York: MacMillan, 1967), 139-145.

¹²¹ Augustine, *Contra epistolam Manichaei quam docant fundamenti* (PL 42, 176), V.vi: “Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me catholicae Ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas.” This expression is to be seen in his rejection to the identification of Manichaeus as the apostle of Christ and his emphasis on “catholic faith (*fides catholica*)” of the gospel. In this vein, Polanus explained that the true intention of Augustine in his declaration was not to depend the authority of Scripture on that of catholic church or our faith of the gospel on the authority of church, but, after quoting its whole context, that his intention was to demonstrate that the catholic church is much more credible than Manichaeos in the proclamation and designation of the gospel. Amandus Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 193: “Casum ponere ex hypothesi, videlicet quid faceret si nondum crederet, viam hoc pacto monstrans Manichaeis autoritate humana nitentibus, quid ipsi facere debeant, videlicet ut credant potius Catholicae Ecclesiae Euangelium Christi praedicanti & commendanti quam Manichaeo.”

¹²² Cf. Muller, *PRRD*, 1:96-99, 2:51-55, 340-362.

¹²³ Muller, *PRRD*, 2:347.

¹²⁴ Polanus, *De traditionibus* (Basel, 1593), *Sylloge thesivm theologiarvm* (Basel: Conrad Waldkirch, 1597), 146-202, and *Syntagma theologiae*, 791-832.

“παράδοσις,” which means “whatever instruction that is handed down in the church.”¹²⁵

This general concept of tradition covers all the historical developments of the church. It could signify the dogma or Word of God, Scripture, or the actions of the church teaching and delivering it to the posterity.¹²⁶ Then, Polanus made a distinction of tradition into four kinds: 1) doctrine and rite, 2) perpetual and temporary, 3) divine and human, and 4) written and unwritten. First, the tradition of doctrines is the instruction of faith or good works, while the tradition of rite is the instruction of those elements which have been observed and fixed in ecclesiastical ritual. Second, perpetual tradition (e.g., baptism and Lord’s Supper) is that tradition which ought to be observed in the universal church “always, immutably, and necessarily,”¹²⁷ while the temporary tradition (for instance, the apostolic tradition of abstinence from strangled things and blood, Act.15:28-29, 16:4) is a tradition that can be changed according to circumstance and thus whose observation is free and not absolutely necessary. Third, the divine tradition is one which is commanded by God to the church through the prophets and apostles. Finally, the written divine tradition is the prophetic and apostolic Scripture itself, while the unwritten divine tradition is that which was handed down by the living voice but not successively recorded in the sacred writings. The latter kind of divine traditions, changeable for the reason of time, place, and persons, was not contrary to what is written in Holy Scripture. God does not set himself against a tradition preserved either by living voice or in written revelation. Polanus indicated that the

¹²⁵ Polanus, *De traditionibus*.

¹²⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 115: “Enim est aequivocatio seu homonymia in nomine traditionis, quod vel significat actionem Ecclesiae docentis & tradentis in posteritatem, Scripturas quas habemus esse divinas: vel significat dogma seu verbum Dei.”

¹²⁷ Polanus, *De traditionibus*, A2: “Perpetua, est quae semper necessario in universis Ecclesiis immutabiliter observari debet.”

unwritten traditions, though not necessary for salvation, were neither immoderate nor useless (*nec fuerunt immodicae nec inutiles*).¹²⁸ Yet he pointed out that “now there is none of such unwritten apostolic traditions which may be definitely recognized to be handed down by the apostles.”¹²⁹ He further argues that Athanasius’s *Apostolica traditio* and Cyprian’s *Dominica traditio* indicate nothing but those things that were written in Scripture.¹³⁰

In a great portion of his discussion on the tradition, Polanus examines the issue of the unwritten traditions (*traditio non scripta*) in polemic against the provocative arguments of Bellarmine. With a firm belief in Scripture as not just formally but also materially sufficient and necessary, Polanus reformulates and starts the debate between himself and Bellarmine in a disputative pattern. Bellarmine argues that “Scripture without traditions was neither entirely necessary nor sufficient”¹³¹ and that “there must be evidently some true traditions” of extrascriptural kind.¹³² He goes further to claim that Scripture is “not the total but the partial standard of faith (*regulam fidei non totalem sed partialem*)” and the

¹²⁸ Polanus, *De traditionibus*, A3.

¹²⁹ Polanus, *De traditionibus*, A3: “Apostolicae traditiones non scriptae, de quibus certo cognitum sit, quod ab Apostolis sint traditae, nunc nullae sunt.” Also note Polanus, *Logicae*, 309.

¹³⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 793-794. Cf. Athanasius, *Epistola ad Adelphium*, in *PG* 28, cols. 1071-1084; Cyprianus, *Epistola 74 ad Pompeium*, in *PL* 3, cols. 1127-1137.

¹³¹ On the ground that the church and religion of God was conserved from Adam to Moses without Scripture, Bellarmine made a claim of Scripture as unnecessary. But Polanus declared that “the worst impiety is surely to contend that Scripture should not be necessary.” Cf. Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 447, 467; Robert Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei, Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Neapoli: Josephus Giulianus, 1836), 119.

¹³² Polanus, *De traditionibus*, A3; Robert Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei*, 122: “Demonstravimus hactenus, Scripturas sine Traditionibus nec omnino necessarias, nec sufficientes fuisse: nunc quod secundo loco proposui ostendemus, esse videlicet aliquas veras Traditiones.” Polanus proceeded with his polemic against Bellarmine on the basis of *De verbo Dei*, 119-124. In *Syntagma theologiae*, Polanus proceeded with his discussion of tradition from the general to the specific (*à genere ad speciem*) with two particular questions: 1) whether now there may be some unwritten traditions of faith and good works, which are truly divine and apostolic; 2) whether now these may be necessary beyond Scripture Cf. Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 791.

total standard of faith is divided into the two partial standards: Scripture and tradition.¹³³ Appealing to numerous church fathers and medieval doctors, Polanus criticizes Bellarmine for making the “novel, ridiculous, heretic, and absurd affirmation” of two partial *regulas fidei* because his new affirmation was not supported by the tradition of the ancient fathers and universal experience. Bellarmine argues in more detail that, if Scripture does not contain a doctrine specifically indicating that women can be cleansed from the original sin, then Scripture does not contain all things and thus is not sufficient.¹³⁴ In reply, however, Polanus disputes Bellarmine’s assumption, by presenting the scriptural teaching that everybody trusting in the blood of Christ, surely including women, would be cleansed from all sin. Bellarmine brings up another occasion for this claim, namely, that circumcision was instituted as a remedy that the male might be cleansed from original sin but Scripture does not have such a doctrine for the female anywhere in it. For this, on the one hand, Polanus clarifies that circumcision was not the remedy by which men were cleansed from original sin since it is only by the blood and the spirit of Christ, and that circumcision was the sacrament of a remedy by which believers were signified and sealed. On the other hand, he continues, circumcision was a seal of the covenant of grace made by God with the patriarchs of the Old Testament and all of their descendents, which accordingly was not just for the male but also for the female.

¹³³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 276: “Scripturam etsi non est facta praecipue, ut sit regula fidei, esse tamen regulam fidei, non totalem, sed partialem: Totalem enim regulam fidei esse verbum Dei sive revelationem Dei Ecclesiae factam, quae dividatur in duas regulas partiales, Scriptura & traditionem. Quae affirmatio Bellarminiana est nova, redicula, prorsus haeretica, absurda.” Cf. Robert Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei*, 140. Lane identifies Bellarmine’s view as the “supplementary view” that Scripture should be supplemented by tradition in authority. See A. N. S. Lane, “Scripture, Tradition and Church: An Historical Survey,” *Vox Evangelica* 9 (1975): 37-55.

¹³⁴ Polanus, *De traditionibus*, A3.

Bellarmino raises a troubling question: in what other way can we discern from Scripture that the gospels of Mark and Luke are true but those of Thomas and Bartholomaeus are false except the way in which the wiser priests prefer the apostolic writings to the non-apostolic?¹³⁵ In answer, Polanus explains that each book in Scripture does not substantially justify its truths by appealing to human decision or ecclesiastical authority but by three other ways: by themselves (*ipsa*), by wonderful harmony (*admiranda harmonia*) with other scriptural writings, and finally by the dispensation of divine wisdom (*divinae sapientiae dispensatio*) which always leads the church to receive Scripture as securing eternal life.¹³⁶ Without quoting the church fathers or any churchly tradition, moreover, Polanus focused the all-embracing harmony of all doctrines (*παναρμόνια totius doctrinae*) drawn from the whole Scripture to defend the canonicity and divinity of each scriptural writing.¹³⁷

Polanus's polemics against Bellarmine also illustrate his approach to the church fathers. Polanus evidences respect for the statements of the fathers that accord with the teachings of Scripture, an insistence on reading the fathers correctly against what he saw as the often tendentious argumentation of Bellarmine, and a willingness (quite opposed to Bellarmine) to declare the fathers to be in error when either Scripture or historical evidence pointed in another direction. Several examples must suffice.

With the partial testimonies of Clement of Alexandria and Ambrose, Bellarmine endeavors to prove the book of Baruch to be a part of Jeremiah. This effort is also opposed by Polanus who is convinced that, if some church fathers supported Bellarmine's argument,

¹³⁵ Polanus, *De traditionibus*, B2.

¹³⁶ Polanus, *De traditionibus*, B2; idem, *Syntagma theologiae christianae*, 374-376.

¹³⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae christianae*, 285-354, 442.

they must have been infected with human opinion and commit errors and “we should not be constrained at all by the errors of the fathers (*erratis patrum*).”¹³⁸ Among these points, Polanus notes that Baruch does not appear in the Hebrew canon. Similarly, appealing to Augustine’s testimony, Bellarmine makes a similar argument that the books of Maccabees were included in the Canon. Polanus replies in turn with a sarcastic academic admonition that Bellarmine should have read his quotation of Augustine duly in its context, without arbitrarily omitting either its premises for its reasoning or logical consequence (*antecedentia et consequentia*).¹³⁹ Augustine had distinguished between the divine canon of the faith and the “ecclesiastical canon” used for reading the church: he had placed Maccabees in the latter, not in the former. Bellarmine also quotes Cyprian and Augustine without consideration to Scripture, argues that the reprobate are also the members of invisible universal church. In response, Polanus, finding fault with his extra-biblical calling for authority, also indicates Bellarmine’s dogmatized misinterpretation of what the two pious fathers really meant. Cyprian was clearly writing about particular churches, and Augustine clearly meant the visible church.¹⁴⁰

According to Bellarmine, if divine scriptures cannot be understood by themselves, it means that not all truths of doctrine are contained in Scripture. But his assumption is wrong in Polanus’s eyes because Scripture itself and the Holy Spirit speaking in it is “the

¹³⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 385-386.

¹³⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 400: “Bellarminus autem testimonium Augustini truncatum allegavit ne antecedentia & consequentia in illo argumentum pro libris Machabaeorum adductum everterent,” citing *De civitate Dei*, lib. 18, cap. 36.

¹⁴⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3375-3378, citing Cyprian, *Epistolae*, lib. 3 and lib. 4, ep. 2.

optimal interpreter of Scripture (*optimus interpres Scripturae*).”¹⁴¹ Bellarmine had argued that Scripture is unable to be its own interpreter given its ambiguity and perplexity.

Polanus counters that this argument is not universally true, because the ambiguous places in Scripture can be expounded and understood by places which are clearer and simpler.¹⁴²

Another argument of Bellarmine concerns the beginning of the church prior to that of Scripture so that the divinity and authority of Scripture must be known to us by the testimony of the church. Polanus makes, in response, a distinction between the two dimensions of Scripture as the word of God in respect of essence (*secundum essentiam*) and the written word of God according to accident (*secundum accidens*). Thus, in essence Scripture is prior to the church, even though the church, as existing from the beginning of the world, is prior to Scripture in terms of its accidental writtenness.¹⁴³ The authority and divinity of Scripture does not rest on the written form of God’s Word but ultimately to the Word itself. Bellarmine insisted that errors could not be discerned and explained without the help of others like the church or the great ecclesiastics. With an emphasis on the αὐτόπιστον (self-authenticating) of Scripture, Polanus asks a question in return: Who among all the ecclesiastical exegetes of Scripture could be better than the prophets and apostles themselves who spoke and wrote under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit?

¹⁴¹ Polanus, *De traditionibus*, B3: “Assumptio est falsa. Ut enim quisque est optimus interpres suorum verborum: ita etiam Spiritus Sanctus in Scriptura loquens est optimus interpres Scripturae”; idem, *Syntagma theologiae*, 118.

¹⁴² The understanding of Polanus’s assent to the existence of many obscure or complex things in Scripture should be balanced against his emphasis on the clarity and perspicuity of Scripture in itself but not “toward us.” Cf. Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 634: “Quia in Scriptura multa sunt nobis obscura & difficilia intellectu, quae a quovis sine interpretatione non possunt intelligi. Dico NOBIS esse obscura & difficilia intellectu: nam in se clara ac perspicua Scriptura est, ut superiore capite explicatum.”

¹⁴³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 187.

Bellarmino's other claim is that the Lord acted and said many things which were not written in Scripture. Polanus agrees with him at this point but he still confirms that now there does not exist such an unwritten tradition. Appealing to Paul's reference to tradition (παράδοσις, 2 Cor. 11:2), Bellarmine alleges further that there are some unwritten traditions. According to the contention of Polanus, that assertion, even if right, does not still by necessity entail the existence of those unwritten traditions in the present day.¹⁴⁴ These arguments are all fairly standard responses to Roman Catholic polemics, as is the generally syllogistic pattern of Polanus's argument.

On the issue of purgatory, Luther indeed said that "purgatory cannot be proved from the holy Scripture," but "I believe that there is purgatory."¹⁴⁵ Appealing to him against the Protestants, Bellarmine says that, if there is purgatory but this is unable to be approved by Scripture, Scripture does not contain all teachings in it. In reply, Polanus returns a similar argument in a sarcastic manner that, if a "donation" had been made by the great Constantine to the Roman pope but this could not be proved by Scripture, it could be said that Scripture does not embrace all teachings in it. By implication, then, Polanus indicates that the absence of a doctrine from Scripture in no way justifies the doctrine: rather it identifies the doctrine as superfluous! Concerning the appeal of Bellarmine to Luther, Polanus points out that Luther's testimony was exactly quoted but his meaning was distorted by Bellarmine. And he exposes a contradiction Bellarmine brought on himself by

¹⁴⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 116: "Verbum aliquod Dei non scriptum ad Apostolis acceptum & ad posteros transmissum quod traditionis nomine Bellarminus intelligit, nequaquam concedimus."

¹⁴⁵ Martin Luther, *Assertio omnium articuloꝝ*, WA 7:149: "Purgatorium non potest probari ex sacra scriptura Ego tamen et credo purgatorium esse, et consulo suadeoque credendum, sed neminem volo cogi."; Robert Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei*, 122. Cf. Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, epistola, fol.10: "Quod contra Scripturam est, impium: quod praeter Scripturam est, superfluum ac non necessarium merito habetur."

quoting Luther's testimony, with two possible outcomes: 1) if Bellarmine assented to Luther's testimony, it means that Bellarmine proved the falsehood of the other Jesuits who were boastfully defending the existence of purgatory with scriptural testimonies; 2) if Bellarmine opposed it, why did he not certify Luther's thought to be false? In either case, people are not obliged to assent to a belief in purgatory.¹⁴⁶

Still, Polanus' advocacy of the sufficiency and supremacy of Scripture should not be taken to imply a denial of the usefulness of the human, temporary, ecclesiastical, and historical tradition. Human tradition set out by human beings or human decision was divided into two kinds. The first kind is pious and useful (*piae & utiles*) as congruous with the cause of the prophetic and apostolic writings, while the second is impious and useless (*impiae & inutiles*) and is repugnant to scriptural truths. Examples of the latter are the many Roman traditions that are beyond and contrary (*praeter & contra*) to biblical teachings, not prophetic or apostolic, not spiritual or pertaining to soul, not necessary for eternal life, and not obliged or able to be observed by any good conscience.¹⁴⁷ As an unbiblical claim of this tradition, for example, the laity's reading of Scripture was not allowed.

Finally, Polanus propounds, as proven, the "orthodox opinion" that, concerning the things necessary for eternal life, faith and good works, the unwritten traditions are not necessary at all but only the divinely inspired and written scriptures.¹⁴⁸ None of the human and ecclesiastical traditions can be made equal to the divine in authority and supremacy.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁶ Polanus, *De traditionibus*, C2r-v.

¹⁴⁷ Polanus, *De traditionibus*, E3.

¹⁴⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 825.

¹⁴⁹ Polanus, *De traditionibus*, E6.

At this point in the *Syntagma*, moreover, Polanus specifically references the patristic background to his conclusions, as found in his *Symphonia Catholica*.

3.3.2. Methodological Use of Tradition

English and continental Reformed theologians of the early orthodox era appeal to an order of authorities, beginning with Scripture, followed by reason, the church fathers, and experience, as authorities whereby doctrines are regulated. Similarly, Polanus in his *Syntagma* placed the *locus de traditionibus* within the discussion of theological principle (*principium theologiae*), prior to all “parts of Christian theology (*partes theologiae christianae*).”¹⁵⁰

Polanus is convinced that the Holy Scripture is the first truth (*prima veritas*), that is, simply true *per se* and *propter se* without any exception or any condition of consensus with other truths. But at the same time he holds that the Apostles’ Creed, Nicene Creed, other symbols, and the writings of the pious ecclesiastical writers were certainly true, as far as being consentaneous with scriptural truth.¹⁵¹ In this vein, Polanus respects what he identifies as the confident assertion or historical testification of the ancient catholic and orthodox church (*asseverationem seu testificationem historicam catholicam aequae orthodoxae Ecclesiae primitivae*).¹⁵² It is true, he notes, that the universal church is able to

¹⁵⁰ See the *Synopsis totius syntagmatatis* of his *Syntagma theologiae*. It, however, should be noted that the placement of a doctrine does not always determine its function or meaning.

¹⁵¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 154: “Scriptura sacra dicitur prima veritas, tum quia Deus eam primo revelavit Ecclesiae per Prophetas & Apostolos: tum quia vera est simpliciter & sine ulla exceptione & conditione consensus cum latero. Scripturam enim Sacram credimus esse veram per se ac propter se: Symbolum autem Apostolicum, item Nicenum & alia symbola ac scripta Ecclesiastica post Scripturam Prophetica & Apostolica a piis viris exarata, censentur vera, quatenus cum Scriptura Prophetica & Apostolica consentiunt.”

¹⁵² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 180.

err and has sometimes erred. When, however, the catholic or universal church is identified with the elect, Polanus argues that the catholic church cannot err in the specific matter of eternal life when the claim is made with a fourfold restriction (*quadruplici restrictione*) or set of qualifiers.¹⁵³ First, the catholic church hears the voice of its shepherd in Scripture. Second, the catholic church can neither misdirect in matters absolutely necessary for salvation nor commit a fundamental error because of Christ's promise that he will "establish [his] church on this invincible rock of truth." Polanus here drew on a typical Protestant exegesis of Matthew 16:18, according to which the "rock" on which Christ builds his church is not the man Peter but the truth of Peter's confession.¹⁵⁴ Third, the catholic church cannot make a mistake on necessary matters linked with salvation because God always protects the witness and herald of His truth. Fourth, the catholic church cannot collapse in an ultimate sense, because it cannot persistently stand in a fatal error till the end of the world. What is more, it is on the ground of Scripture that the orthodox fathers proposed, illustrated, and proved the doctrines of faith and good works.¹⁵⁵

While maintaining that the true unwritten apostolic traditions are very few (*multo minus*), Polanus acknowledges that "there are certain words or acts of Christ or apostles written down by the fathers," not directly attested in Scripture, "but yet which are comprehended by common reason in the holy writings."¹⁵⁶ In the the first chapter of *Symphonia catholica*, for instance, Polanus indicated that some ancient orthodox fathers,

¹⁵³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 229-230.

¹⁵⁴ Cf., Johannes Piscator *Analysis logica evangelii secundum Mattheum, una cum scholiis et observationibus locorum doctrinae* (London: R. F. for B. Norton, 1594), "Matt. 16:18," 247, 251.

¹⁵⁵ The discussion of the catholic church with a series of patristic testimonies in more detail will be provided later in the fifth and sixth chapters.

¹⁵⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 817-819: "Concedimus singularia quaedam dicta aut facta Christi vel Apostolorum a Patribus notari, sed quae tamen ratione communi in Sacris literis comprehensa sunt."

such as Dionysius, Origen, and Basil, had rightly and authoritatively witnessed some important issues, such as the orderly and pastoral administration of the church, the external mode and order of ecclesiastical rites, the proper church disciplines, the ecclesiastical agendas, and the relinquishment and adjustment of church to the judgment of dedicated pastors.¹⁵⁷ They provided a good understanding of scriptural truth obtained, properly using the analogy of faith, and such understanding that is consentaneous and conformable with the divine scriptures. For this reason, Polanus, though being convinced that “Scripture is to be interpreted duly by Scripture,” encourages people to attribute to “the writings of the orthodox fathers” the honor that is properly their due.¹⁵⁸

This approach represents Polanus’s attempt to keep the proper authority of the church fathers and their human limitations in balance. This is summarized well in his answer to the question of the reason for his exhaustive study and extensive use of the church fathers, in the preface to his commentary on Hosea, *Analysis libri Hoseae prophetae* (1601). Polanus clearly states that he does not understand the church fathers as a foundational source of doctrine or *principium* (which would conflict with his understanding of Scripture as *principium cognoscendi*) or as a judges (*judices*) of the truth of a doctrine. Rather they are witnesses (*testes*) to the teaching and interpretation of Scripture to whose ancient testimony Polanus’s readers ought to listen, even when they are

¹⁵⁷ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica seu consensus catholicus* (Basel: Conrad Waldkirch, 1607), I.i; *Syntagma theologiae*, 825.

¹⁵⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 830: “Patrum orthodoxorum scriptis tribuimus quantum par est & quantum ipsi voluerunt. Etsi enim Scripturam ex Scriptura interpretandam merito censeamus: tamen ut infirmitati hominum communi hac quoque in re succurratur; non repudiamus Patrum expositiones & sententias, sed quascunq; habent analogiae fidei consentaneas & Scripturis divinis conformes acceptamus, gratias agentes Deo pro laboribus utilissimis quibus Patres Ecclesiae Christi profuerunt.”

less than willing to hear Polanus's own words.¹⁵⁹ He also acknowledges the famous threefold criterion of the Vincentian canon, that is, universality, antiquity, and unanimity of Christian catholic faith but, unlike the Roman Church, with his invincible conviction of Scripture as perfect, satisfactory, and sufficient to all.¹⁶⁰ In this context, Polanus made an extensive use of the ancient, catholic, orthodox fathers in every genre of his writings – philosophical, exegetical, patristic, and dogmatic – as the twofold witness, not only for establishing and verifying the *symphonia catholica* of the Reformed church with the ancient catholic orthodox church, but also more thoroughly for refuting the argumentation of the Roman Catholic apologists.

With regard to his use of patristic literature, it therefore needs to be recognized that Polanus, though advocating a principle of *sola scriptura*, did not merely put the fathers at the service of religious controversy but also, contrary to Polman's argument, at the service of developing Reformed theology.¹⁶¹

By way of summary and conclusion: there are some methodological guidelines according to which Polanus uses tradition or the church fathers in his doctrinal discussions in the *Syntagma*. A close look at these guidelines would lead us to see how significant the

¹⁵⁹ Polanus, *Analysis libri Hoseae prophetae*, praefatio, 4: "Patres allego, non tanquam principium probandi dogmataee Ecclesiae, nec tanquam iudices; sed ut testes duntaxat consensus in doctrinae & interpretatione Scripturarum, ut si ex meis verbis quod sentio et dico quispiam non assequatur, ex patrum verbis intelligat, patrum, inquam, non quorumvis et obscurorum, sed vetustissimorum et laudatissimorum, cuiusmodi aliquot allegavi." Cf. Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 396-397, 435, 440, 831.

¹⁶⁰ See Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, epistola, fols.9-10; idem, *Syntagma theologiae*, 277; Vincent of Lerins, *Commonitorium* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915), II.iii: "In ipsa item catholica ecclesia magnopere curandam est ut id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est; hoc est etenim vere proprieque catholicum quod ipsa uis nominis ratioque declarat quae omnia fere uniuersaltier comprehendit. Sed hoc ita demum fiet si sequamur uniuersitatem antiquitatem consensionem." Even though, for this reason, there are vastly more references made to the church fathers in his writings than to the medieval scholastics, Polanus's acknowledgement of the Vincentian canon must not be uncritically taken to indicate that he ignored the medieval doctors. Cf. Idem, *Syntagma theologiae*, 275-276.

¹⁶¹ Pontien Polman, *L'élément historique*, 539-543. This is shown more evidentially in the fifth and sixth chapters.

use of the patristic sources and thought is in Polanus's formulation of theological doctrine and dogmatic system. First, it is implied in his use of the church fathers that they are both inferior and posterior to the absolute authority of Scripture. Second, the church fathers are not a *principium* or judges of a theological doctrine but its witnesses. Third, the appeal to the church fathers is not intended to authorize or judge but testify to the divinity of Scripture, especially its sufficiency and necessity. Fourth, the fathers, as human beings, are not only *able* to make but *have* also made some mistakes so that we should be selective or eclectic, following the Vincentian canon of universality and antiquity and consensus, to receive the better orthodox church fathers whose thought and writings provide and retain more of the scriptural truths. Fifth, the affirmation of the ancient authors regarding what was done certainly in their time is more credible (*magis credendum*) than its negation by the recent authors.¹⁶² Sixth, we should not impose our theology on patristic materials but show respect for their contextual meaning as originally intended by the fathers.

Following these guidelines, Polanus uses patristic thought as an important part of his theological method in his balanced knowledge of their usefulness and limits. This is seen in the way in which Polanus formulates each doctrine, including the *rational* invention or product of theological theme from Scripture, the patristic witnesses for defending invented theses and refuting their antitheses the Roman Catholics provoked, in accompaniment with the numerous enthymemes, syllogisms, or pro-syllogisms and then the orderly and methodical arrangement of the witnessed theses in the theological system with the aid of the blended *Aristotelico-Ramaeum* method. The appeal to the witness or authority of

¹⁶² In this vein, Polanus criticizes Bellarmine for rejecting that Liberius was infected by the Arian blunder, even though it was witnessed by Athanasius, Jerome, Damasus, Platina, and Fasciculus at that time. Amandus Polanus, *Logicae*, 127-128.

patristic thought and sources, following the biblical foundation of each doctrinal thesis, is observed in each chapter of Polanus's *Syntagma theologiae christianae*.

3.4. Theology and Philosophy

As scholarship has long recognized, medieval theologians argued the case for a necessary relationship between faith and reason in theology, often identifying reason and also philosophy as a handmaid or *ancilla* in theological discourse. This traditional balance between theology and philosophy, or faith and reason, as recent studies have demonstrated,¹⁶³ was also received by the Reformation and orthodox theology. However, the reception was not merely a reproduction of the medieval way but was made with some modification and development in theological method by both the Reformers and the Reformed orthodox suitable for their altered environment of religion. This phenomenon of methodologically modified reception to which many Reformed orthodox testify is called a “philosophical eclecticism,” in which whatever was useful for the clear understanding and organized presentation of Christian truth was employed by the Reformed orthodox in their theological formulation and application.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶³ See Richard A. Muller, “Vera Philosophia cum sacra Theologia nusquam pugnat: Keckermann on Philosophy, Theology, and the Problem of Double Truth,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 15/3 (Autumn, 1984): 341-365; idem, *PRRD* III:360-404; Sebastian Rehnman, *Divine Discourse: The Theological Methodology of John Owen* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2002), 109-128; Jeffrey Mallinson, *Faith, Reason, and Revelation in Theodore Beza, 1519-1605* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2003); Stephen Grabill, *Rediscovering the Natural Law in Reformed Theological Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006); Carl R. Trueman, “Reason and Rhetoric: Stephen Charnock on the Existence of God,” in *Reason, Faith and History: Philosophical Essays for Paul Helm*, ed. Martin Stone (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008), 29-46; Adriaan C. Neele, *Petrus van Mastricht (1630-1706), Reformed Orthodoxy: Method and Piety* (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

¹⁶⁴ Muller, *PRRD* I:367-382.

Polanus's view of the relationship between theology and philosophy, or faith and reason, provides evidence of the progressive appreciation of the traditional balance, coupled with philosophical eclecticism typical of early orthodoxy. The use of philosophy in Polanus's theological work is not, generally, for the sake of generating any specific theological or philosophical content but rather for the sake of procuring a method or tool most suitable for doing theology in his time. Polanus's attitude toward the use of philosophy, especially logic, is indebted to the thought of the church fathers, especially Augustine, as well as to the medieval tradition.

Unfortunately, Polanus did not treat such an important subject of the relationship between theology and philosophy as an independent disputational thesis or doctrine. For this reason, we need to collect and analyze portions of his thought on the issue scattered in his writings, among which *Logicae libri duo* (1599), *Syntagma logicum Aristotelico-Rameum* (1605), and *Syntagma theologiae christianae* (1610) are most useful for our discussion. Given that Polanus asserts there is nothing more important and noble than logic in philosophy and we need to consider logic in the highest place (*summo loco*) among all sciences,¹⁶⁵ it is important briefly to examine the relationship of theology and philosophy in Polanus, with a focus on theology and logic.

Polanus was a theologian who, showing a tendency to emphasize the supremacy of Scripture over reason in authority, nevertheless sought after "a harmony and consensus between the natural and supernatural manifestations of God (*harmonia & consensus inter*

¹⁶⁵ Polanus, *Logicae*, epistola, ii. It is of interest that Polanus does not write other philosophical works than *Logicae* and *Syntagma logicum Aristotelico-Rameum* (1605). This shows Polanus's long-standing concern of logic.

patefactiones Dei naturales & supernaturales)." ¹⁶⁶ "Whatever is congruous with this norm [harmony of reason and Scripture]," he says, "is true either in theology, in philosophy, or in any other discipline."¹⁶⁷ Like the other Reformed orthodox, he does not assume that there is a double truth, that is, what is theologically true can be philosophically false.¹⁶⁸ Philosophy, or even all sciences, and theology, properly understood, have no substantial conflict with each other despite their different methods and subjects.

With biblical and patristic testimonies, Polanus describes that philosophy or logic is the product of reason given to human beings by God in creation. As the logical faculty of humans, reason remains constant in its nature and exercise when philosophical disciplines, theology, jurisprudence, and medicine are expounded by it.¹⁶⁹ His theological discussion of human reason in the *Syntagma theologiae christianae* begins by characterizing the intellectual or rational power of a human being as the supreme faculty of the human soul according to which humans are properly human and by which they are distinguished from animals (Rom. 7:25, 12:1, Heb. 4:13).¹⁷⁰ Right reason (*recta ratio*) and the conscience are inserted into the human intellect by God. The interesting point Polanus makes here, quoting Cyril, is that the author of human reason, although the Triune God in general, is

¹⁶⁶ Polanus, *Logicae*, 213. In dispute against the insistence that God is the author of sin, for example, Polanus appeals to both Scripture and proper reason. Cf. Amandus Polanus, *Logicae*, 214, 254.

¹⁶⁷ Polanus, *Logicae*, 213-214: "Quicquid igitur cum hac norma congruit, verum est, sive in Theologia, sive in Philosophia, sive in quacunq[ue] alia disciplina."

¹⁶⁸ Polanus, *Logicae*, 252-253: "Non enim duplex est veritas, ut nempe in Philosophia verum sit quod in Theologia est salsum. Sed verum non nisi unicum est, sive a Philosopho, sive a Theologo dicatur." Cf. Muller, "Vera Philosophia cum sacra Theologia nusquam pugnat: Keckermann on Philosophy, Theology, and the Problem of Double Truth," 341-365.

¹⁶⁹ Polanus, *Logicae*, 310.

¹⁷⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 2103.

specifically the λόγος, or Son of God.¹⁷¹ With appeal to Melanchthon, he identifies natural principles, namely, knowledge (*notitia*) and divine wisdom (*sapientia divina*) inserted by God into the depth of human mind, as the form and norm of human reason, principles which are the witnesses of God and His will, which distinguish humans from the beasts, and which “direct valuable arts, sciences, and disciplines, of which the use is necessary in life.”¹⁷²

The natural principles are divided into *theoria* and *praxis*, and the former is the source of precepts in arts and sciences towards the cognition of things, while the latter regulates morals and duties of humans by discerning justice and injustice, honesty and dishonesty, and equality and inequality. *Theoria* and *praxis* combine our wills and actions with the will of God. The witness of these natural principles is found everywhere (*passim*), even in the writings of pagan philosophers, like Homer, Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, Hesiod, Phocylides, and Theognis.¹⁷³ Polanus states that God’s glory is the ultimate goal of proper reason in humans, which these philosophers may not know. The use of proper reason is not just in terms of human matters but also in terms of divine things. At this point, Polanus argues that the abuse (*abusus*) of right reason must fight even with reason itself but faith in the truths of revelation has no conflict with reason but is above and beyond reason (*super*

¹⁷¹ Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarius in Ioannis evangelium, Opera*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1872), I.vii (81); Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 2103: “Auctor rectae rationis in mente hominis, est λόγος ille eaternus, id est, Filius Dei, ut testatur *Johannes Evangelista* cap. I. vers. 9.”

¹⁷² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 2104: “Forma ac norma ejus sunt principia naturalia, quae sunt, definitore Philippo Melanchthone, notitiae a Deo naturae mentis humanae insitae, veluti radii lucis & sapientiae divinae, ut sint testimonia de Deo & ejus voluntate, & discernant nos a bestiis, & regant vitam & gignant honestas artes, scientias ac disciplinas, quarum usus in vita necessarius est.” Cf. Philip Melanchthon, *Enarrationes aliquot librorum ethicorum Aristotelis, Opera quae supersunt omnia*, vol.16 (C. A. Schwetschke et filium, 1850), 384: “Principia practica sunt notitiae a Deo mentibus insitae, ut monstraent obdientiam Deo debitam, et discrimen honestorum et turprium, et regant mores.”

¹⁷³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 2104.

and praeter rationem). Both are divine gifts and God's gifts do not oppose each other.¹⁷⁴

But depraved and corrupt reason should be distinct from right reason, which Polanus considers as the helmsman for directing every art and science.

Quoting Plato and Cicero, on the one hand, he defines logic as the noblest and most perfect of every art working the greatest number of things, and as exceptional (*eximium quoddam*) among the most gleaming gifts of God, who is the highest Artist of all things (*summi rerum omnium artificis Dei praeclarissima dona*) that grant immeasurable benefits to human beings.¹⁷⁵ The understanding of God as the fountain of all arts and sciences enables Polanus to further clarify this logic as a light (*lumen*) with which God illuminates our intellect to discover benefits in rational nature (*in natura rationali*), “invent arguments, dispose the invented, propose the disposed, and judge the proposed acutely and accurately.”¹⁷⁶ For this “divine and noble benefit,” logic must be necessary for all other sciences, any of which could not be founded rightly and fruitfully without it. Thus, Polanus assumes the supremacy of logic over all other arts.

On the other hand, Polanus makes an intimate connection between logic and the study of Holy Scripture, appealing to the authority of Augustine and Jerome, who coincided in their view of logic as a methodological tool for penetrating and dissolving all kinds of difficult questions in Scripture.¹⁷⁷ Logic, says Polanus, clearly teaches *how* to

¹⁷⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 2105.

¹⁷⁵ Polanus, *Logicae*, epi.a.2. Polanus pays special attention to Cicero's understanding of reason and logic as a virtue on the ground of that benefit “without which anybody may be seduced from truth into error (sine hac arte quemvis arbitrantur a vero abduci fallique posse).” Cf. Cicero, *De finibus bonorum et malorum* (London: William Heinemann, 1914), III.xxi.72.

¹⁷⁶ Polanus, *Logicae*, fol.3.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, II.xxxi.48; Jerome, *Commentarium in Ezechielem prophetam*, in *PL* 25, 236.

propose themes from Scripture, explain whatever is proposed in it, shed light on what is obscure in it, demonstrate what is dubious of it, confirm what is true in it, and confute what is false about it.¹⁷⁸ Logic, nevertheless, is not taken by Polanus as the position or content of any specific philosophical tradition but as an excellent tool for theological work. This methodological nature of logic is reflected even in his definition of logic as “the art of well *using* by reason (*ars ratione bene utendi*).”¹⁷⁹ This definition should be affected by Augustine’s methodological conceptualization of logic as teaching *how* to teach and *how* to learn.¹⁸⁰ As proved by the patristic testimonies, thus, the use of logic should not be seen as a token of Polanus’ departure from the biblical and humanist character of Reformation theology or his firm association with scholastic rationalism; its instrumental feature was as a method or tool.

Polanus goes further to assert the divine origin of logic and its multi-faceted usefulness as follows.

Thus, it is reasonable to estimate the dignity of logic from its author, necessity from its end, and utility from its advantages. Its author is the God of all praiseworthy good, the source of things, and the constructor and governor of the whole world. All parts of study reveal purpose, any of which you would not be able to overlook with the use of logic. So many writings of the most erudite, so many orations, and so many sermons delivered to the people of all time demonstrate the usefulness of logic.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁸ Polanus, *Logicae*, epistola, fol.6: “Logica docet thema quodvis explicare, obscura declarare, dubia demonstrare, vera confirmare, falsa confutare.”

¹⁷⁹ Polanus, *Logicae*, 1. Faulenbach and Deal did not probably pay sufficient attention to Polanus’s tendency of keeping the methodological nature of logic in mind so that they claimed a rationalistic tendency in his theology.

¹⁸⁰ Polanus, *Logicae*, 1-2; Augustine, *De ordine*, in *PL* 32, II.xiii.

¹⁸¹ Polanus, *Logicae*, epistola, fol.7: “Logicae dignitatem ex auctore; necessitatem ex fine; utilitatem ex commodis licet aestimare. Auctor ejus est bonorum omnium laudandarumque; rerum fons, totius ille mundi molitor et moderator Deus. Finem omnes studiorum partes ostendunt, quarum nulla Logicae usu potest carere.

With Augustine, moreover, Polanus identifies logic as “the science of truth and pertaining to all wisdom (*scientiam veritatis et ad omnem sapientiam pertinere*)” and thereby focuses the inseparability of logic from theology defined as “the wisdom of divine things.”¹⁸² For this reason, he asserts that both “in theology and philosophy the authority of any human being ought not to be paid attention to but the truth alone [based on the scriptural revelation] should be assumed.”¹⁸³ This theology-logic connection is also enunciated in his gradation of value in which wisdom is most precious in *intellectus*, which is most gleaming in reason, which is most exquisite in soul, which is most outstanding in a human being, who is most excellent in the whole of this visible world.¹⁸⁴ At the summit of his value system lies Christian theology, the most outstanding and noblest wisdom of divine things, *the* wisdom whose source and author is God Himself. Thus, it is not strange or unreasonable to Polanus that logic, produced by reason and closely associated with matters of wisdom, is employed in theology, especially in formulating doctrines and theological system.

Within the boundary drawn by the scriptural testimonies, for example, Polanus exerts the logical argumentation of human reason to prove his assumption of theology as

Utilitatem tot eruditissimorum hominum scripta, tot orationes, tot conciones ad populum omnibus temporibus habitae demonstrent.”

¹⁸² Augustine, *Contra Academicos libri tres*, in *PL* 32, III.xiii.29: “perfecta dialectica ipsa scientia veritatis est”; Polanus, *Logicae*, praefacio, fol.4; idem, *Syntagma theologiae*, I.ii. Polanus goes on to say that Augustine even called logic wisdom itself. But Augustine did not quite say that but rather that “philosophy is not called wisdom itself but the study of wisdom (*philosophia non ipsa sapientia sed studium sapientiae vocatur*).” See Augustine, *Contra Academicos*, III.ix.20.

¹⁸³ Polanus, *Logicae*, 125: “Nam in Theologia, & in Philosophia, nullius hominis auctoritas attendi, sed SOLA VAERITAS proposita esse bedet.”

¹⁸⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, epistola, fol.1.

sapientia.¹⁸⁵ He begins with an attempt of syllogistic universal proof: 1) to know the most profound cause of the whole world is the most special wisdom; 2) our theology is the cognition of God as the highest cause of the whole world; 3) our theology is thus *sapientia*. In this syllogistic way, Polanus uses other theological ratiocinations of right reason. The second proof of “our theology” as *sapientia* is that the discipline operating in the most difficult things and most remote from human sense is truly wisdom, the unique sort of which is our theology. The third proof relates to the sapiential theology linked with Aristotle’s five intellectual virtues: theology includes in itself all properties of intelligence, science, art, and prudence together from nature and beyond nature (*ex natura & supra naturam*), explicitly in the most excellent mode, so that it is the most certain index of *principia*, the most extensive precepts of all theoretical and practical sciences and all rational activities, and therefore theology must be the greatest wisdom.¹⁸⁶

Logic, “an art of using well by reason” all things with all wisdom, is regarded as a most serviceable gift of divine origin, deals with the knowledge of truth, and engages even in the wisdom of divine things. Polanus, thus, widely uses this logic, generally along with syllogism, in his discussions of almost every doctrinal issue as shown in the *Syntagma theologiae*. His goal of such an extensive use of logic in inventing, arranging, using, and defending true precepts is to glorify the immortal God and provide the benefit to the church of Christ.¹⁸⁷ It is in this vein that Polanus’ philosophical work, *Logicae*, is filled

¹⁸⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 83-85.

¹⁸⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 83: “Theologia omnes omnino proprietates intelligentiae, scientiae, artis, prudentiae, ex natura & supra naturam, modo plane excellentissimo in sese complectitur, velut certissima principiorum index, amplissima scientiarum omnium theoreticarum & practicarum princeps, & omnium actionum rationumque accuratissima arbitra, omni exceptione major.”

¹⁸⁷ Polanus, *Logicae*, epistola, fols.7-8.

with a number of biblical texts and theological matters which provide examples to testify to each logical theory and axiom.

As seen most evidently in his commentary on Hosea, Polanus followed a Ramist method of “logical and theological analysis (*logica & theologica analysis*),” dealing with each verse in the duplex exposition of *analysis* and *usus*. The compendium of his early dogmatics, *Partitiones theologiae*, is also structured by the laws of natural method (*naturalis methodi leges*) with the repetitive use of bifurcation. His patristic dogmatic work, *Symphonia catholica*, is also written and constituted with a distinction between synopsis and *loci communes*, each locus consisting in numerous pairs of doctrinal theses of the Reformed church and the consensus of the church fathers. What is more, his *Syntagma theologiae christianae* is a more harmoniously developed system of *loci communes* and is framed very systematically “on a par with the laws of methodical order (*iuxta leges ordinis methodici*).” Each doctrinal discussion in the *Syntagma* proceeds from theses and arguments with the support of Scripture and the church fathers, through counter-theses and counter-arguments of his theological opponents (primarily Bellarmine) and his rejection of them also with biblical and patristic testimonies, then finally to the *orthodox* conclusions of the Reformed church. All *loci* are combined and harmonized in an organic nexus in which each locus has the logical, but not causal, relationship with other *loci*. His exposition and disproof of the opponent’s theses and arguments are also coupled with the logical dispute of numerous enthymemes or syllogisms. Similarly, the compendium of his theology, *Partitiones theologiae*, is also structured Ramistically following laws or rules of natural method (*naturalis methodi leges*) and with the typically Ramist repetitive use of bifurcation.

The positive conceptualization and extensive use of logic in theology by Polanus, however, should not be understood to mean that logic lead him to allow as Deal has claimed that “the formal demands of logic strive to become a separate noetic principle” of theology or that it enticed him to explicate God’s nature and work “from the speculative axioms of Perfect Being” rather than from the revealed testimony of the divine scriptures.¹⁸⁸ The definition of God as the philosophical term “*summum bonum*” by Polanus, for instance, does not demonstrate adherence to a specific philosophical tradition or the subjection of divine truth to the human philosophy but rather his positive, selective, and critical manner of using philosophy in theology. In the discussion of God as *summum bonum*, it is true that he introduces ideas and language of Plato and Aristotle, but not without filtering off their theological inadequacies by using biblical principles.¹⁸⁹ Plato, first of all, distinguishes general good from the idea of good (ἡ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἰδέα),¹⁹⁰ or the greatest of superiorities (τῷ μεγίστῳ ἂν προέχουσιν) of good, which is considered as “the cause (αἰτία) for all things of all that is right and beautiful, giving birth in the visible world to light, and the author (κύριον) of light and itself in the intelligible world being the authentic source of truth and reason, and that anyone who is to act wisely in private or

¹⁸⁸ Deal, “Meaning and Method of Systematic Theology in Amandus Polanus,” 52.

¹⁸⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, I.v.

¹⁹⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, I.v. Paul Shorey asserts that “The idea of God was taken by Plato from the religion of the Greek people and purified by criticism One sentence I admit seems to identify the idea of good with God ... [but] there are other sentences in this part of the *Republic* which, if pressed, are irreconcilable with the identification of the idea of good with God.” Paul Shorey, “Introduction,” in *The Republic* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935), ix-xxx. However, Aquinas claims that Plato called “God the absolute good, from whom all things are called good by way of participation (*summum Deum, a quo omnia dicuntur bona per modum participationis*).” Aquinas, *Summa*, I.vi.4 In the Stoic definition of φύσις, I. G. Kidd asserts that “a man will never make sufficient progress until he has conceived a right idea of God. This is ... what they mean by their common definition of the End for Man, ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει ζῆν.” I. G. Kidd, “The Relation of Stoic Intermediates to the *Summum Bonum*, with Reference to Change in the Stoa,” *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series 5-3/4 (July-October, 1955): 181-194.

public must have caught sight of this.”¹⁹¹ Unlike him, Aristotle identifies the good with “that at which all things aim (τὰγαθὸν οὐ πάντ’ ἐφίεται),”¹⁹² not distinguishing the good into the ideal and the general,¹⁹³ but in a different mode into “things good in themselves (τὰ καθ’ αὐτά)” and “things good as a means to them (θάτερα διὰ ταῦτα).”¹⁹⁴ With the view of the highest good and human happiness (εὐδαιμονία ἀνθρωπίνη) as identical, Aristotle gives a more detailed description of happiness as “a certain activity of soul in conformity with perfect excellence (ψυχῆς ἐνέργειά τις κατ’ ἀρετὴν τελείαν).”¹⁹⁵ Even though he labored to find the greatest source of happiness in the activity of god (ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνέργεια), he eventually linked the *summum bonum* with something human.¹⁹⁶

Having this philosophical view of the good in mind, Polanus indicates a main difference between the theological and the philosophical views, by saying that “to philosophers *summum bonum* and beatitude are one and the same, but theology

¹⁹¹ Plato, *The Republic* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935), IV.i.B, VII.iii.B-C: “πᾶσι πάντων αὐτῆ ὀρθῶν τε καὶ καλῶν αἰτία, ἐν τε ὀρατῶ φῶς καὶ τὸν τοῦτου φκῦριον τεκοῦσα, ἐν τε νοητῶ αὐτῆ κύρια ἀλήθειαν καὶ νοῦν παρασχομένη, καὶ ὅτι δεῖ ταῦτη νὶ δεῖν τὸν μέλλοντα ἐμφρόνως πράξειν ἢ ἰδίᾳ ἢ δημοσίᾳ.”

¹⁹² Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926), I.i-ii. Thomas Aquinas accepts Aristotle’s concept that “goodness is what all desire (*bonum est quod omnia appetunt*).” Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, in *Corpus Thomisticum* (Roma, 1888), I.v.1.

¹⁹³ Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, I.vi.5. Rather, Aristotle emphasizes the correspondence (συστοιχία) of the ideal good and good as a more probable doctrine according to the Pythagoreans. Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, VII.i.2. As Aquinas rightly indicates, Aristotle also agrees that “there is the first thing which is essentially being and essentially good” in a way that “the virtue of God is something more exalted than virtue (οὕτως οὐδὲ θεοῦ, ἀλλ’ ἢ μὲν τιμιώτερον ἀρετῆς).” Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I.vi.4: “*quod est aliquod unum per essentiam suam bonum.*”

¹⁹⁴ Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, I.vi.9. In a similar way, Anselm distinguishes that which is good through itself (*quod per se est bonum*) from that which is good through something else (*quod per aliud est bonum*). Moreover, he calls the former good as the *summum bonum*. Anselm, *Monologium*, in *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* vol. 158 (Paris, 1853), i.

¹⁹⁵ Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, I.xiii.1-6.

¹⁹⁶ Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, X.viii.7.

distinguishes them as two.”¹⁹⁷ He claims and shows that the distinction of *summum bonum* and *beatitudo* is confirmed either by the testimonies of Scripture or by logical arguments drawn out of it. With regard to the philosophical view, Polanus criticizes Aristotle for taking human *summum bonum* and human beatitude as identical, and prefers Plato’s view of *summum bonum* but he reconditions it by grounding *summum bonum* in the biblical text, especially Genesis 15:1 and Psalm 73:15.¹⁹⁸ Thus, Polanus does not espouse or reject the totality of a specific philosophical tradition like Platonism or Aristotelianism but employs philosophy for formulating theological doctrine and a system in a critical and selective way. The philosophical term *summum bonum* was chosen and modified as a methodological vehicle through which a theological content contained in revelation is delivered as fully and clearly as possible.

Another example concerns Polanus’s use of Aristotelian-Ramist, or semi-Ramist, logic as a methodological tool for shaping the structure of his theology. Armed with Nygren’s view of axiomatic argumentation,¹⁹⁹ Deal asserts that “the Ramist method gives Polanus a framework for orderly thinking which is consistent with the biblical material as he understands it” and also that “the analytic character of Ramist logic carries the stern

¹⁹⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 15: “Philosophis Summum bonum & Beatitudo sunt unum & idem: sed Theologia haec duo distinguit.”

¹⁹⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 15: idem, *Exegesis analytica illustrium aliquot vaticiniorum Veteris Testamenti de Incarnatione, Passione, Morte et Refurrectione Domini nostri Jesu Christi* (Basel, 1608): “Plato proprius ad veritatem accessit, statuens summum bonum esse Deum Aristoteli summum hominis bonum fuit beatitudo hominis Nos Christiani summum hominis bonum a beatitudine ejus distinguimus, Summum hominis bonum est Deus Johova.”

¹⁹⁹ Cf. Anders Nygren, *Meaning and Method: Prolegomena to a Scientific Philosophy of Religion and a Scientific Theology*, trans. Philip Watson (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 191: “Rightness in axiomatic argumentation is decided solely by consistency, and consistency has to do exclusively with the relation that obtains between axioms and inferences.”

rationalism associated with Protestant orthodoxy.”²⁰⁰ Deal further claims that Polanus excessively adhered to the bifurcated tendency of “Ramist method and the Aristotelian philosophy to create a division between being and act” thereby separating God in His being from God in His act, and as argued by Barth, falling a semi-nominalist philosophical trap.²⁰¹

There are several problems, historical and philosophical, with Deal’s analysis. In the first place, Deal, like many neo-orthodox writers of the twentieth century, confuses rational argumentation with rationalism. Rationalism implies the identification of reason as the *principium* or foundation of knowing, something that Polanus did not do. In the second place, the tendency of Ramism to bifurcate arguments ought not to be used as an explanation of all pairs of terms: God made human beings male and female; the Bible divides into the Old and New Testaments; the person of Christ is one person in two natures, divine and human. These bifurcations are hardly Ramist in origin—and neither is the distinction between being and act. Neither Polanus nor any other Ramist invented the distinction; nor did Polanus separate God’s being and act. He only distinguished them. The alternative, which would be to identify being and act, would ultimately deny the freedom of God, specifically by denying that God need not act. In any case, Deal’s criticism is fundamentally misplaced. Further, the distinction between being and act is so standard in traditional theology and philosophy that it hardly indicates a nominalistic tendency. Third, more important still, is Deal’s (and also Faulenbach’s) reductionistic explanation of Polanus’s theology on the basis of these purported doctrinal motifs. As argued here, the

²⁰⁰ Max Eugene Deal, “The Meaning and Method of Systematic Theology in Amandus Polanus,” 81.

²⁰¹ Max Eugene Deal, “Meaning and Method of Systematic Theology in Amandus Polanus,” 90. Cf. Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics* II/1:334-335.

massive sourcing of Polanus's thought together with his long-term methodological efforts, indicates a very different understanding of his theology.

Polanus observes that there are two questions in philosophy most necessary and deserving of being explicated, one about “the beginning of arts (*de origine artium*)” and the other about “the legitimate constitution of them (*legitima earundem conformatione*).”²⁰² On the beginning of arts, Polanus agrees with Aristotle that, since “there is nothing in the intellect which was not first in sense” (*nihil est in intellectu, quod prius non fuerit in sensu*), the experience of sense perception is the beginning (*principium*) and source (*fontem*) of every art and science.²⁰³ It is, thus, in terms of method that Polanus admits “it is impossible to contemplate the universals but through induction (ἀδύνατον δὲ τὰ καθόλου θεωρῆσαι μὴ δι’ ἐπαγωγῆς).”²⁰⁴ From this, we may infer that Polanus adopted the inductive and analytic *method* of reasoning in theology. This inference, however, should be supplemented by his view on the first law or rule (*prima lex*) of every art and science, that is, “*lex κατὰ παντός* (the law of truth or universality)” which ratifies that all precepts of sciences and arts are constantly true, affirming, and universal.²⁰⁵ To put it another way, the criterion by which all precepts are known to be universal is not what is fabricated by us but what is gathered from the highest authorities, namely, the scriptural revelation of God.²⁰⁶ In this sense, Polanus confirms that all precepts of arts are those of

²⁰² Polanus, *Logicae*, praefatio, fol.1.

²⁰³ Cf. Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Problema de harmonia fidei catholicae et verbi Dei* (Basel, 1586), B2: “Rei Theologicae duo sunt κριτήρια, λόγος, Ratio: & πείρα, Experientia.”

²⁰⁴ Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics, Topica* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930), I.18, II.19.

²⁰⁵ Polanus, *Logicae*, praefatio, fol.4.

²⁰⁶ Polanus, *Logicae*, praefatio, fols.4-5: “Praecepta igitur artis universalialia sunt ... non a nobis ipsis conficta, quod semper in controversiam vocari possint: sed praeclara, sed infignia a classicis et praestantissimis auctoribus, praesertim vero ex sacra scriptura, petita sunt.”

truth, and there is no essential precept of each art which was true at the time of Plato and Aristotle that is not still true today. This law of *κατὰ παντός*, Polanus adds, is not only applicable to the theology of God the Father, Christ, Holy Spirit, and the catholic church, but also even to the physics of the sun and the moon.²⁰⁷ The point is that every universal teaching about arts and sciences must be filtered through the final authority of scriptural revelation.²⁰⁸ This point demonstrates Polanus's strong advocacy for the sovereign authority of revelation over reason or philosophy in theological work. On this ground, it is certain that Polanus's approach to method and logic did not "carry the stern rationalism" into his theology; rather, it reflected an older Christian tradition that included such works as Bonaventure's *Reduction of the Arts to Theology*.²⁰⁹

What is more, Polanus's assumption of an Aristotelian analytic-inductive *method* needs to be balanced against his harmonious combination of it with the synthetic-deductive method which Polanus takes from several thinkers, including Zabarella and Ramus, but with modification. Ramus is the thinker who was most influential in framing Polanus's framing of method.²¹⁰ His intention in the reform of logic was "to put the logical books of

²⁰⁷ Polanus, *Logicae*, praefatio, fol.4: "Sic in Physicis de Sole, de Luna, & aliis planetis singulis: in Theologia de Deo Patre, de Christo, de Spiritu sancto, de Ecclesia Catholica [lex κατὰ παντός] est docendum."

²⁰⁸ Cf. Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, epis., fol.1.

²⁰⁹ Cf. Bonaventure, *On the Reduction of the Arts to Theology*, ed. Zachary Hayes (St. Bonaventure, N.Y: Franciscan Institute, 1996).

²¹⁰ On Peter Ramus, see Charles Waddington, *Ramus (Pierre de la Ramée): Sa vie, ses écrits et ses opinions* (Paris: C. Meyrueis et Cie, 1885); Walter J. Ong, *Ramus: Method and the Decay of Dialogue* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958); Neal W. Gilbert, *Renaissance Concepts of Method* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960), 129-63; James Veazie Skalnik, *Ramus and Reform: University and Church at the End of the Renaissance* (Milwaukee: Merry Wiesner-Hanks, 2002); Howard Hotson, *Commoplace Learning: Ramism and Its German Ramifications, 1543-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Steven J. Reid and Emma A. Wilson, eds., *Ramus, Pedagogy and the Liberal Arts: Ramism in Britain and the Wider World* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).

[Aristotle's] *Organon* to the use of erudition (*ad eruditionis usum*)."²¹¹ It is, of course, true that Freige's anti-Aristotelian wording "whatever might be said by Aristotle is a fabrication (*quaecumque ab Aristotele dicta essent, commentitia esse*)" is widely known to have been defended by Ramus as his master's inaugural thesis under the supervision of Johann Sturm and Jacques Toussain at Paris in 1536. But this should not be carelessly seen as the utter rejection of Aristotle because the term *commentitia*, as Duhamel points out, would be better translated as "artificial," "fabricated," or "contrived."²¹² In fact, Ramus blamed, instead of Aristotle himself, the peripatetics for putting their logical precepts *in alieno loco et confuso modo*. His censure of Aristotle's elaborate corpus of logical writings, the *Organon*, is that it was unnatural and complicated from a practical point of view.²¹³ As Miller pointedly says, "a fundamental intention of Ramist logic was the avoidance of alien places and confused modes."²¹⁴

An outstanding opponent of Ramus, Jacob Schegk, had expounded the difference between "philosophies of Aristotle and sophist Ramus (especially that of syllogism and

²¹¹ Peter Ramus, "*Scholae dialecticae*" in *Scholae in liberales artes* (Basel, 1569), 153-155. On Ramus' acknowledgement of the benefits of Aristotle, see his early biographer, Baronius, "Petri Rami Vita," in *Commentarium de religione christiana* (Frankfurt: Andrea Wechelus, 1576), a.3: "Mei non est instituti Aristotelem in Philosophicis negligere, quem scientia rerum, scriptorum copia, eloquendi suavitate, inuentum acumine, varietate operum imprimis celebrem philosophum dici posse nemo sanus unquam negauerit." Cf. Ong, *Ramus: Method and the Decay of Dialogue*, 36-41; Hotson, *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and Its German Ramifications, 1543-1630*, 42-45.

²¹² Peter Ramus, *Aristotelicae animadversiones* (Lutetiae, 1548), fol.18. Agreeing with Duhamel's thought, Skinner translates this proposition like this: "Everything affirmed on the authority of Aristotle is artificial and contrived." Cf. Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 59.

²¹³ Thus, Duhamel goes further to say that the anti-Aristotelian character of Ramus is by nature the same as those enunciated by Lorenzo Valla in his *Disputationes dialecticae*, Erasmus in his *Anti-barbari*, and the authors of *Epistolae obscurorum virorum*. Cf. Albert Duhamel, "Milton's Alleged Ramism," *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 67/7 (December, 1952), 1035-1053; Ong, *Ramus: Method and the Decay of Dialogue*, 45-47.

²¹⁴ Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983), 129.

enthymeme)” as that of “gold and lead.”²¹⁵ For this, it is worth noting that Ramus wrote not only *Aristotelicae animadversiones* (1543) but also *Defensio pro Aristotele* (1571).²¹⁶ Surely acknowledging some positive aspects of Aristotle’s logic as *true* and defending them against Schegk in the *Defensio*, Ramus called Aristotle “my Aristotle, not your Aristotle (*Aristoteles meus, non tuus*)” and required Schegk to “start to understand, acknowledge, and proclaim P. Ramus [as] the champion, patron, and defender of Aristotle’s philosophy.”²¹⁷ In addition, his final edition of *Dialecticae* (1569) presents, in agreement with Aristotle, his completed version of method: “therefore the method constantly progresses from universals to singulars. By this one and only way, the declaration is proceeded, from antecedents entirely and absolutely better known to consequents unknown, and this is the unique method that Aristotle teaches.”²¹⁸ It is also remarkable that in framing his logic Ramus interacted, either positively or negatively, with the logical writings of other numerous logicians as Plato, Cicero, Peter of Spain, and Agricola. For this, it is hard to characterize Ramus’ logic just as philosophical renovation but, more adequately, as a typical example of philosophical eclecticism. Likewise, Polanus’s rigorous reception of Ramist logic did not cause his rejection of Aristotelian

²¹⁵ Schegk, nevertheless, acknowledged that some good ideas of Ramus’ logic were taken directly from Aristotle without citation. Jacob Schegk, *Hyperaspistes responsi, ad quatuor epistolas Petri Rami contra se editas* (Tübingen, 1570), 111-113. Cf. Muller, *PRRD*, 1:181; Hotson, *Commomplace Learning*, 22, 102.

²¹⁶ Cf. Reijer Hooykaas, *Humanities, Mechanics and Painting: Petrus Ramus, Francisco de Holanda* (Coimbra, 1991), 18-19.

²¹⁷ Peter Ramus, *Defensio pro Aristotele adversus Jac. Schegkium* (Lausanne, 1571), 32: “At Aristoteles meus, non tuus, longe alium sibi logicae usum in explorandis excellentium logcorum laudibus, in notandis hominum inertium elenchis spectavit, alium discipulis suis in perpetua communium locorum commentatione & declamatione proposuit...sapere tandem incipe, & tandem P. Ramum Aristoteleae philosophiae, assertorem, patronum, vindicem agnoscere ac praedicare.”

²¹⁸ Peter Ramus, *Dialectica*, 432: “ideoque methodus ab vniuersalibus ad singularia perpetuo progreditur. Hac enim sola & vnica via proceditur ab antecedentibus omnino & absolute notioribus ad consequentia ignota declarandum eamq; solam Methodum Aristoteles, docuit.”

logic but reaches the eclectic harmony of both.²¹⁹ It is in this vein that Polanus, without rejection of either of Aristotle and Ramus, could basically take the synthetic-deductive approach and the analytic-inductive model for formulating theological loci and exegetical work in terms of form or style and organization.²²⁰

Ramus considered dialectic and logic as signifying the same (*idem*) and identified dialectic with an art of *discoursing* well (*ars bene disserendi*).²²¹ The three characteristics of Ramus' logic are worth noting for our further discussion. First, Ramus, observing that there was no division of logic in the *Organon*, put that logical chaos into order by making a large distinction of dialectic into *inventio* (invention consisting in questions, arguments, and *loci*) and *judicium* (judgment corresponding to syllogism, a lengthier concatenation of arguments, and religion). Second, he abstracted and reformulated three principles of art grounded in Aristotle's *Analytica posteriora*, more suitable to treat any art or discipline: the law of truth or universality (κατὰ παντὸς), the law of justice or homogeneity (καθ' αὐτό), and the law of wisdom or reciprocity (καθ' ὅλον πρῶτον).²²² Ramus identifies the judgment made by such universal laws to be the most truthful and primary science. Third, every teaching is a movement, from universals to individuals, from the general to the particular, from the generic to the specific, or from the more known antecedents to the less known consequents, which implies the deductive way of seeking truth.

²¹⁹ Staehelin, *Amandus Polanus*, 90.

²²⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 671-672. On the advocacy of the Reformed orthodox to both the synthetic and the analytic models for *loci communes* and biblical exegesis, see Muller, *PRRD*, 1:181-186.

²²¹ Peter Ramus, *Dialectica* (Köln, 1587), 36, 50: "Dialectica est ars bene disserendi: eodemque sensu Logica dicta est ... Ergo Dialectica et logica idem significant, soloque vocis sono differunt, vt ex praecedentibus etiam notationum fontibus intelligitur."

²²² Peter Ramus, *Dialectica*, 308-309.

Polanus largely assumes Ramus' pedagogical transformation of logic but not completely. He modifies the Ramist logic to be more useful for formulating his doctrine and the structure of his theology. His definition of logic is "the art of *using* reason well."²²³ He criticizes Ramus' first distinction of logic into invention and judgment or disposition for its weakness that "the partition of logic into invention and disposition does not embrace the integral use of logic."²²⁴ For this, Polanus distinguishes logic into *proposito* and *judicium*, with the subdivision of the former into *thema* and *argumenta*, holding that "*dispositio* and *judicium* are separated in *genus*" and that *dispositio* should be placed within the department of *proposito*.²²⁵ These basic elements of logic, such as *proposito*, *thema*, and *argumenta*, are widely applied to the exegesis of scriptural texts and the use of the exegetical results, and also to the formulation of doctrinal locus in theological system. Especially, Polanus understands *argumenta* as the fountain (*fontes*) of knowledge and solid erudition that should be most diligently observed. This understanding is fully embodied in his *Syntagma theologiae christianae*. Polanus's extensive use of arguments does not have a direct link with the production of a specific theological content but is "to argue, that is, to explicate, make perspicuous and plain, declare, and demonstrate" it in an effective

²²³ Polanus, *Logicae*, 1.

²²⁴ Polanus, *Logicae*, praefatio, fol.9: "vero partitio Logicae in inventionem et dispositionem, integrum Logicae usum non complectitur."

²²⁵ Ramus defines *Judicium* as that which "pronounces the right judgement by placing the arguments under the efficient disposition," but Polanus identifies it as "the way in which what is proposed may be rightly judged," which consists in examination and appraisal. Peter Ramus, *Dialecticae*, 296: "Definitio Iudicij a genere & forma, quae efficiente dispositione, subiectis argumentis, & fine, bene iudicare, exprimitur....Iudicium est de disponendis argumentis, ad bene iudicandum." Polanus, *Logicae*, 209: "Iudicium, est secunda pars Logicae, docens quomodo de quovis proposito recte sit iudicandum. Partes iudicij sunt: Examinatio & Censura."

manner.²²⁶ Notably, Polanus calls for some patristic exemplars to corroborate that the use of logical demonstration in theology, along with themes and arguments, is also supported by some patristic writings, such as Augustine's sermons on the *logos Domini* and Hilary's *De Trinitate*, books IV and IX.²²⁷ Thus, Polanus does not ardently appeal to the patristic thought for the formulation of logical method but still he does not fail to employ patristic examples to justify his theological application of logic or philosophy in his theological work.

Concerning Ramus' three universal laws of art, Polanus featured them as "the matter of arts (*materiam artis*)" and outlined three laws or norms of *judicium* according to the form of "natural method": the law of brevity (appealing to Horatius), the law of methodical order (in line with Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Zabarella, and Zanchius), and the law of continuity. Then he suggests two laws or norms of *judicium* according to the matter of natural method: homogeneity and the law of agreement (*lex παναρμομίας*), the laws that concern the form of arts connected with all precepts or pertinent to the composition of the whole body.²²⁸ Discussing the law of methodical order, Polanus did not appeal to Ramus but to Aristotle and Zabarella for shaping another part of his theological method, the synthetic-deductive approach and remarks, "in method the process is made from what is more known to what is more obscure. Understand what is more known, which prevails to the sequence of what is noticed. In the order of teaching, the generic is delivered prior to

²²⁶ Polanus, *Logicae*, 422: "Argumenta enim fontes sunt cognitionis, & verae solidaeque eruditionis....Finis enim & usus argumenti, est arguere, hoc est, explicare, perspicuum & planum facere, declarare, demonstrare."

²²⁷ See Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 689.

²²⁸ Polanus, *Logicae*, 415-417.

the specific.”²²⁹ It is on this ground that Polanus blames his chief opponent, Robert Bellarmine, several times for making a universal conclusion from the particular.²³⁰

Polanus’s Christian philosophy is not duplication of the approach of his previous Christian philosophers, which can be demonstrated by the following example. It is Aristotle whom Polanus quoted most frequently in his *Logicae*. In his conceptualization of *materia* and *forma*, for example, Polanus also calls the name of Aristotle. But unlike Aristotle who ascribed the principle of individuation to *materia*, Polanus gives *forma* the role of providing a principle of individuation by pronouncing that “it is by form that an individual is what it is (*per formam est individuum id quod est*).”²³¹ In addition, Polanus, though agreeing with Aristotle in the definition of *essentia* as the effect of constituting *materia* and *forma*, disagrees with him by asserting that *forma* is the more noble and excellent part of *essentia* than *materia*.²³² Polanus, it should be noted, was not alone in his

²²⁹ Polanus, *Logicae*, praefatio, fol.8: “In methodo progrediendum est a notioribus ad ignotiora. Notiora intellige, quae ad sequentia notificanda valent. Ordine doctrinae est prius de genere agendum, quam de speciebus.” Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), I.iv; Jacobus Zabarella, *De doctrinae ordine apologia* (Paulum Meietum, 1584), I.v. (9). This approach, as Deal rightly points out, is found especially in Polanus’s discussion of the Trinity. Max Eugene Deal, “The Meaning and Method of Systematic Theology in Amandus Polanus,” 175-178.

²³⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 735-737.

²³¹ See Polanus, *Logicae*, 27-29. On this issue of individuation, Polanus does not make any reference to medieval thinkers like Scotus and Suarez both of whom implied form to be the *principium* of individuation. See Scotus, *De primo principio*, ii.20: “quia materia de se est in potentia contradictionis ad formam; igitur non est ex se actu per formam; ergo ab alio reducendo istam potentiam ad actum – illud est efficiens compositum, quia idem est ‘facere compositum’ et ‘materiam esse actu per formam’”; Suarez, *Disputationes metaphysicae* (Monguntiae, 1614), V.vi.15 (p. 118): “adaequatum individuationis principium esse hanc materiam et hanc formam inter se unitas, inter quae praecipuum principium est forma.”

²³² Polanus, *Logicae*, 42: “Essentia, est effectum ex materia & forma constitutum. Nam materia & forma constituunt, perficiunt, & absolvent cujuslibet rei essentiam. Unde etiam essentialia causae dicuntur. Materia ignobilior & minus-praestantior: forma autem nobilior & praestantior essentiae pars est.”

time in attempting to modify Ramist logic with elements of a more traditional Peripatetic approach.²³³

Polanus's approach to and his formulation of logic as explained above does not show a tendency to seek after a purely specific line of philosophical tradition – a Melancthonian, an Aristotelian, or a Ramist logic – but to synthesize the various traditions of logic and assimilate them into his own version of logic most suitable to discover and dispose of all true precepts of arts for the sake of both God's glory and the benefits to the church.²³⁴ This is typical of a philosophical eclecticism, a way in which whatever good and useful for the service of Christian theology could be employed and combined into a theological method. Polanus shows such eclecticism not just in his reception of philosophical traditions but also in his reception of individual philosophers.

To see Polanus's thinking on the relation between theology and philosophy more fully, special attention should be given to his approach to the pagan philosophers in knowing truth. Echoing the approach of the church fathers, he does not shrink from reading and affirming some beneficial aspects of the pagan philosophers in his discussion of theological doctrine, but moreover he states that Orpheus, Sophocles, Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero and other wise gentiles, though ignorant of the biblical God, affirmed that "God is one" (*esse unum Deum*).²³⁵ They knew, continues Polanus, even a more nuanced fact that "God alone is simply perfect, entirely sufficient, and consummately desirable in

²³³ See, e.g., Thomas Spencer, *The Art of Logick delivered in the precepts of Aristotle and Ramus* (London: John Dawson, 1628).

²³⁴ It is quite simplistic to say, as Faulenbach observes, that Polanus's logic is to combine those of Melancthon and Ramus. See Heiner Faulenbach, *Die Struktur der Theologie des Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf*, 19.

²³⁵ Appealing to Justin Martyr, Clemens of Alexandria, and Theodoret, Polanus claims that Plato's knowledge of God was obtained from Moses and Hebrews. See Amandus Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 153.

the highest degree” (*solus Deus est simpliciter perfectus, prorsus sufficiens & summe desiderabilis*), which are considered the three conditions of the highest good (*tres summi boni conditiones*).²³⁶ In order to testify to philosophers’ recognition of the highest good as God,²³⁷ he employs the notion of the Platonic *idea*, that is, “the exemplary forms and the incorporeal, invisible, eternal and immutable truths of all things” and claims that truths as the idea of all things exist in the divine mind (*in mente divina*) always in the same way (*semper eodem modo*), truths according to which all things are created by God (*secundum quas omnia a Deo creata sunt*) and by the participation of which a thing may be made as it is, wherever it is and by whatever manner it is (*quicquid est, quoquo modo est*).²³⁸ Polanus also appeals to the orthodox fathers (*orthodoxi Patres*), like Clement, Tertullian, Eusebius,

²³⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 19-20: “Quod est simpliciter perfectum, plane sufficiens & summe desiderabile, id est summum bonum nostrum. Hae enim tres sunt summi boni conditiones, quas ipsi etiam Gentiles Philosophi agnoscunt. Oportet insum esse simpliciter perfectum: quia si summo bono aliquid deesset, summum sane non esset. Idem est prorsus sufficiens: quia nihil deest ie, cuius est. Est summe desiderabile: quia in illo & ex illo & propter illud est, quod appetendum est; ad illud reliqua bona omnia referuntur.” Also note Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 152, 2104; Muller, *PRRD* I:246; Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I.vi.3: “Perfectio autem alicuius rei triplex est. Prima quidem, secundum quod in suo esse constituitur. Secunda vero, prout ei aliqua accidentia superadduntur, ad suam perfectam operationem necessaria.”

²³⁷ This is affected by Melanchthon who confirmed the conceptual agreement of philosophical and theological truths, saying that “God is the eternal mind, that is, a spiritual essence, intelligent, the eternal cause of good in nature, that is, a truthful, good, just, almighty Creator of all good things, of the whole order in nature, and of human nature, all of which are directed to a certain orderly goal, that is, certain obedience. All of these things are embraced by Plato.” Yet Melanchthon indicates the limit of philosophical truths that “they are still the thoughts of the human mind (*hae sunt adhuc humanae mentis cogitationes*).” This is the case in Bonaventure and Zacharias Ursinus. Bonaventure, *Collationes De Septem Donis Spiritus Sancti*, iv.12: “Qui confidit in scientia philosophica et appetiatur se propter hoc et credit se esse meliorem, stultus factus est”; Zacharias Ursinus, *Explicatio Catechetarum* (Cambridge, 1587), 263: “Philosophice ita describitur, Deus est mens aeterna, sivi ad felicitatem sufficiens, optima, & causa boni in natura Differt descriptio Dei Theologica, quam tradit Ecclesia, ab illa descriptione Philosophica, quia illa hac est perfectior. 1. numero partium ... 2. partium communium intellectis & declaratione ... 3. effectu seu fructu.”; Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, I.v, II.v; Barckley, *Summum bonum*, 7, 581; Muller, “Vera Philosophia cum sacra Theologia nusquam pugnat: Keckermann on Philosophy, Theology, and the Problem of Double Truth,” 341-365; Philip Melanchthon, *Loci Communes theologici*, in *Philippi Melanchthonis Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia* vol. 21, eds., C. G. Bretschneider and H. E. Bindseil (Brunswick: Schewtschke et Filium, 1854), 610.

²³⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae christianae*, 21: “Plato enim per ideas non intellexit species nescio quas in aere volitantes, ut falso ei affictum, sed quemadmodum jam dictum, formas exemplares, incorporeas, invisibiles, veritates rerum omnium quae sunt, semper in mente divina existentes.” Cf. Ramus, *Commentarium de religione christiana*, I.iii.

Augustine, and Theodoretus, all of whom apply the Platonic notion of idea to the understanding of God as “the first idea (*prima idea*)” of all good things since the divine things are the ideas of all things and the examples of eternal forms.²³⁹

The use of pagan philosophers by Polanus did not lead him to make reason or philosophy rule over the formulation of theological content. He kept in mind the concept of post-lapsarian reason of human beings as depraved and thus that “the corrupt reason, opposing the Holy Spirit, judges the teaching of the gospel to be stupid and enigmatic, a teaching to which, [on the contrary,] the pious mind assents and subscribes with the right judgment of the Holy Spirit (*judicio Spiritus Sancti merito*).”²⁴⁰ The judgment of human reason (*rationis humanae iudicio*) under sin, for Polanus, should submit to the gospel of Christ because the gospel, conceived in divine revelation, is above the *rational* judgment constituted by humans.²⁴¹ He acknowledges that corrupt reason would not surrender to the external *principia* of knowing the salvific truth of God without the internal illumination of the Holy Spirit.

In this vein, for instance, Polanus cautions against the privation of the transcendental nature of God that often occurred in pagan philosophy, arguing that it is sacrilege to imagine God as being located in some place outside Himself (*extra se quicquam positum*) as if He might be set in order according to what He constituted (*quod constituebat*).²⁴²

²³⁹ Polanus, *Sytagma theologiae*, p. 20; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, in *PG* 8, cols.1363-1364; Tertullianus, *De anima*, vii, in *PL* 2, cols.677-680; Eusebius Pamphilius, *Praeparatio evangelica*, XV.xliv, in *PG* 21, cols.1391-1392; Theodoretus, *Graecarum affectionum curatio*, in *PG* 83, cols.833, 902; Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, VII.xxviii, in *PL* 41, cols.218-219.

²⁴⁰ Polanus, *De concionum sacrarum methodo institutio*, 70.

²⁴¹ Polanus, *De concionum sacrarum methodo institutio*, 182.

²⁴² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 21.

With regard to the eternity of God, moreover, he distinguished *idea* from εἶδος²⁴³ in such a way that, while the latter is in work (*in opere*), the former is beyond and before work (*extra et ante opus*). The scriptural knowledge of God, for Polanus, is indisputably above and prior to reason and philosophy: the latter ought to be sanctioned by the former in theology.

In conclusion, for Polanus there is no antagonism but rather harmony between theology and philosophy because of their same divine origin and end, God and His glory. Belief in the truths of scriptural revelation is not unreasonable or contrary to reason but is above and beyond it. And that fact is proved in Polanus's thinking in that the pagan philosophers who properly use reason are aware of God's oneness, perfection, and sufficiency though not in a salvific sense. Thus, the proper use of reason and philosophy or logic in expounding theological doctrine, as instrumental or methodological in Polanus, did not lead to a rationalistic departure of Reformed theology from Scripture or revelation. Logic, with "the brevity of its precepts, the clarity of its examples, and the dexterity of its analyses," which Alsted called "three prerogatives of Ramist logic,"²⁴⁴ does not relate to the content of theology but to its style and organization by inventing arguments, disposing the invented, proposing the disposed, and discerning the proposed always under the supreme authority of scriptural revelation. Logic just serves as a handmaid to explain Scripture but does not control the interpretation or meaning of it as if it were the authority for Scripture. It is remarkable that Polanus did not assume any specific philosophical or

²⁴³ On the meaning of εἶδος, note Cornelii Scherevelii, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (London: Gulielmus Robertson, 1676), 206.

²⁴⁴ Johann Heinrich Alsted, *Clavis artis Lullianae, et verae logices* (Argentorati: Lazarus Zetzner, 1633), I.iv.

logical tradition but, in an eclectic way, abstracted and combined sound factors from several traditions into a unified theological method more suitable for the best formulation of his doctrine and theological system. Finally, we should remember Polanus's appeal to the moderate attitude of the church fathers, on their association of faith and reason, or theology and philosophy, the fathers who were aware both of the usefulness and limitations of philosophy or logic for theology.

Chapter Four: Exegetical Theology

4.1. Introduction

In the last three decades, the scholarly approach to the history of Reformation-era biblical exegesis has significantly altered from its older scholarship,¹ which had been seldom interested in the contextual examination of the field associated with its broad sources from the fathers and medieval doctors, as well as of other contemporaries, with the expected result that the thought of the Reformers tended to be discussed in relative isolation. This change is found notably in a great number of recent studies of David C. Steinmetz, Richard A. Muller, Elsie A. McKee, Irena D. Backus, Kenneth Hagen, Guy Bedouelle, Timothy Wengert, John L. Thompson, Susan Schreiner, Wulfert de Greef, Max Engammare, Craig S. Farmer, Mickey L. Mattox, and Deborah K. Marcuse.² Among those

¹ Heinrich Bornkamm, *Luther and the Old Testament*, trans. Eric W. Gritsch and Ruth C. Gritsch (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969); Jaroslav Pelikan, *Luther the Expositor: Introduction to the Reformer's Exegetical Writings* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1959); Gerhard Ebeling, *Evangelische Evangelienauslegung: Eine Untersuchung zu Luthers Hermeneutik* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1991); idem, "Die Angänge von Luthers Hermeneutik," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 48 (1951): 172-230; Hansjörg Sick, *Melanchthon als Ausleger des Alten Testaments* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959); Wulfert de Greef, *Calvijn en het Oude Testament* (Amsterdam: T. Bolland, 1984); T. H. Parker, *Calvin's New Testament Commentaries* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971); idem, *Calvin's Old Testament Commentaries* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986). This is cited from Richard A. Muller, "Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation: The View from the Middle Ages," in *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 3-22.

² David C. Steinmetz, *Calvin in Context* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); idem, *Luther in Context* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002); Richard A. Muller, "Interpretation of Scripture" in *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, vol.2 (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 442-524; idem, "Biblical Interpretation in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries" in *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2007), 22-44; R. A. Muller and J. Thompson, eds., *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996); Elsie A. McKee, *John Calvin on the Diaconate and Liturgical Almsgiving* (Geneva: Droz, 1984); idem, *Elders and the plural Ministry: The Role of Exegetical History in Illuminating John Calvin's Theology* (Geneva: Droz, 1988); Irena D. Backus et al., *Martin Bucer apocryphe et authentique: études de bibliographie et d'exégèse* (Geneva: Revue de théologie et de philosophie, 1983); idem, *Reformation Readings of the Apocalypse: Geneva, Zurich, and Wittenberg* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); Kenneth Hagen, *A Theology of Testament in the Young Luther: The Lectures on Hebrews* (Leiden: Brill, 1974); idem, *Hebrews Commenting from Erasmus to Beze, 1516-1598* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1981); idem, *Luther's Approach to Scripture as Seen in His*

studies, it is notable that Steinmetz's two seminal essays, "Theology and Exegesis: Ten Theses" and "The Superiority of Pre-critical Exegesis," served as a catalyst for reevaluating the so-called pre-critical exegesis of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which is significantly different from the modern critical exegesis of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries.³ Muller recapitulates four characteristics of the pre-critical exegetical model as follows.⁴ First, pre-critical exegesis regards the *historia* as resident in and not under or behind the literal and grammatical sense of the text. Second, pre-critical exegesis holds that the meaning of a particular text is not governed exclusively by the *sitz im leben* of the original audience or human author but by the scope and goal of

"Commentaries" on Galatians, 1519-1538 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1993); Guy Bedouelle, *Lefèvre d'Étaples et l'Intelligence des Écritures* (Geneva: Droz, 1976); idem, *Le Quinqueplex Psalterium de Lefèvre d'Étaples: Un guide de lecture* (Geneva: Droz, 1979); Timothy Wengert, *Philip Melancthon's Annotations in Johannem in Relation to Its Predecessors and Contemporaries* (Geneva: Droz, 1987); John L. Thompson, *John Calvin and the Daughters of Sarah: Women in Regular and Exceptional Roles in the Exegesis of Calvin, His Predecessors and His Contemporaries* (Geneva: Droz, 1992); Susan Schreiner, *Where Shall Wisdom Be Found? Calvin's Exegesis of Job from Medieval and Modern Perspectives* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); Wulfert de Greef, "De Ware Uitleg": *Hervormers en hun verklaring van de Bijbel* (Leiden: J. J. Groen, 1995); Craig S. Farmer, *The Gospel of John in the Sixteenth Century: The Johannine Exegesis of Wolfgang Musculus* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); Mickey L. Mattox, "Defender of the Most Holy Patriarchs: Martin Luther's Interpretation of the Women of Genesis in the 'Enarrationes in Genesim,' 1535-1545 (Leiden: Brill, 2003); Deborah K. Marcuse, "The Reformation of the Saints: Biblical Interpretation and Moral Regulation in John Calvin's Commentary and Sermons on Genesis" (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 2005).

³ The ten theses Steinmetz presented are "1. The meaning of a biblical text is not exhausted by the original intention of the author. 2. The most primitive layer of biblical tradition is not necessarily the most authoritative. 3. The importance of the Old Testament for the church is predicated upon the continuity of the people of God in history, a continuity which persists in spite of a discontinuity between Israel and the church. 4. The Old Testament is the hermeneutical key which unlocks the meaning of the New Testament and apart from which it will be misunderstood. 5. The church and not human experience as such is the middle term between the Christian interpreter and the biblical text. 6. Gospel and not law is the central message of the biblical text. 7. One cannot lose the tension between the gospel and the law without losing law and gospel. 8. The church that is restricted in its preaching to the original intention of the author is a church that must reject the Old Testament as an exclusively Jewish book. 9. The church which is restricted in its preaching to the most primitive layer of biblical tradition as the most authoritative is a church which can no longer preach from the New Testament. 10. Knowledge of the exegetical tradition of the church is an indispensable aid for the interpretation of Scripture." David C. Steinmetz, "Theology and Exegesis: Ten Theses," in *Histoire de l'exégèse au XVIe siècle* (Geneva: Droz, 1978), 382; idem, "The Superiority of Pre-Critical Exegesis," *Theology Today* 37 (1980-81): 27-38.

⁴ Richard A. Muller and John Thompson, "The Significance of Precritical Exegesis: Retrospect and Prospect," in *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation*, 335-345.

the biblical book in accord with the scope and goal of the whole scriptural revelation. Third, pre-critical exegesis regards the primary reference of the literal, grammatical sense of the text, not as the historical community that produced the text, but as the believing community that once received and continues to receive the text. Finally, pre-critical exegesis sees Scripture as self-authenticating and thus the highest norm of theology and understands the interpretive task as an interpretive conversation in the context of the historical community of belief. Moreover, Muller asserts that precritical exegesis proffers an indication of continuities and developments in relation to the medieval model of exegetical investigation, pointing to “a genuine concern for the literal sense as well as some philological and text critical interest among the medieval exegetes, a continuance and enhancement of those developments in the Renaissance and Reformation, a flowering of philology and text criticism augmented by the study of Judaica in the era of orthodoxy, and, in addition, a rhetorical refinement of various figurative and allegorical understandings in the Reformation and orthodoxy.”⁵

Concerning the commentary of early orthodoxy, the biblical interpreters of the period must be considered as producing highly varied exegetical works and commentaries, ranging from text-critical essays, to textual annotations, doctrinal annotations, linguistic commentaries, homiletical commentaries, and all manner of permutations and combinations of these several types.⁶ The commentaries of both the Reformation and orthodox eras, notably, tend to begin with *argumenta* or analyses of the scope, goal,

⁵ Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 41-42.

⁶ For its detailed discussion, see Richard A. Muller, “Biblical Interpretation in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,” 22-44.

summary, and partitions of the entire book. They also hold that all difficult places of Scripture are to be explained by clear places and that nothing belonging to salvation is obscure in Scripture.

In order to see the intimate relationship between exegesis and theology in early orthodoxy, we need to know that the Reformed orthodox would not distort biblical texts out of their context or dispense with biblical exegesis for the formulation of a theological system. The idea of *dicta probantia* in the orthodox systems was rather intended to lead their readers, by the citation of texts, to the exegetical results in the commentaries that undergirded the theological system. It is also worth noting that crucial to an intimate connection between exegesis and theology was the locus method, a scholastic method by means of which theological topics or *loci communes* were elicited from the exegetical results of biblical texts and disposed into a theological system.

Polanus's exegetical theology and biblical commentaries follow the general patterns of pre-critical exegesis as described above. In this chapter, I will examine his perspective on biblical exegesis in relation to the formulation of his Reformed orthodox theology and also to patristic thought. The discussion is largely divided into two: concerning Polanus's theories on biblical interpretation and actual exegesis of four scriptural books – Malachi, Daniel, Hosea, and Ezekiel – with some concluding remarks. Special attention will be given to Polanus's method and to the relation of biblical exegesis to the church fathers, with a focus on their exegetical benefits and limits.

4.2. Biblical Interpretation

4.2.1. Polanus's Method in General: Hermeneutics and Polemics

Polanus's approach to the interpretation of Scripture not only fits into the broad model of early modern pre-critical exegesis, it also shares a series of significant characteristics with the approaches of his contemporaries, including some that belong to a specifically Ramist or semi-Ramist method. The commentary understood as "analysis," as in the cases of Polanus's commentaries on Malachi and Hosea, is characteristic of his Ramist contemporaries, such as Johann Piscator and Robert Rollock.⁷ The identification of doctrinal *loci* arising from the text—for example, the *locus de praedestinatione* that appears in chapter of on Polanus's *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachi*, is not so much an approach belonging to the Ramists as a general doctrinal pattern of interpretation in the line of earlier Protestant writers like Heinrich Bullinger and Peter Martyr Vermigli, reflecting the influence of Agricolan logic. So also, Polanus use of questions or objections followed by formal responses, a reflection of traditional scholastic method, stands also in a line of earlier Protestant interpretation as practiced perhaps most notably by Wolfgang Musculus. Polanus's rules for grammatical interpretation are also reflective of contemporary patterns, as evidenced in such works as William Whitaker's *Disputatio de sacra scriptura*, a work that, like Polanus's later polemic, was posed against the arguments of Bellarmine.⁸

⁷ See I. Backus' article "Piscator misconstrued. Some Remarks on Robert Rollock's exegesis of Hbr. 9," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 14/1 (1984): 113-119.

⁸ William Whitaker, *Disputatio de sacra scriptura; contra hujus temporis papistas, imprimis Robertum Bellarminum ... & Thomam Stapletonum* (Herborn: Christophorus Corvinus, 1600); in translation, *A Disputation on Holy Scripture, against the Papists, especially Bellarmine and Stapleton*, trans. and ed. William Fitzgerald (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1849).

Our approach to Polanus's general method of interpretation is based on his *Sylloge thesium theologicarum* and the *Syntagma theologiae*. Characterizing interpretation as the gift of God (*Dei donum*), Polanus provides an integral discussion of biblical interpretation in the *principium* part of *Syntagma theologiae christianae* (1610) prior to any other section on theology. The character of his discussion of the biblical interpretation is primarily polemical in this book, quite distinct from the more didactical tone of his discussion in *Sylloge thesium theologicarum* (1597). For him, interpretation is not a version or translation from one language into other languages but the presentation of the true meaning and use of Scripture (*ostensio veri sensus & usus Scripturae*).⁹ He proceeds in his discussion of interpretation in the pattern of the classic scholastic *quaestio* method, with a great number of questions with regard to 1) necessity of interpretation, 2) parts of interpretation, 3) twofold interpretation, 4) authority or rights of interpreting Scripture and judging its interpretation, 5) norms of interpretation, 6) means of discovering the true sense and use of Scripture, 7) source of biblical interpretation, and 8) authority of biblical interpretation, usually following with some counter-arguments by his opponents against each argument.

In answer to the first question concerning the necessity of interpretation, Polanus like Whitaker indicates that biblical interpretation is necessary because Christ and the Holy Spirit commanded us to declare the genuine sense of Scripture for the edification of the church (John 5:39, 1 Thess. 5:19-20, 1 Cor. 14:3).¹⁰ To speak with understanding is the great gift of a more excellent and more useful language necessary in the church, because

⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 633; idem, *Sylloge thesium theologicarum ad method leges conscriptarum* (Basel, 1597), 51-52.

¹⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 633-635. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, I.v.1 (402).

Scripture has many things, though perspicuous and clear “in themselves” (*in se*), that are obscure and difficult “for us” (*nobis*) to understand. And the example of Christ, the apostles, and evangelists interpreting and teaching the Old Testament to the non-believers in many places also proved the necessity of interpretation. His opponents made a superficial argument: Scripture was read and understood by believers in the early church without commentaries, so its interpretation might not be necessary. In response, Polanus, though admitting the antecedence, rejects the consequence by arguing that reading Scripture in the early church was not without (*non sine*) the interpretation that Christ and the apostles handed down to explain Scripture to them and admonish them by their living voice.¹¹

On the second question, Polanus says that the interpretation of Scripture consists in two things: the exposition of its true meaning with perspicuous words and its accommodation to use for God’s glory and the edification of the church.¹² Quoting biblical and patristic testimonies, he emphasizes that the word of God, stupidly or falsely understood, is no longer God’s word and that the divine word, not comprehended, has nothing useful.¹³ The exposition may be not only with the consideration of biblical texts explained by themselves (*consideratione loci explicandi per se*) or with the collation of a text with other places in Scripture (*collatione eius cum alijs*). The *consideratione loci*

¹¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 635.

¹² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 636.

¹³ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 53-54: “269. Ipsa vis, & quodammodo anima & vita Scripturae, in sententia consistit. 270. Sic Jerome ait *contra Luciferianos*: Non in legendo, sed in intelligendo Scripturae consistunt. Et in 1. ca *Ad Galatas*: Ne putemus in verbis Scripturarum esse Euangelium, sed in sensus: non in superficie, sed in medulla: non in sermonum folijs, sed in radice rationis. Basilius lib. 2. *Contra Eunomium*: Non in se no aeris, sed in vi seu virtute rerum significatarum pietas est. Theodoretus: Verbum Dei stolide intellectum, non est verbum Dei. Hilary *ad Constantinum Augustum*: Omnes haeretici Scripturas sine sensu loquuntur, fidem sine fide praetendunt: Scripturae enim non in legendo sunt, sed in intelligendo.”

explicandi per se can, moreover, be distinguished into the interpretation of things (*rerum*) and of words (*vocum*).¹⁴

Polanus here applies his own, slightly modified Ramist approach to logic as consisting in two parts or exercises, *propositum* and *iudicium*, modifying slightly the typical Ramist *inventio* and *iudicium*. Polanus modification, arguably, is more focused on exegesis and interpretation than the original Ramist model. Nonetheless, once having identified the first part of the logic of interpretation as establishing the purpose or intention (*propositum*), Polanus does go on to use the more typical Ramist language of *inventio* in his discussion of the exposition or analysis of the intention of the text. As in Ramus' logic, *inventio* specifically refers to the "invention" or discovery of an "argument." The "argument," understood not as a debate but in the early modern sense of *argumentum* as identifying the underlying reason or pattern of something, including a text. These arguments can be simple or complex; they can reference agreements or disagreements between things or concepts; and they consist in the examination of causes and effects, subjects and adjuncts, relations, and disparates.

Polanus applies his logic to biblical interpretation by making an initial division of the *interpretatio rerum* into identification of the *propositum*, the purpose or intention, and the establishment of the *iudicium* or judgment concerning the meaning. First of all, to identify the "purpose" or "intent" (*propositum*) of the text, it is necessary to make sure what is explained in a given text, whether teaching, prohibition, history, narrative, petition,

¹⁴ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 62: "290. Expositio veri & genuini sensus fit tum consideratione loci explicandi per se, tum collatione eius cum alijs. 291. Consideratio loci explicandi per se, duas habet partes, interpretationem rerum & interpretatorem verborum. 292. Interpretationis rerum duae sunt partes, ostensio propositi & iudicium." Cf. Polanus, *Logica*, lib. I, *De proposito*; lib. II, *De iudicio*. And see the discussion of Polanus' critique of Ramus' logic, above, chapter 3.4.

dissuasion, encouragement, mandate, consolation or something else. Every intention is identified with a theme and argument by which the theme is explained, the former possibly being simple or complex. In a simple theme, the argument may be discussed either in its cause or effect, subject or adjunct. The text under consideration reveals either what is different from it, what is opposed to it, what is equal to it, what is more than it, what is less than it, to what it is similar, to what it is dissimilar, to which species it belongs, whether it is expressed in itself or in its species, how many parts of it there may be, how many efficient causes of it there may be, what its matter is, what its form is, what its *finis* is, or what kind of effects it has.¹⁵ Complex themes may be presented in arguments through which they may be confirmed or refuted. These arguments can focus on hortation, dissuasion, mandate, petition, prohibition, or complaint. The exegete must make clear how many arguments are needed, from which places of invention (causes, effects, subjects, adjuncts, and so forth) they must be taken, and in what manner they are disposed with the theme. It is always advantageous for the audience to know how many arguments are needed to expound the proposed theme. The method of disposing those arguments is axiomatic, syllogistical, or enthymematical. The axiomatic approach, although not exclusive to Ramism, probably indicates Polanus Ramist inclinations. In short, the exposition of Scripture first identifies the intention or *scopus* of a given scriptural text, develops the interpretation in theses and concludes with argument, through which the meaning is declared and confirmed.¹⁶

¹⁵ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 64.

¹⁶ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 65-66.

The second part of *interpretatio rerum* is the *iudicium* in which we must interpret the intention of the text according to the “norm of rectitude” proposed by God himself, that is, according to the canonical scriptures, just as the apostles did (Acts. 15:14-15, 17:11, Gal. 2:11, Tim. 3:1, 16, Tit. 3:8, 1 Cor. 10:15).¹⁷ The *iudicium* is either concerning doctrines or concerning deeds. Whatever God immediately taught and did is true and right without any uncertainty, while the prophetic and apostolic words and deeds are true and right without controversy. Just as in jurisprudence, no interpretation or judgment should be made according to a particular law without consideration of the whole law (*lege tota*), so in theology no interpretation or judgment should be made by any particular text without consideration of the intention of the whole Scripture (*textu toto*).¹⁸

The second part of *consideratione loci explicandi per se*, the interpretation of words, is the one in which some obscure or ambiguous expressions are explained for the audience to rightly understand. If a biblical text has difficult expressions or phrases, they should be unfolded in everyday language (*populariter*): what is more general should be expressed more fully through species or sub-species and what is simpler through using longer paraphrase, epimone, definition, or description.¹⁹ With further distinction of *interpretatio vocum* into the singular and the conjunct, Polanus explains the interpretation of singular voice needs when certain voices may be obscure or unusual, or have many significations, which are divided into the proper (τό ῥητόν, proper or literal meaning) and the tropological (διανόια, thorough reasoning). The διανόια is the true and genuine meaning

¹⁷ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 67.

¹⁸ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 68.

¹⁹ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 68-69.

that ought to be completely observed in interpretation of all scriptural texts, and its examples are the articles of faith and the precepts of the Decalogue.²⁰

As the second part of exposition, the collation of places or texts (*collatio locorum*) is distinguished into the collation of harmonious places (*locorum consentientium*) and the collation or comparison of opposing texts (*in speciem pugnantium*). This approach is also a reflection of the Ramist pattern invention, specifically if the analysis of kinds (species) in terms of their agreement or disagreement. The *collatio locorum consentientium* should be made when a given text is explained by comparing it with other texts which agree with it. This hermeneutic collation makes a more obscure text of Scripture manifest by the light of certain more apparent texts, the texts of more evidences, the more popular texts, or the texts producing a similar meaning. For example, Polanus believes, the historical books of the Old Testament should be read and understood by means of collation with the Mosaic laws and the prophetic narratives, and by the harmony among themselves. The way of *collatio locorum in speciem pugnantium* is this: some places of Scripture are reconciled with other places which are seemingly in opposition to it in appearance so that the perfect consensus of Scripture may be retained.²¹

With regard to the multiple senses of Scripture, Bellarmine catalogues the scriptural senses into a fourfold schema: the literal, allegorical, tropological, and anagogical. And then he argues that this distinction was not always observed by the ancient fathers such as Basil, Augustine, and Jerome, due to the obscurity or ambiguity of certain biblical texts.²²

²⁰ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 69-70.

²¹ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 71-72.

²² Bellarmine talked about the fourfold senses of Scripture in the context of arguing the insufficiency of Scripture. See Robert Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei*, III.iii. [101-103]; Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 639; idem,

In opposition to Bellarmine, Polanus like other Reformed writers of his era responds that the true and genuine meaning (*sensus verus & genuinus*) of Scripture is unique, that is, the literal (also called as the grammatical or historical sense), which refers to what is rightly understood by letter itself or words themselves (*ex ipsa litera seu ex ipsis verbis*) according to the intention of the primary author, the Holy Spirit.²³ For Polanus, the allegorical, tropological, and anagogical senses are not various meanings of the same scriptural place, different from the literal sense, since they were not immediately invented in any sentence, either of the Old Testament or of the New, as Bellarmine also agreed. They are just the diverse accommodations of the one literal sense to be used (*accommodationes ad usum*).²⁴ There is no voice or enunciation brought forward by God which is ambiguous by itself or restrained to itself, as if it would be intended to make humans uncertain and dubious in studying it, because God would not speak ambiguously. It is true, Polanus acknowledges, that many parts of Scripture are quite obscure and ambiguous because of the imperfection of human understanding, and we may not always listen thoroughly and follow what God intends in them.

Polanus provides a series of reasons for his argument concerning the single, genuine, and proper sense of biblical texts: 1) the truth cannot be more than one; 2) any firm, valid, and efficacious argument is made out of the literal sense alone for a certain confirmation; 3)

Sylloge thesium theologiarum, 55-56. Cf. Basil, *Homiliae IX in Hexaemeron*, in *PG* 29, 187-207; Augustine, *De utilitate credendi ad Honoratum*, in *PL* 42, 68-72; Jerome, *Epistola ad Hedibiam, de quaestionibus xii*, in *PL* 22, 981-1006.

²³ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 54; cf. similarly, Whitaker, *Disputation*, v.2 (404, 409).

²⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 643-644; idem, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 56: "Tropologia igitur, Anagoge & Allegoria non sunt verij sensus eiusdem loci, sed tantum varia ex vno sensu consecraria, vel variae vnus sensus accommodationes ad vsum"; Robert Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei*, III.iii.8; cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, v.2 (404).

the meaning, seen from the word according to the intention of the Holy Spirit, is clear; 4) the literal sense alone is invented in all sentences as much of the Old Testament as of the New; 5) Scripture is not in itself and by itself ambiguous, and any voice in one and the same sentence with the same construction has one unique signification, a unique, not multiple, meaning.²⁵ “Even though one repeated word can signify multiple things in diverse enunciations, it cannot still have multiple significations in one and the same simple enunciation, in one and the same sentence and oration, and in one and the same place.”²⁶ To investigate the true and proper literal sense of Scripture, Polanus provides a summary of basic exegetical methods, chiefly in relation to the self-authenticating character of Scripture, as follows:

The means of the investigation and invention of the true sense of Scripture are 1) the appeal to divine illustration for the understanding of Scripture, 2) the collation in context of what precedes and follows by considering the *propositum*, themes and arguments, 3) the investigation of source, 4) the observation of phrases and styles, 5) the collation of the loci which must be explained with other similar or dissimilar places of Scripture, 6) the collation with the analogy of faith, 7) the collation with the sentence of other interpreters because the spirits of prophets are subject to prophets.²⁷

An overall division of the literal sense, Polanus continues, occurs between *simplex* and *compositus*. The *simplex sensus literalis* is that meaning which occurs in a bare oracle

²⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 640-641.

²⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 642: “Etsi igitur in diversis enunciationibus vna vox repetita posit plura significare: tamen in una & eadem enunciatione simplici, in una eademque sententia & oratione, uno & eodem in loco plures significationes habere non potest.”

²⁷ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 58: “Media inuestigandi & inueniendi verum Scripturae sensum sunt, 1. Imploratio illustratinis diuinae ad intelligendum Scripturas. 2. Antecedentium & consequentium in contextu collatio: considerato proposito, themate, argumentis. 3. Inspectio fontium. 4. Observatio phrases & styli. 5. Collatio loci explicandi cum alijs Scripturae locis similibus vel dissimilibus. 6. Collatio cum Analogia fidei. 7. Collatio cum aliorum interpretum sententia, quia Spiritus Prophetarum subijciuntur Prophetis.” Also note Polanus, *In Daniele Prophetam visionum amplitudine difficillimum* (Basel, 1600), 110.

without any type of clothing, and which is divided again into *proprius* and *figuratus*: the *sensus literalis proprius* is that meaning without any trope or figure involved which is generated “from some properly used words (*ex verbis proprie usurpatis*),” like the text “Jehova is just”; the *sensus literalis figuratus* is that meaning which is taken “from certain figuratively or tropologically used words (*ex verbis figurate seu tropo aliquo usurpatis*),” like the text ‘the circumcision is my covenant between me and you.’²⁸ The *totus sensus literalis compositus* is that meaning of a given text which consists in signs (*signis*) and things which are signified by signs (*re significata*). Circumcision, in this sense, refers to a surgical removal of the foreskin of males as *signum* and at the same time (*simul*) the removal and wiping away of those things that impede and defile God’s love and righteousness, as *res significata*, refers to getting into the covenant between God and the elect. The point, also made by Polanus’s contemporaries, is that the literal sense is not merely the grammatical construction: it may contain figures, tropes, and other literary forms.²⁹

Concerning the issue of some ambiguous words in Scripture, Polanus suggests some rules that have great benefits with regard to the true voice or declaration that is obscure and ambiguous to us, rules which Scripture itself teaches by the patterns of its own interpretations. Each of these rules, moreover, relates to the “place” or locus, namely, the text understood as allocation of meaning in its relation to other texts. First, the scriptural text whose meaning is not determined by itself has various and multiple determinations, definitions and interpretations by reason of collations with other places. Second, some

²⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 642-643.

²⁹ Whitaker, *Disputation*, v.9 (470).

scriptural texts (such as John 1:1 and Matt. 26:26) are capable of various determinations, whose sense is inquired from a given place itself (*ex loco ipso*) but not from other places where the same things are neither taught in substance nor in analogy (*nec re nec analogia*).³⁰ Third, when one place is expounded by other places, these places should be consistent in substance or analogy; otherwise the interpretation might not be justified. Fourth, the properly or tropologically used voice ought to be recognized from its place itself, for example, from the antecedent and consequent consideration or from the circumstance of the place. Fifth, the predication that may be said of a subject tropologically, figuratively, or properly is truly said (*vere dicitur*). That “this bread is the body of Christ,” for instance, is a true enunciation that the body of Christ is truly said, even though it is figuratively predicated so that it may not be the body of Christ in a proper, natural, and substantial sense (*proprie & naturaliter substantialiterque*).³¹ Sixth, the scriptural texts that are ambiguous or obscure to us in the same place are often explained in different ways, sometimes with the figurative oration following or preceding the proper and simple oration, or sometimes with the exposition of the obscure or ambiguous words following or preceding. Polanus finds an example of this rule in Chrysostom’s homilies on the Psalms.³² In some cases, according to the archbishop of Constantinople, the more obscure orations having plural significations could be explained by the more obvious and at the same time supported by types or parables. In other cases, we need to exposit things in a given text, with additional reference to several words of adequate illustrations or the

³⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 645-646; cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, v.9 (471-472).

³¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 647.

³² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 650-653; John Chrysostom, *Monitum ad homiliam in Psalmum XCV*, in *PG 55*, 622-624.

arguments of logical invention, just as through indications and inquiries of causes, effects, subjects, and adjuncts or through the removal of false interpretations. It is notable that Polanus neither rigorously depends his thought of exegetical method on the church fathers nor entirely ignore them on the issue.

Regarding the second part of interpretation, Polanus distinguishes the *usus* of Scripture into four modes: ἔλεγχος (proof or examination), ἐπανόρθωσις (correction), παιδεία (instruction or admonition), and παράκλησις (encouragement or consolation). First, Polanus links the first use of Scripture with ἔλεγχος, which is for the sake both of the firm establishment of true doctrine and the condemnation of the errors of the Jewish, pagans, Roman Catholics, or other heretics. With Psalm 51:10, “God, create in me a clear heart,” for example, he points out the grave error of pagan philosophers who teach us to prepare the cleanness and morality of heart as much as possible virtue but with our actions, on the ground that the cleanness of heart cannot be prepared by human actions but only created by God. It is not enough to accommodate Scripture to the confirmation of true doctrines and the confutation of false doctrines. On the third use of Scripture, it is necessary to apply Scripture to ἐπανόρθωσις of behavior and the instruction of justice,³³ which mainly involved the reprehension of sins whereby to celebrate God’s justice, truth, sanctity, and other virtues. Polanus then argues that Scripture, when recalling the pious, must designate their faith and good works in an ultimate sense. It is notable that what Scripture talks about and emphasizes is reflected in his partition of doctrines into faith and good works. Thirdly, Scripture is applied to νοουθεσία or παιδεία of others’s impiety (Psal.

³³ John Chrysostom, *Commentarius in Acta Apostolorum*, in PG 60, 33-42.

119:126-128), by which we may avoid a similar impiety, and Polanus inspires us to love the divine laws. The fourth use of Scripture is *πρόκλησις* that is a certain ratiocination in which we contrast something good to something bad in order to mitigate or prevent suffering from the bad.

On the third question, Polanus answers that all right interpretation of Scripture is twofold: analytic and synthetic.³⁴ As expounded in logic, the analytic interpretation is one which proceeds from end to principles (*a fine ad principia*), that is, from the *scopus* and intention of an author to what all that he wrote meant. This is subdivided into common and singular: the former is the way in which we expound the end, total, and parts of the texts in general, while the latter is the way in which we inquire into some singular parts and particular circumstances of doctrines, narratives, and other intentions. The synthetic interpretation of Scripture is one which extends from principles to an end (*a principiis ad finem*) and in which we invent doctrinal theses from a given text and accommodate them with several illustrations and evidences to the comprehension and practical use of the audience in their faith and life.

In answer to the fourth question, Polanus offers several theses for explanation. First, in a Ramist division, the authority or right of interpreting Scripture and judging its interpretation and all religious controversies is divided into *publica* and *privata*. Second,

³⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 671: “Omnis justa Sacrae Scripturae interpretatio duplex est, analytica & synthetica....Analytica interpretatio, est quae a fine ad principia procedit, hoc est, qua monstrato in-primis auctoris scopo atque proposito, ad quod omnia quae scribit referuntur, totus liber aut Psalmus aut tota epistola in suas partes, totaque doctrinae summa in certas propositiones seu theses & propositionum seu thesium confirmationes tanquam in sua membra resolvitur....Synthetica interpretatio Sacrae Scripturae, est quae a principiis ad finem contendit, hoc est, qua ex textu quem interpretamur, varias de eodem dogmate propositiones seu theses ad usum Scripturae inculcandum pertinentes, earumque confirmationes, distincte, certoque & ad auditorum captum accommodato ordine in unum colligimus atque componimus, pluribus etiam ex aliis Scripturae locis adductis, si opus sit, illustrationibus aut probationibus.”

again bifurcated Ramistically, the public authority is supreme or ministerial (*vel summa vel ministerialis*). Third, the supreme authority of interpreting Scripture and judging its interpretation and all religious controversies is ascribed only to God the Father, the Lord Christ, and the Holy Spirit speaking in and through Scripture, who is the principal author of Scripture, the principal and supreme interpreter of Scripture in the same manner, and the principal and supreme index of all biblical interpretations and all religious controversies (1. Cor. 2:12, 1. Joh. 2:27).³⁵ The Holy Spirit, in addition, reveals the true sense of Scripture to the believers by internal illumination.³⁶ Polanus holds this thesis to be widely acknowledged and testified by the orthodox fathers, strongly by Augustine in particular.³⁷ Fourth, the ministerial public authority or right pertains not only to Scripture itself but also to the orthodox church of God. Fifth, as the voice, testament, and epistle of God, Scripture is the minister of the supreme judge to interpret and judge anything of interpretation. Sixth, *ecclesia Dei orthodoxa* is similarly a ministerial interpreter of Scripture, as appointed by Scripture (John. 14:16-17). Seventh, the church does not have the absolute power and authority of interpreting Scripture and judging interpretation and religious controversies but is just “the ministry both of God and Scripture (*ministra tum Dei tum Scripturae*).”³⁸ God’s Word was immediately inspired in prophets and apostles, divinely announced and

³⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 672: “Summa potestas seu autoritas interpretandi Scripturam & judicandi de interpretatione ejus & de omnibus controversiis religionis est penes Deum seu Christum Dominum seu Spiritum Sanctum per Scripturam & in Scriptura loquentem; est enim princeps autor Scripturae sacrae: ac proinde Deus ipse seu Christus Dominus seu Spiritus Sanctus per Scripturam & in Scriptura loquens est principalis ac summus interpres Scripturae, principalis itidem & summus iudex interpretationis omnis & controversiarum religionis omnium.”

³⁶ Polanus defines this internal testimony of the Holy Spirit as “the internal revelation of the Holy Spirit which, by internal inspiration, teaches us in our hearts in such a way as effectively to persuade us to believe firmly that holy Scripture, as we have it in the books of the apostles and the prophets, is truly and indubitably the word of God.” See, Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 117.

³⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 673; idem, *Symphonia catholica*, 67-75.

³⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 674.

written by them to be Scripture, handed down to the church, and thus should not be legitimately denied to any of the church members. Thus, the pure and orthodox church of God terminates every religious controversy with God, the unique supreme judge, from Scripture. Here Polanus reemphasizes the self-authenticating character of Scripture by saying that “the church of God after the era of prophets and apostles has interpreted Scripture from Scripture itself and judged interpretation and religious controversies from Scripture itself and according to it as the voice of the supreme judge, but not from its counterfeit trick, opinion, doctrine, and thoughts which it raises by itself beyond Scripture.”³⁹ Eighth, therefore, the church, only if it is true but not malicious like the Roman Church, is acknowledged to have the power and right of interpreting the scriptures and judging interpretation and religious controversies.⁴⁰ It is noteworthy that Polanus presents these doctrinal theses in agreement with patristic and conciliar testimonies as illustrated in the *Symphonia catholica*.⁴¹

The efficient cause of biblical interpretation is twofold: one divine and the other human.⁴² Similarly, once again, the pattern of exposition is Ramist – namely, bifurcatory. The human interpretation is divided into the public and the private: the former is also twofold: catholic or particular. The catholic or universal human interpretation of Scripture

³⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 676: “Ecclesia Dei post Prophetas & Apostolos Sacram Scripturam interpretatur ex Scriptura ipsa, & de interpretationibus controversiisque religionis ex ipsa Scriptura & secundum eam tanquam vocem Summi Judicis judicat, non autem ex suo ingenio confictis opinionibus, dogmatibus & sententiis, sese supra Scripturas effert.”

⁴⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 677.

⁴¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 677: “ut testimoniis illustribus Patrum & Conciliorum ostensum in Symphonia Catholica.”

⁴² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 682: “Interpretatio divina, est quae habet autorem Deum in Scriptura ipsa per Prophetas & Apostolos loquentem & ipsam exponentem...Humana interpretatio Scripturae Sacrae, est quae habet autores homines sive singulos, veluti Origenem, Ambrosium, Hieronymum, Augustinum.”

is one which is scribed, promulgated, received, and approved by the consent, judgment, and the name of the whole Christian orthodox church scattered through the whole world, like the Creeds of Apostles (Nicene, Athanasius, Ephesus, Chalcedon, and so forth). The particular human interpretation of Scripture is one which is edited by some particular churches, such as the confessions of Augustine, and Helvetic, Bohemian, Gallican, Anglican, and of Basil, Schmalcaldic articles, and the ecclesiastical catechisms. What is more, the private interpretation of Scripture is the one that may be done or written by ecclesiastical individuals, such as Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory the Great, Martin Luther, Philip Melanchthon, Johann Oecolampadius, John Calvin, Peter Martyr Vermigli, Theodore Beza, and Jerome Zanchi.⁴³

On the fifth question, Polanus argues that the unique norm of interpreting biblical texts and judging whether an interpretation of biblical text is true or false is Holy Scripture itself “because God says whatever Scripture says, and God is by all means the qualified witness of himself and his word.”⁴⁴ In this regard, the interpretation of a biblical text, only if being consentaneous with Scripture itself, would be considered as true, while any interpretation, differing from or opposing Scripture, would be false and should be refuted.

On the sixth question, Polanus answers, with illustrations and evidences of scriptural texts and the church fathers, that the media of inventing the true meaning of Scripture and using it are triplex: what precedes the meditation on Scripture, what is required in the meditation itself, and what follows reading. Those attitudes which precede the meditation

⁴³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 682-683.

⁴⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 107: “nam quicquid Scriptura dicit, Deus dicit: Deus autem omnibus modis idoneus est de seipso suoque verbo testis.”

of Scripture⁴⁵ are the firm persuasion about the true and solid sense of Scripture and its use given by the Triune God (Prov. 2:6; 2 Pet. 1:20; 1 Cor. 12:3; Luk. 24:45); prayer to God from true faith, a pure heart, and good conscience (Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* III.xxxvii); decisive conversion to God, sincere piety, fear of God and humility (Psal. 25:14; Prov. 1:7); love and desire of truth (Psal. 119:40, 47, 48); aptitude (John 3:21, 33); a willingness to do the proven will of God (John 7:17); knowledge of catechetical doctrines of faith and good works (Heb. 5: 12-14); cognition of biblical languages (1 Cor. 14:5); faith in Scripture as most harmoniously and beautifully consentaneous with itself (Augustine, *epistola ad Hieronymum*). The means required in the meditation of Scripture are the assiduous reading and investigating of Scripture (Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, II.vii-viii); the inspection of the Hebrew language in the Old Testament and of the Greek language in the New Testament (Hilary, *Enarrationes in Psal.* 118; Jerome, *epistola ad Suniam*); the perpetual collimation toward the *finis* and *scopus* of the whole Scripture, Jesus Christ our Lord (John 5:39, Acts 3:18, Rom. 10:4); the observation of the differences between the law and the gospel; the investigation of the sense of Scripture and its use in proper order and legitimate method (Augustine, *De verbis Domini*, ii, xxiv; Hilary, *De trinitate*, iv, ix); the consideration of expression (Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, II.x, III.v-vi, x); the comparison of one place with other parallel and similar places, and of the obscure with the clear places on the same subject (Origen, *Matt.* 14; Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, III.xx; idem., *De unitate ecclesiae*, v, xvi; Basil, *Regul. Contract.* 267); collation of the text to be explained with other dissimilar texts (Augustine, *De verbis Domini*, ii); the restriction of inventing new theological words to use Scripture (Deut. 4:2);

⁴⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 684-691.

the examination of interpretation if it may agree with the analogy of faith and the truth of primary doctrines, like the Creed of Apostles or the Decalogue (Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, XV.vii); the exercise of an understanding of Scripture by conference (1. Cor. 14: 29-33); the knowledge of arts and disciplines, first of all, grammar, rhetoric, dialectic, and physics (Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, II.xxx-xxxii).⁴⁶

The order and method of interpretation, according to Polanus, is triplex: “The first thing is the consideration of the intention; the second, of the theme from which it is urged; the third, of the arguments by which the theme is explained or confirmed, along with the circumstances, truly, persons, context, place, time, antecedents and consequences.”⁴⁷

The necessary means after meditation on Scripture are the gratitude toward God and the declaration of grace in action toward God; the repetition and rumination of lecturing the audience from Scripture and its interpretation; the communication of salvific truth in the meditation of Scripture; the translation of the meditated Scripture to our life.⁴⁸

What are contrary to the revealed means are, in the first order, the wisdom and prudence of flesh, natural lack of discernment, impiety, boredom and fastidiousness of truth and Scripture, unteachableness on account of prejudice, neglect of divine will,

⁴⁶ In this regard, Faulenbach argues that “with the approval of grammar, rhetoric and logic for the explanation of theological meaning and things, especially as applied in the exegesis, the natural cognition of reason and its logical method penetrate into the theology....Rationalism has penetrated into the whole theological system of teaching in the period leading up to Polanus.” Faulenbach’s argument ignores Polanus’s assumption that the firm persuasion about the true and solid sense of Scripture and its use given by the Triune God takes the first place for the invention of the true meaning of Scripture. More importantly, Faulenbach’s argument confuses the use of linguistic tools and general knowledge with rationalism. Cf. Heiner Faulenbach, *Die Struktur der Theologie des Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf* (Zurich: EVZ Verlag, 1967), 280.

⁴⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 689: “Ordo & methodus in sensu & usu investigando. Prima enim consideratio est propositi, secunda thematis de quo agitur, tertia argumentorum quibus thema explicatur aut confirmatur, simul circumstantiarum, nempe, personarum, occasionis, loci, temporis antecedentium & consequentium.”

⁴⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 692-693.

ignorance of catechism and primary religious doctrines, unfamiliarity with biblical languages, and doubt of scriptural truth. Those things which are contrary to the means in the second order are negligence in reading and scrutinizing Scripture, neglect of Hebrew and Greek fonts, ignorance of Christ, nescience of the law-gospel distinction, neglect of order in meditation on Scripture, ignorance of significance and acceptance of expression, omission of the collation of the similar places, neglect of the *analogia fidei* in investigating the meaning and use of Scripture, innovation of expression, ignorance of arts and disciplines, disregard of dissimilar places, arrogance, omission of repetition and rumination of reading or listening, and disobedience.⁴⁹

In answer to the seventh question about the source from which the scriptural interpretation and judgment of controversial interpretations are sought, Polanus suggests a series of reasons for the exercise of judgment by God from Scripture itself (*a Deo ex ipsa Scriptura*), but not by the universal church, ecclesiastical fathers and doctors, councils, Roman pontiffs, or any received nor current tradition.⁵⁰ The first reason is that the interpretation of Scripture must be sought in “the most splendidly and most manifestly divine things (*res divinas*) of all,” that is, in the things or materials of Scripture itself. Polanus’s use of the term *res divinas* reflects a standard distinction, looking back to

⁴⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 693-696.

⁵⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 697-699: “Scripturae interpretation, sive sensum spectes, sive unum, & dijudicatio interpretationum dogmatum q; religionis petenda est a Deo ex ipsa Scriptura: non autem ab Ecclesia Catholica, non ex Patribus & Doctoribus Ecclesiasticis, aut Conciliis, aut Romanis Pontificibus, aut consuetudine recepta & currente.... I. Quicquid omnium luculentissime & manifestissime res divinas exponit, inde Scripturae interpretatio petenda.... II. Quia ipsa Scriptura potest sapientem reddere hominem ad salutem. III. Quia Scripturae sensus est ipsa Scriptura: ut recte scripsit Jerome super epist. Ad Galatas; Non in verbis Scripturarum est Euangelium, sed in sensu: non in superficie, sed in medulla: non in sermonum foliis, sed in radice rationis. IV. Quia ipsa divino modo, cum sit θεόπνευστος, utilis est ad doctrinam & redargutionem...V. Quia Scriptura docet modum interpretandi seipsam....VI. Quia Scripturam esse interpretandam per Scripturam Patres affirmant.... VII. Quia Scripturam interpretati sunt per Scripturam Patres orthodoxi.”

Augustine, between a sign (*signum*) and the thing signified (*res significata*): the signs in Scripture being the words and, by extension, the immediate meanings of the words both of which consistently point, in Scripture, to divine things, namely, to the ultimate substance of the faith intended by God as the meaning to be understood by believers for the sake of salvation. This language is traceable to Augustin's *De doctrina christiana*, but was also mediated to Polanus by the medieval tradition, where perhaps the most notable meditation on the issue can be found in Aquinas.⁵¹ Second, it is Scripture itself that is able to make people wise unto salvation. Third, again reflecting the distinction between signs and things, "the meaning of Scripture is Scripture itself, as Jerome has correctly written on the epistle to the Galatians: the gospel does not reside in the words of Scripture but in its sense; not on the surface but in the marrow; not in the leaves of discourse but in the bottom of reason." Fourth, Scripture itself, inasmuch as it is divinely inspired, is useful to teaching of truth and disproof of errors in a divine manner. Fifth, Scripture alone can teach the manner of interpreting itself. The best manner, Polanus suggests, is that "the whole New Testament is the interpretation of the Old Testament (*totum Novum Testamentum est interpretatio Veteris Testamenti*)."⁵² Sixth, it is affirmed by the church fathers, like Clement (*Jus canonicum*, dist. 37), Irenaeus (*Adversus haereticos*, 63), Hilary (*De trinitate*, I.xxxii; *Enarrationes in Psal.* 125), Augustine (*De unitate ecclesiae*, v), and Chrysostom (*Genesin homilia*, xiii), that the most preferable way of biblical interpretation is *Scriptura sui ipsius*

⁵¹ Cf. Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, a1.i.10.

⁵² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 698.

interpretes.⁵³ Seventh, the orthodox fathers, in fact, interpreted Scripture by means of Scripture.

Polanus also gives two reasons that the universal church should not be considered as the supreme interpreter and judge in the interpretation of Scripture and judgment of interpretation. The first reason is that God's word teaches that the comprehension of Scripture must be obtained from God himself, but the catholic church is not God. Second, the catholic church, properly defined, is invisible to us in this life, for it is the union of all the elect and thus it is impossible (ἀδύναματος) to have the true interpretation of Scripture from such a church.⁵⁴ Here, Polanus argues a distinctly Protestant, even distinctly Reformed point, based on the traditional distinction between the invisible and the visible church: his Roman Catholic opponents would not, of course, accept the point inasmuch as they would certainly have identified the catholic church with the visible church, indeed, with the hierarchy of the visible church.

It is of importance to note that Polanus relativized the exegetical authority of tradition and the "pious" fathers, yet taking those fathers as *testes veritatis* in biblical interpretation. His main thesis is that, just as the catholic church and the church fathers are not the *principium* of truth, so any of them cannot be the norm and rule of true interpretation of Scripture and of judging all religious and doctrinal controversies. Polanus labors to prove this by making some theses on the limitation or weakness of the church fathers and even taking Bellarmine as a witness about this. Polanus, it should be noted, is

⁵³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 698-699.

⁵⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 699: "Ab Ecclesia vero Catholica tanquam summo interprete & iudice non est interpretatio Scripturae & dijudicatio interpretationum controversiarumq; religionis petenda, ut ex sequentibus argumentis patet."

an early formulator of these objections to the normative status of the fathers. The highly negative elements of his theses would be repeated in such later Reformed works as Jean Daillé's *Traicté de l'employ des saincte peres*.⁵⁵ First, the patristic expositions of a given scriptural text are diverse and sometimes contradictory to each other. Second, the church fathers seem, occasionally, to be even unfaithful to the true sense of Scripture. Third, they often contradict themselves. Because of this, Polanus questions how the consensus of all the church fathers could be the norm and standard of true scriptural interpretation. Fourth, the church fathers are even more obscure than Scripture. Fifth, not a few of patristic writings are spurious and corrupted by pontifical exculpators. Sixth, every word and deed of the church fathers must be measured by Scripture. Seventh, the ancient fathers themselves acknowledged that they were blind in many things of Scripture. Eighth, sometimes they did not discuss scriptures to a completely accurate degree. Ninth, some fathers, due to the ignorance of their ages and the excessive admiration and reverence people had for them, got carried into the sandbank of error and inconsiderate and absurd interpretations of Scripture. Tenth, some fathers thought and wrote in their youth so that they had to correct or retract their early writings, as Augustine's books of *Retractationes* testify. Eleventh, the patristic writings are read and accepted by us not always with discrimination and judgment. Twelfth, our adversaries, appealing to some fathers like Tertullian and Cyprian, make weird sound, accept nonsense as to Mass and purgatory, and dismiss some good thoughts. Thirteenth, the church fathers, in reality, do not satisfy the Roman Catholics, just as Bellarmine's controversies show.⁵⁶ Fourteenth, the scriptural

⁵⁵ Jean Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des saincte peres, pour le iugement des differends, qui sont auiourd'hui en la religion* (Geneva: Pierre Aubert, 1632).

⁵⁶ Robert Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei*, 116-119.

interpretation of the church fathers is not divine but human. Fifteenth, we have more benefit from one God the Father, Christ the supreme doctor of the church, and the Holy Spirit having the authority of interpretation in Scripture itself, who is the God of the church fathers, than we do from the Roman Catholics, all other church fathers and doctors, or even angels.⁵⁷ These fifteen theses illustrate several issues. They identify the Reformed approach to the fathers in its contrast to the Roman Catholic approach, they underline the primacy of Scripture as a doctrinal norm, and they serve to undermine Bellarmine's use of the fathers inasmuch as fathers could be cited as contrary to Roman Catholic positions on various doctrines. So much to the good, as far as Polanus is concerned. The theses also identify the problem confronting Reformed reception of the fathers as indicators of catholic orthodoxy. Given their errors and disagreements, the fathers could not be taken over uncritically and, as noted, Protestants were hardly inclined to engage in so-called reverent exposition. Appropriation of the fathers's theology would need to be selective and, as we will argue under the topic of Polanus's ecclesiology,⁵⁸ would require a way of

⁵⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 701-706: "I. Quia in Scriptura exponenda infinita pene varietate laborant....Scripturae dictum diversas Patrum expositiones adducit.... II. Quia saepe a vero sensu Scripturae aberrarunt.... III. Quia non raro secum ipsi pugnant.... IV. Quia Patres sunt obscuriores Scriptura, a qua illi lucem suis scriptis mutuuntur ut a Sole clarissimo.... V. Quia illorum scripta multa sunt supposititia, multa per Expurgatores Pontificios corrupta. VI. Quia de Patribus ipsismet ex Scriptura Sacra est judicandum.... VII. Quia Patres ipsimet fatentur se multa non intelligere in Scriptura.... VIII. Quia Patres saepe non admodum accurate sacras literas tractarunt.... IX. Quia non paucos patres, inscitia temporum & nimia admiratio atque reverentia quorundam ad Syrtis errorum & absurdas interpretationes Scripturae incogitantes advexit.... X. Quia Patres aliter juvenes, aliter senes multa & senserunt & scripserunt: ut testantur libri Retractionum Augustini. XI. Quia cum judicio & delectu a nobis sunt legendi & non ubiq; approbandi.... XII. Quia ex Patribus adversarii sonum, non sensum reddunt, & voces accipiunt, sententiam amittunt.... XIII. Quia Patres ne ipsis quidem Roman churchis satisfaciunt.... XIV. Quia Patrum interpretatio tantum humana est, non autem divina. XV. pluris merito est apud nos Dei unius tanquam Patris Patrum & Christi summi Doctoris Ecclesiae & Spiritus Sancti in Scriptura seipsum interpretantis autoritas, quam Papae aut aliorum Patrum Doctorumque omnium, aut etiam Angelorum."

⁵⁸ See below, 5.2.6 and 6.2.4

measuring the catholicity and orthodoxy of the fathers themselves and of identifying lines of the communication of that orthodoxy and catholicity through the tradition.

Polanus similarly gives a series of reasons the Reformed do not assume that the correct interpretation of Scripture arose from the general councils many of which were characteristic of the Reformation from Luther onward.⁵⁹ First, universal councils also made mistakes, for example, when the first council of Nicaea 1) condemned the soldiers who, professing the Christian faith, had returned to lawful military service, 2) made the law of penitence to cause many superstitions in the church and to obscure the merit of Christ, and 3) wanted the marriage of the clergy to be prohibited, though Paphnutius opposed it. Second, general councils dispute against each other, explaining Scripture in diverse ways. Third, there had been no ecumenical councils from the apostles to the first Nicene Council; meanwhile the church, nonetheless, might have the true sense of Scripture. Fourth, general councils themselves expound Scripture by Scripture itself. Fifth, general councils are unable to be celebrated too easily with the dubious meaning of Scripture.

In reply to the eighth question concerning the authority of scriptural interpretation, Polanus argues that, just as there are diverse interpretations, so there are diverse authorities. First of all, he, with reference to the self-authenticating character (αὐτόπιστος) of Scripture, asserts that “the authority of *divine* interpretation is as absolutely divine and canonical as that of Scripture.”⁶⁰ This authority must be purely (*simpliciter*) accepted as a

⁵⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 707: “I. Quia concilia etiam universalis errant.... II. Quia Concilia etiam generalia inter se pugnant, Scripturam diversi modo exponentia.... III. Quia Concilia Oecumenica post Apostolos usq; ad Concilium Nicenum primum nulla fuerunt.... IV. Quia Concilia generalia ipsa Scripturam ex Scriptura exposuerunt.... V. Quia Concilia generalia pro quocunq; dubio Scripturae sensu tam facile celebrari nequeunt.”

⁶⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 711: “Pro diversitate autorum interpretationis, divers est illius autoritas. Interpretationis divinae autoritas est divina prorsus & Canonica, ut ipsiusmet Scripturae Sacrae, cujus illa

part of Scripture and the first truth (*prima veritas*) by all without exception and condition of consensus with others. Otherwise, the authority of human or ecclesiastical interpretation is not divine or canonical. The catholic symbol of the ancient orthodox and universal church, the Apostle's Creed, must be named in doubt not by even a Christian because it surpasses all other ancient symbols and thus is their norm (*regula*), but still it is inferior to Scripture on the ground that it "almost consents (*fere constat*)" with the whole of scriptural truth.⁶¹ There is nothing other than Scripture which could be the immortal and universal norm of faith and truth (*immota etque universalis norma fidei & veritatis*), according to which everything must be judged or pronounced, trusted or relinquished, repudiated or condemned, as true or false and as orthodox or heretical.⁶²

The Roman Church's argument, Polanus points out, is that, as Moses was appointed as the supreme judge of interpreting the will of God (Exo. 18:26), so the pope was given the supremacy of judging biblical interpretation. Opposing it, Polanus explains that Moses was immediately instructed by God with the extraordinary calling but the pope was not. On the ground that "the scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses's seat (Matt. 23:2)," the Roman church claims that the pontiff could be the supreme interpreter of Scripture and judge of all religious controversies. In response, Polanus appeals to Augustine who interpreted this verse that, indeed, "it is God who teaches by means of them" but "if they will teach you

pars est. Proinde est ἀυτόπιστος, non indigens alterius testimonio, nec Angelorum nec hominum censurae subjecta: sed simpliciter tanquam prima veritas ab omnibus acceptanda, sine ulla exceptione & conditione consensu cum altero."

⁶¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 712: "Symbola Catholica universae veteris Ecclesiae orthodoxae a nemino vere Christiano in dubium vocanda. Symbolum Apostolicum aliis antecellit autoritate, quia fere totum Scripturae verbis constat, & aliis Symbolis antiquius, & eorundem regula est."

⁶² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 714. Polanus regards the Nicene Creed, Athanasian Creed, Constantinopolitan Creed, and Chalcedon Creed as having manifest consensus with Scripture (*Syntagma*, 712).

things of their own, and not the things that pertain to Christ” we should neither hear them nor follow their counsel.⁶³

Concerning Bellarmine’s understanding of “the keys of heavenly kingdom (Matt. 16:19)”⁶⁴ as the supreme authority of biblical interpretation, theological doctrine, and religious controversy, Polanus contends, again, much in accord with contemporary Reformed exegesis, first, that “the keys of heavenly kingdom” refers to a ministerial power of preaching the gospel and administering church disciplines, but not to a supreme authority of judging, and, second, that the pope is not the successor of Peter. The “papists” further argue that Christ gave Peter the supreme authority of scriptural interpretation and religious judgment by saying, “feed my sheep (Joh. 21:16).” Polanus’s short confutation is to reemphasize that this verse also refers not to the supreme authority of teaching, interpreting, and judging but to the ministerial office of serving all the Christians with all true doctrines of Christ.⁶⁵

Given that Peter exerted his leadership in the council of Jerusalem (Acts. 15:7), the Roman Catholics assert, Peter must be the supreme judge in any serious question of faith and the first Roman pontiff. Polanus’s response that respects the context of the text is threefold: first, it was not Peter but more probably (*probabilius*) James who might be “the first chief (*primus praeses*) of the Jerusalem council” because James finalized the council by declaring his thought at last; second, Peter might be “the first proposer of an opinion (*primus princeps sententiae*)” but not the first chief of the council; and third, given that

⁶³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 719-725; Augustine, *De sermone Domini in monte*, in *PL* 34, cols. 1147-1149; idem, *In Joannis evangelium tractatus*, in *PL* 35, cols. 1730-1731.

⁶⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 722; Robert Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei*, III.v. [104].

⁶⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 725. Cf. Piscator, *Analysis logica evangelii secundum Mattheum*, Matt. 16:19 (247-248, 252).

James supported Peter's thought but did not follow him, James might be the first human judge of controversies in the time.⁶⁶

With appeal to Augustine, Jerome, and Tertullian, Bellarmine argues in his comment on Galatians 2:2 that Paul went to Jerusalem for Peter's confirmation of his gospel preached among the gentiles, and this implies Peter was the supreme judge of others' doctrines. In reply, Polanus agrees with him that whoever confirms others's doctrine with supreme authority would be the supreme judge. For him, moreover, some may confirm the doctrines, thoughts, and judgments of others, with a singular agreement as brothers, with a common vote as colleagues, or with the highest authority as a head or leader. But Bellarmine's argument, Polanus contends, is not found in that text which teaches nothing but Paul's intention of explaining his doctrines to the other apostles, like James, Cephas, and John, that they might see their doctrinal agreement.⁶⁷ Peter did not confirm the doctrine of Paul, and the church fathers quoted by Bellarmine did not ratify Peter's exclusive authority of approving Paul's gospel.

Bellarmino took 1. John 4:1 (δοκιμάζετε τὰ πνεύματα εἰ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν) as another example of the authoritative approval of others' doctrines and claims, with his analysis of Acts 15:28 (ἔδοξεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν) as the cooperation of the Holy Spirit and the apostles, that the pontiffs, with the Holy Spirit by whose direction

⁶⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 726-727; Robert Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei*, III.v. [105]; cf. Johannes Piscator, *Analysis logica libri S. Lucae qui inscribitur Acta Apostolorum* (London: Felix Kingston, 1597), Acts 15:7 (p. 153).

⁶⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 728-729; Robert Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei*, III.v. [105]. Indeed, Bellarmine is not supported by the fathers he quoted. Note Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, in *PL* 2, IV.iii [cols.364-365], Jerome, *Epistola CXII, ad Augustinum*, in *PL* 22, cols.916-931; Augustine, *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, in *PL* 42, XXVIII.iv [cols.486-487].

they cannot err, were capable of affirming whether a spirit is true or not.⁶⁸ Rather than “test (δοκιμάζετε),” Polanus points out, “from God (ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ)” is more focal in the contextual meaning of the text, and whether any spirit is “ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ” should be vindicated “by reason of consistency and conformity with the divine Scripture (*ex convenientia & conformitate cum Scriptura divina*).” In addition, Acts 15:28 does not support Bellarmine for three reasons: first, he derives his general conclusion from the particular against the well proved scriptural standard; second, the apostles themselves in the council of Jerusalem examined and refuted the problematic opinions of the Pharisees, based on the view of Scripture as a touch-stone (*lydium lapidem*); third, the Roman pontiffs and councils, in reality, deny that we should discern only from Scripture with the Holy Spirit alone whether a spirit is from God.⁶⁹

4.2.2. Division and Interpretation of Text: An Example

After the presentation of hermeneutic theories and polemics against the Roman Catholics, Polanus provides an example of interpretation on Matthew 21:1-10 in his *Sylloge thesium theologiarum* that serves well as an illustration of his analytical, semi-Ramist approach to exegesis.⁷⁰ First, he separates the text into three parts: 1) narrative about the dispatch of two disciples by Christ to bring a donkey which he would use to enter Jerusalem; 2) doctrine, for which the Lord must go to Jerusalem, riding on a donkey; 3) narrative about the office and servitude of the disciples and the crowd around the Lord.

⁶⁸ Robert Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei*, III.v. [105].

⁶⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 731-735.

⁷⁰ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 85-103.

After this basic division of the text, he analyzes the first part with five arguments in the manner of questions: 1) when did Christ send his disciples to bring a donkey? 2) whom did the Lord send? 3) to which place were the disciples sent? 4) how did the Lord confer certain predictions to his disciples, not just finding a donkey tied there but also with her colt by her? 5) in what way did Christ send his disciples?

Having presented these five structural questions, Polanus moves on to their explanations, again in a Ramist mode, emphasizing practical teaching or “use.” He applies the first argument to give a doctrine that there is a certain time for all things determined by the Lord from eternity. The second argument is related to the affirmation of Christ’s supreme power and authority, that is, there is no power or authority prior to the Lord. From this, we also learn that, in whatever manner Christ administers his kingdom, he does some works immediately by himself but he does other works mediately through his pious ministers. From the third argument, Polanus concludes that the Lord does not seek the splendor of the world but delights in the humble and that Jesus never disregards the feeble but would use them, clothing them with his grace and dignity. And the fourth argument is linked with the doctrine of Christ’s eternal divinity, that is, he knows all things not just in past and present but also in the future and in their absence, and besides their state. From this, Polanus further elicits the doctrine of the Trinity by saying that Christ, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, must be the true and eternal God. For the use of interpretation, he applies the doctrine of Christ’s omniscience to confirm us that, in order that we may avoid every kind of hypocrisy, we should walk before his omniscient eye sincerely with integrity. Polanus’s answer to the fifth question is that Christ sent his disciples with certain instructions or commands. From the command of untying and bringing the donkey and her

colt, Polanus elicits that Christ is the Lord of all things and has the sovereignty of using them by reason of his most divine choice (*sanctissimo arbitrio*), which is also supported by Matthew 28:18. And another doctrine drawn from the fifth argument is that there cannot be any injustice in Christ's command given to his disciples, because he should and would (*debit & voluit*) be free from the whole injustice. Its accommodation to use is that all the more superior and powerful who disregard Christ's supreme sovereignty over all creatures must be condemned. The other doctrine is that not just prescience but also power must be respected in Christ, both of which according to his divine freedom may be given to and also taken from those who have mortal souls. The hortative use of this doctrine follows that we should willingly provide to the poor whatever they need, listening to the voice "the Lord needs them."⁷¹

The second part of the biblical analysis of the text is to elucidate the reason for the Lord going to Jerusalem, riding on a donkey in its immediate contexts and its canonical relationships, the reason that is to accomplish the predictions (*vaticinia*) revealed by the prophets. From this, Polanus points out whatever Christ has done should not be suspected as if he casually (*temerarie*) undertook without any prophecy; Christ has satisfied all prophecies written of himself in the Old Testament; he is the highest surety of all the prophets' promises; Scripture requires to be fulfilled finally in Christ; Christ, as our origin and example, obeyed the Father and fulfilled the prophets, and we are thus responsible to lean on the obedience of Christ and devote ourselves to declaring our gratitude to him throughout our lives.⁷²

⁷¹ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 91.

⁷² Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 92.

The prediction of Christ's coming into Jerusalem is separated into four parts. First, it is the mandate of indicating the sons of Zion, that is, Christ's approach to the faithful. Second, the newness of Christ's coming (*adventus Christi novitas*) is added in the prediction. Polanus here points out that predictions in Scripture are not yet all accomplished, like those of the destruction of the antichrists, the conversion of the Jews to Christ, or the convulsion before the last day of the world. The third part concerns the goal of Christ's coming: Christ our king came unto us, as the origin of justice and salvation. As to the fourth part, Polanus tries to expound an ambiguous part of the text about an assistant cause of Christ's arrival at Jerusalem by basing it on other biblical testimonies (Mark. 11:7, Luke. 19:35, and John. 12:14-15). With reference to the linguistic character of Hebrew, he reasons that Matthew's expression of Christ sitting on the donkey and her colt (*sedens super asinam & pullum*) is a sort of enallage and diaeresis for "on the colt of the donkey (*super asinae pullum*)."⁷³ From this, Polanus produces four doctrinal theses: 1) Christ is the king of peace, and his kingdom does not begin in a military form of horses and chariots, but by a donkey; 2) Christ, building the spiritual kingdom, is far away from the pomp and arrogance of the world; 3) his ministers, admonished from his example, may also avoid the splendor and ambition of the world; 4) as Bernard rightly said, the glory of Christ's kingdom is changed into the disgrace of worldly pride by those who identify themselves with the vicars of Christ, the successors of apostles, and the pillar of Christ's kingdom.⁷⁴ This citation of Bernard exemplifies one of several patterns of polemical citation. Here, unlike the places where the cited text directly confirms Polanus's theological argument,

⁷³ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 94.

⁷⁴ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 94-95; Bernard of Clairvaux, *De consideratione ad Eugenium*, in *PL* 182, cols.775-776.

Bernard's intention was not to undermine church authority but rather to admonish Pope Eugenius, who was a fairly close colleague, to proper humility in his station. Polanus's hermeneutic concern next moves into the analysis of a term *rex* in a double way: its general meaning is one in which Christ guides and governs all things in the universal; and its special meaning is one in which he reigns over his church particularly as its head.

Polanus's polemic application of this analysis is directed against the Roman papacy in that the Roman popes or clerics should be neither imitators nor, more definitely, successors of Christ.

In the third practical part of interpretation, Polanus emphasizes the office and servitude of the disciples and the crowd toward Christ, that is, the declaration of him in life, and makes some arguments with the accommodation of each to use. The first argument is that they were fashioned by Christ's command, changed, took up this path, and journeyed into the place where Christ sent them. From this argument, Polanus derives some admonitions: our eager and willing adhesion to the narrow path of Christ, the craven dispersion of the disciples after the death of Christ, and our dutiful office to go, for the sake of the gospel, toward the sacred audiences who are the afflicted, the exiled, and the incarcerated. The second argument is that the disciples took action as Jesus had commanded them. This argument is used in two ways: whatever the Lord commands should be done and spoken; and those who serve fraudulently or differently from the precepts of Christ must sin, making trouble. The third argument is that the disciples brought the donkey and its colt, which does not prove their insanity but shows a typical example of the faithfulness of Christ's servants. The fourth argument is that the disciples put their garments upon the donkey, teaching us to devote our whole person to the glory of

Christ. As for the fifth argument, the position of Christ upon (*super*) the garments teaches that we have to use our faculties for the Lord who gave them to us.

A close investigation of Polanus's commentaries with their logical and theological analysis on individual books of the Old Testament shows that the philological studies of words and textual criticism by comparative observations of the several versions of Scripture are rigorously exerted as the elementary task in biblical exegesis.⁷⁵ His biblical exegesis, as Burnett well summarizes, shows the threefold approach of interpretation, analysis, and application, that is, beginning "with a philological explanation of the text, followed by a longer logical analysis that identified theme and arguments and concluded with a discussion of the practical application."⁷⁶ Still, as is clear from an examination of his commentaries, Polanus also had a deep interest in the tradition, notably in the interpretations of the church fathers. As a Hebraist, he would also evidence interest in medieval Jewish exegesis.

4.3. Biblical Commentaries

Before he gained his fame as a dogmatician in producing the *Syntagma*, Polanus began his theological career as a biblical professor of the Old Testament and as an exegete published some biblical commentaries on the books of Malachi (1597), Daniel (1599), Hosea (1601), and Ezekiel (1608), generally based on lectures he gave between 1596 and

⁷⁵ Cf. Faulenbach, *Die Struktur der Theologie des Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf*, 39-44.

⁷⁶ Amy N. Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation: Ministers and Their Message in Basel, 1529-1629* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 142.

1608.⁷⁷ It is also significant that the genre of his commentaries, briefly speaking, is textual, linguistic, critical, logical, but also theological exegesis, including the derivation of *loci* and *aphorismi* from the text. In effect, Polanus's exegetical efforts were a blending of fairly standard elements of early modern, Renaissance and Reformation methods with a more specifically Ramist model of analysis.

4.3.1. Commentary on Malachi (1597)

The publication of his first commentary on the book of Malachi, which originated from his lecture series given in Geneva, was motivated by his practical diagnosis of the religious climate in his day; Many people individually suffered spiritual indignities and they were driven to madness and miserable despair by the wide-spread desolation and the overwhelming ruin of warfare; this was fundamentally the result of their rebellion against God and his glory.⁷⁸ The book of Malachi, for Polanus, is the sacred document most illustrating the social and religious situation of his day by repeatedly indicating the sins of priests and people and the severe punishments because of their sins. Not just exposing sins and gloomy prospects, the prophet also demonstrates that we must follow Christ, the healing light of the dark world, who is depicted more gloriously in the apostolic writings. This awareness of reality in his present world is the reason that Polanus, when requested

⁷⁷ Amandus Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachiae, aliquot praelectionibus Genevae proposita* (Basel: Waldkirch, 1597); idem, *In Daniele prophetam visionum amplitudine...Commentarius* (Basel: Waldkirch, 1599); idem, *Analysis libri Hoseae prophetae* (Basel: Waldkirch, 1601); idem, *In librum prophetiarum Ezechielis commentarii* (Basel: Waldkirch, 1608).

⁷⁸ Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachiae*, epistola.

by Beza to give lectures in Genevan theological school, did “not flee from his authority” and chose the book of Malachi.⁷⁹

In a short prolegomena prior to the interpretation of each verse, he presents his exegetical method by saying that he would like to examine and explain the book of Malachi “with a logical and theological analysis (*analisi logica & theologica*)” according to the grace that Christ has given to him.⁸⁰ Polanus’s description of his approach is of interest given its fairly obvious Ramist accents and his presentation of the lectures in Geneva, where Ramus was not welcome! The whole book, according Polanus, is structured with a pair Ramist of arguments and partitions, and the explanation of each verse is given in a consistent balance of *analysis* or *theoria* and *applicatio* or *usus* again, a Ramist accent. The argument of the whole book is this: Although the Jews corrupted the worship of God and their morality after their return to the city of Jerusalem from the Babylonian exile, they will finally return to God through the reconciliary mediation of Christ. In a material sense, the whole book is structured in two parts: inscription and oracle itself.

Pointed out in the inscription of the book (מִשָּׂא דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֶל־יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּיַד מְלָאכִי:), *Onus verbi Domini ad Israelin manu Malachiae Prophetiae* are four parts: burden (*onus*) as the subject of the book, Jehova as its principal efficient cause (*caussa efficiens princeps*), the whole people of Israel as its audience (*subiectum*), and the prophet Malachi as its

⁷⁹ Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetiae Malachiae*, 2-3: “Discamus a Propheta loquente: Praeceptum Iehovae purum, illustrans oculos. Lucerna pedibus meis verbum tuum, & lumen semitae meae. Sequamur Christum, qui est lux mundi, quam lucem qui sequitur, e tenebris omnibus emerget: sed Christum sequamur in Prophetis coruscantem, in Apostolis clare refulgentem. Haec caussa fuit, cur cum a reverendo viro Domino THEODORO BEZA Praeceptore & patre nostro, ac venerando fratrum collegio, quorum auctoritatem defugere nequaquam debui, a me postulatum esset, ut quandiu Dominus volet, Scholae Theologicae Genevensi operam aliquam navarem; cur, inquam, Prophetiae Malachiae libellum elegerim, quem *Analysi Logica & Theologica*, quatenus gratia Christi mihi largietur, retexerem & enarrarem.”

⁸⁰ Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetiae Malachiae*, 2-3.

administrative cause (*caussa administra*).⁸¹ The oracle may be divided into four parts: the wrath of God toward his people and priests for their serious sins, the threat of penalty due to the sins, the prophecy about the calling of the gentiles, and the exhortation for obedience and eagerness for the glory of God.

Polanus uses the Hebrew text of the book in careful comparison with the Vulgate and often provides a contemporary directly from the original Hebrew text, indicating the weakness of its rendering in the Vulgate. His translation is based primarily on the *Biblia sacra* (1581) edited by Tremellius, Junius, and Beza, but almost always without citation. In Malachi 1:3, for example, he points out that “Seir,” not found in the original Hebrew text, was later inserted in the Vulgate and he would translate לְתַנּוֹת מִדְּבַר into “draconibus deserti,” instead of “in dracones deserti” as found in the Vulgate.⁸² The translation of וּפִשְׁתֶּם, “saliētis” (Mal. 4:2) in the Vulgate, is replaced by him with “augescētis.”⁸³ Sometimes, Polanus provides his own translation from the original Hebrew text, differing from Tremellius’ *Biblia sacra*. For example, appealing to the Hebrew grammar of David Kimchi, Polanus translates the word נִדְבָּרוּ, rendered as “loquuti sunt” in the Vulgate and “frequenter praedicant alter apud alterum, dicentes” in the *Biblia sacra*, into “frequenter inter se dicunt, seu praedicant.”⁸⁴

Given his own rabbinic training, as evidenced by emphases on the original language, Hebrew grammar, and Aramaic paraphrase of the Malachi, Polanus frequently references

⁸¹ Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachiae*, 5-7.

⁸² Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachiae*, 9. Cf. Tremellius, Junius, and Beza, eds., *Testamenti veteris Biblia sacra* (Hanovia: Wechelus, 1596), Maleaci.

⁸³ Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachiae*, 152-153.

⁸⁴ Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachiae*, 149-150.

David Kimchi (יהמק דוד),⁸⁵ a medieval rabbi, biblical commentator, philosopher, and Hebrew grammarian; and the Targum Jonathan (לאיזוע ןב ןתנוי םוגרת), an Aramic translation or paraphrase of the Hebrew Bible written or compiled from the second temple period, largely reflecting the midrashic interpretation of the Tanakh.⁸⁶ On the one hand, Polanus finds some fault with Kimchi and the Targum. He notes that they clearly corrupted (*plane depravant*) the text of Malachi 1:11, specifically taking exception to Kimchi's explanation and the Targum, but reserving his most pointed critique for the Roman Catholic interpreters.⁸⁷ In the text of Malachi 1:10, Polanus criticizes the Targum for substituting a simple prohibition for an interrogative sentence which appeared to be a genuine form of its Hebrew text.⁸⁸ He also criticizes Kimchi for mistranslating Malachi 2:3 and for understanding Malachi 4:1-3 in an earthly manner (*terreno modo*) and ignoring its spiritually comprehensive understanding. On the other hand, Polanus could appeal to Kimchi and even his father, Joseph Kimchi, in order to confirm his proper interpretation of Malachi 1:12-14.⁸⁹ He also praises Kimchi by saying that he is more ingenuous (*magis ingenuus*) in the interpretation of Malachi 3:1 than the Vulgate or Targum.⁹⁰ Thus, Polanus's approach of biblical exegesis to the traditional medieval sources, especially

⁸⁵ Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachiae*, 86, 88, 91, 101, 103, 106, 112, 121, 131, 133, 150, 155.

⁸⁶ David Kimchi and the Targum Jonathan are the main sources for the *Mikraot Gedolot* (תולודג תוארקמ), Great Scriptures), which was published (1516-1517) by Daniel Bomberg in Venice and known as the first rabbinic Bible. This Bible contains the Hebrew text along with Onkelos and Rashi for Pentateuch, with Targum Jonathan and Kimchi's comments for the Prophets, and with both Targum and Kimchi for Psalms.

⁸⁷ Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachiae*, 90-92; Kimchi, *Commentarii Rabbi Daudis Kimchi* (Paris, 1557), 85.

⁸⁸ Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachiae*, 88; Kimchi, *Commentarii Rabbi Daudis Kimchi*, 85.

⁸⁹ Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachiae*, 100-103; Kimchi, *Commentarii Rabbi Daudis Kimchi*, 85.

⁹⁰ Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachiae*, 131; Kimchi, *Commentarii Rabbi Daudis Kimchi*, 94.

Kimchi and the Targum Jonathan, is quite eclectic or selective, and, interestingly, can show a preference for Jewish over Roman Catholic exegesis.

The character of Polanus's biblical exegesis, as shown in his commentary on Malachi, may also be called theological. This is well evidenced in his placement of a long theological discussion of predestination in between the analyses of Malachi 1:1-3 and 1:4-5. Notably, he devotes one third of the whole commentary to this discussion of predestination.⁹¹ This is grounded in the model of Paul who openly applied Malachi 1:2-3 to his discussion of eternal predestination in Romans 9. And "this verse," Polanus argues, "requires us to say something about predestination, suggesting the grace of Christ."⁹² It is remarkable for his doctrinal development of predestination that such doctrine was shortly discussed first in two pages of *Partitiones theologiae* (1590), exegetically developed in his commentary on Malachi 1:2-3 (1597), doctrinally matured in the *De aeterna dei praedestinatio* (1598), patristically justified in the *Symphonia catholica* (1607), and dogmatically completed in the *Syntagma theologiae christianae*, vol. 1 (1610). This pattern is characteristic of Polanus's doctrinal formulation. It is also noteworthy that Polanus tends, only if necessary, to call on patristic authority to verify his own translation of the original Hebrew word or phrase of Malachi but more actively to discuss theological theses.

⁹¹ From this, Faulenbach mistakenly concludes that "Polanus can superbly develop the whole theological doctrine from one single verse because each book holds the sum of Scripture in it." See Heiner Faulenbach, *Die Struktur der Theologie des Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf* (Zürich: EVZ-Verlag, 1967), 42. Faulenbach's claims indicate his failure of the locus method on the early modern biblical commentary.

⁹² Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachiae*, 13: "Nam in persona Iacobi specimen electionis: in persona vero Esavi reiectionis exemplum propositum nobis fuit, auctore Paulo, qui Rom. 9. hunc locum ad aeternae Praedestinationis arcanum aperte accommodat. Postulat igitur hic locus, ut suggerente gratia Christi aliquid de Praedestinatione dicamus."

4.3.2. Commentary on Daniel (1600)

If Polanus's Ramist approach to Malachi stood in contrast to the methods favored in Geneva where his lectures on the book had been delivered, it is also the case that his equally Ramist approach to the book of Daniel stood in contrast, although with less likelihood of opposition, to the methods that had earlier been favored in Basel, where his mentor, Grynaeus, had published his exposition of Daniel just over a decade earlier.⁹³ Quite in contrast to Grynaeus almost exclusively theological approach, Polanus insists that erudition in diverse languages is necessary to properly understand and expound the book of Daniel. The reason is that Daniel requires the knowledge of Hebrew and Chaldean languages; he uses Aramaic languages and sings the prediction of the future which no one is able to explain without having the knowledge of Hebrew, Chaldean, Median, Persian, Greek, Macedonian, Egyptian, Syrian, and other languages of ancient Rome.⁹⁴ Regardless of linguistic ability, he acknowledges that grasping the true sense of prophecy takes the first place (*locum primum*) among all the difficult investigations, and for such issues Polanus appeals to those who are expert with mysterious things and ancient people, as in the *Syntagma*, to the church fathers and his immediate predecessors, like Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Sleidanus, Lucidus, Funccius (Funck), Onuphrius (Onofrio Panvinio), and Geredus Mercator. Sometimes, for the amplitude and dignity of prophetic history, Polanus recommends reading the historical works of Ostatus Vasco, Andreas Frankebergerus, and Matthaeus Dresserus. Concerning a historical method of exegesis, Polanus owes a great

⁹³ J. J. Grynaeus, *Explanatio Danielis V primorum capitum* (Basel: Sebastian Henricpetrus, 1587).

⁹⁴ Polanus, *In Danielem Prophetam*, oratio de Danielis prophetae libro magnificiendo: "Id autem difficile, maxime in hoc Propheta, qui linguae Hebraeae, Chaldaeaeque, notitiam requirit, ut qui dimidia ex parte Aramaeo sit usus sermone; qui futurorum praedictiones cecinerit tales, quas nemo, nisi Judaeicae, Chaldaicae, Medicae, Persicae, Graecae, Macedonicae, Aegyptiae, Syriacae, Romanae denique antiquitatis gnarus, valeat enarrare."

deal to Johannes Bodinus, Immanuel Tremellius, and Franciscus Junius.⁹⁵ With great interest in the theological and political history of Christianity, he also enumerates not only the bad rulers who mistreated God's people and the erroneous biblical exegetes who perverted the gospel of Christ, but also the pious who rightly expounded Scripture, properly instructed the people of God, withstood the heresies of Roman pontiffs, or were persecuted by doing so.⁹⁶

To textually establish the whole book (*totum librum*) of Daniel the great portion of which, in Polanus's view, had been corrupted by various rabbinic editors and commentators (Schelomo Jarchi, Levi ben Gershon, Aben Ezra, Saadja, Mosche Alschich, and Barbinel), Polanus consulted the church fathers (Jerome, Theodoret, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine), the medieval doctors (the authors of *Glossa ordinaria*, Nicholas of Lyra, and Hugo of Cher), and the Protestants of the Reformation and post-Reformation eras (Luther, Melanchthon, Oecolampadius, Pellican, Bullinger, Calvin, Tremellius, Junius, Grynaeus, and Rollock).⁹⁷ This recourcing stands in contrast to Grynaeus's Daniel commentary, which did not work to establish the text, but rested on extant translations.

⁹⁵ Polanus, *In Danielem Prophetam*, oratio de Danielis prophetae libro magnificiendo: "Regnorum illorum quorum imago Nebucadnetzari Magno in somnijs oblata, quartum, praestantissimi Interpretes antiqui, & recentes, Martinus Lutherus, Melanchthon, Calvinus, Sleidanus, Lucidus, Funcius, Onuphrius, Gerardus Mercator, rerum divinarum & antiquitatis homines valde periti, de Romanorum Monarchia intellexerunt...Ex iis Johannes Bodinus, qui sex de Republ. libros & Methodum Historicam conscripsit, Romanum Imperium denotari negat: Ei vehementer obsistunt Ostatus Vasco, & Andreas Frankebergerus Saxo, qui Augusto Saxoniae Duci ligrum de amplitudine & excellenti Historiae Propheticae dignitate nuncupavit, & Dresserus in Oratione de 4. Monarchijs. Eidem Bodino tamen Immanuel Tremellius & Franciscus Junius, Deus bone, quanti viri! assentiuntur, quibus & Germani multi, & Angli, & Scoti suffragantur."

⁹⁶ See Polanus, *In Danielem Prophetam*, 346-354.

⁹⁷ Polanus, *In Danielem Prophetam*, epistola, a2 and 3-6.

As for the veracity of the history told in the book of Daniel, he points out that it was rightly and truly (*recte vereque*) attested by the profane histories, that of Dionysius Halicarnasseus in particular, and yet argues that the history is much more splendid (*multo luculentius*) in Daniel than in any of pagan historians.⁹⁸ Thus, Polanus does not prefer any other sources to the scriptural text itself to show the historical veracity of the Daniel narrative, reflecting his conviction that Scripture alone is by itself worthy to be trusted (ἀυτόπιστος), not appealing to any other testimony of either angels or humans.⁹⁹ Yet, Polanus does not fail to indicate that some ancient rabbis generally acknowledged the book of Daniel to be canonical and authentic to confirm the points of faith as appeared among their תנ"ך or ἀγιογράφα.¹⁰⁰ Here, again, Polanus's work contrasts with that of Grynaeus.

The body of this commentary begins, as with an *argumentum* in the book of Malachi, with the prolegomena in the book of Daniel where Polanus, perhaps echoing Grynaeus, deals with the fourfold cause and scopus of the book. The Triune God, the archetypal author of supreme authority (ἀρχέτυπος ἀυθέντης), is its principal efficient cause, while Daniel is its administrative cause.¹⁰¹ The matter of the book in which the things are pronounced is mentioned in terms of two (*rebus & sermone*): the things are divine and breathing the heavenly majesty, with nothing human and no fraud involved or added, and the words are divinely inspired and written in Hebrew and Chaldean. The form of the book is disposition consisting partly in the story of things as they occurred in Judea and Babylon

⁹⁸ Note Polanus, *In Danielem Prophetam*, oratio de Danielis prophetae libro magnificiando.

⁹⁹ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 269

¹⁰⁰ Also note John Mayer, *A Commentary upon All the Prophets Both Great and Small* (London, 1652), 515.

¹⁰¹ Polanus, *In Danielem Prophetam*, prolegomena, 1. Cf. Grynaeus, *Explanatio Danielis*, 2-11, where Grynaeus offers a full fourfold causal argument.

and partly in the prophecy of things that will occur in the future. And the *scopus* or goal of the book is twofold, as with all the other canonical books: the glory of God and the salvation of the church. Notably, Polanus's biblical exegesis has the same goal as his theological dogmatics, not a humanistic interpretation of texts, but a pursuit of God's glory and our salvation.

Polanus's commentary on the book of Daniel, as revealed in its title,¹⁰² may be adequately called an exegesis of logical and theological analysis, using the philological and dialectical tools of humanism and the Aristotelian-Ramist syntagma of logic. At the beginning of the exposition of each chapter, first of all, Polanus tends to present the readers with a short *argumentum* where he provides the analytical summary of the central issues talked about in each chapter. The general pattern for the interpretation of each verse is first to analyze the text by the textual comparison with several Latin translations, often followed by providing his own rendering, the analysis of syntactical and contextual meaning based on grammar, the scope and goal of the book, and furthermore the unified scope and goal of the whole canonical revelation of God. In Ramist fashion, he moves from analysis of the text to its use for the elicitation of doctrines and the praxis of the Christian's pious life.

A good example to illustrate Polanus's exegetical methods is his exposition of Daniel 4:27, starting with the suggestion of his own Latin translation, identical to the same text of Tremellius-Junius' *Biblia sacra*, but still removing one word *forte* from it: "Quapropter, o

¹⁰² The title of Polanus's commentary on Daniel is *In Danielem Prophetam visionum amplitudine difficillimum, vaticiniorum majestate augustissimum commentarius, in quo LOGICA ANALYSI ET THEOLOGICA tradadita in publicis praelectionibus in vetusta Basiliensi Academia totius libri ad hoc aevum calamitosum saluberrimi, genuinus sensus & multiplex usu ostenditur. cum triplici indice, vocum difficilium expositarum, rerum seu locorum communium explicatorum, & locorum sacrae scripturae a depravationibus, cum aliorum, tum in-primis Bellarmini vindicarorum.*

Rex, consilium meum placeat tibi: & peccata tua justitia abrumpe & iniquitates tuas gratia erga afflictos si [forte] erit prorogatio tranquillitati tuae.”¹⁰³ Appealing to the original Chaldean text, Polanus argues that “*eleemosynis redime*” in the Vulgate and “ἐν ἐλεημοσύναις λύτρωσαι” in the Septuagint are bad (*mala*) translations because its Chaldean word ܩܕܩܐ does not signify *eleemosysis* but *justitia*, and ܦܪܩܐ does not mean *redime* but *abrumpe*. Since ܩܪܐ refers to *gratia* and ܥܢܐ refers to *afflictos, misericordiis pauperum* in the Vulgate grounded in the Septuagint (ἐν οἰκτιρμοῖς πενήτων) is erroneous. With emphasis on the literal rendering, especially in terms of Scripture, he translates ܩܪܐ ܥܢܐ ܦܪܩܐ into *erit prorogatio tranquillitati tuae* and points out the wild paraphrases of the Vulgate (*ignoscet Deus delictis tuis*) and the Septuagint (ἔσται μακρόθυμος τοῖς παραπτώμασίν σου ὁ θεός) as departing far away from the original Chaldean text. Although ܩܪܐ must be rendered to *si*, however, Polanus does not criticize the Vulgate for translating it into *forsitan* because this translation would help the readers to understand the meaning of the text better.

After making the textual comparison of his translation based on the Chaldean text with the Latin Vulgate and the Greek Septuagint, Polanus analyzes the propositions of the text, “remove your sins by doing justice and iniquities by showing mercy to the afflicted,” and its *argumentum*, so that “there may be a prolonging of your tranquility.”¹⁰⁴ His detailed analysis proceeds to vindicate the verse from its abuse by exposing its true meaning and demonstrating its proper use.

¹⁰³ Polanus, *In Daniele Prophetam*, 195. Cf. Tremellius, Junius, and Beza, *Prophetici libri omnes in Biblia sacra*, 210.

¹⁰⁴ Polanus, *In Daniele Prophetam*, 196.

Polanus indicates that the Roman Catholics abused this verse by confirming, based on it, not just human satisfaction for sin but also the uncertainty of God's grace as if Nebuchadnezzar could have been redeemed from his sins and iniquities by the human merit of doing justice and mercy. But Polanus presents in response the problem of the Vulgate's translation foreign to the Chaldean text and exerts, appealing to the rabbi Mardonchai Nathan, his philological erudition by suggesting that the verb פָּרַק has two significations: its primary meaning is *abrumpere* but its secondary is *eripere* or *salvum facere*. With reference to the exposition of the rabbis Shlomo ben Yitzchaki and David Kimchi about the term and to its usage in other scriptural texts, particularly Exodus 32:2, Polanus confirms its primary meaning to be more appropriate, also in light of its literary context of Daniel, and then he claims that the liberation from penalty or satisfaction for punishment, which is a meaning that the Roman Catholics alleged falsely and foolishly (*falso & inepte*), is signified neither in a Hebrew nor in a Chaldean language. Polanus also moves the grammatical problem of the Roman church's exegesis in that the noun צִדְקָה is not plural but singular. The Roman Church's claim, therefore, is rejected by the proper translation of the text. With regard to the uncertainty of God's grace wrongly grounded in the rendering of לֵךְ into *forsitan*, Polanus insists on the hermeneutic defect of the Roman Church by pointing out that the adverb *forsitan* is not to be taken for doubt in persuasion and exhortation but serves as erecting hope and enlivening trust in the prolonging of tranquil state as a result of obedience. He adds, following the rule of *collatio locorum*, that this analysis is verified by other biblical testimonies of Joshua 14:12 and 1 Samuel 14:7.

After vindicating the text from its abuse, Polanus labors to accommodate the exegetical result to the elicitation of *loci communes*. Here Polanus's short *loci communes*,

set under the seemingly Ramistic rubric of *usus*, are quite in accord with the general methods of the era. Zanchi, for example, had inserted short *loci* into his exegesis and Grynaeus had done much the same thing, including in his exposition of Daniel, in the form of aphorisms: the practice be understood as distinctively Ramist, although Ramist exegetes certainly adopted it. Polanus's recourse to questions and responses throughout his exposition is also reminiscent of the more general practices of the era and is not particularly Ramistic. Polanus's first *locus communis* is that to make people keep moderation or humility (*tenere mediocritatem*) belongs to the ministry of the church.¹⁰⁵ The church must conduct to the sinner things through which the punishment due to their sins are imposed or threatened for them to be humble, just as Daniel did to a king of Babylon. But the ministry should not be done with inhumanity and pure harshness of intimidation or mitigation of flattery but with apparent indication of divine benevolence to lead the sinner into conversion (*resipiscentia*). The second *locus communis* is that this conversion consists in breaking off sins and exerting justice: the former is "to withdraw from evil and avoid sins and occasions of sins most rapidly and without procrastination," whereas the latter is "to do good with a living conscience before God and the righteous, exhibit grace and mercy to the poor, and most supremely fulfill the whole duty of love."¹⁰⁶ It is of interest to note that Polanus does not consider justice but in substantial association with grace, mercy and love. The third doctrine concerns a question of whether God's decree of punishing sins may be immutable. In response, Polanus says that, although the

¹⁰⁵ Polanus, *In Danielem Prophetam*, 197.

¹⁰⁶ Polanus, *In Danielem Prophetam*, 198.

divine wrath must be brought on account of sin, resipiscence is advantageous, since with resipiscence God is doing more benevolently and refrains from the rigidity of justice.

With regard to the patristic influence on Polanus's exegetical theology, it is notable that he actively consults with the church fathers in doctrinal and practical accommodation of exegetical results to *locus communis* and Christian life, for instance, in his interpretation of Daniel 9:24. As usual, he begins his exposition of the text by exerting the textual criticism through philological analysis and providing his own translation of the text in comparison to several ancient codices of Scripture. The second part of the text, "to finish the transgression, to make an end of sin, to make atonement for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal up the vision and prophecy and to anoint the most holy place," Polanus argues, is the prediction of what Christ would do for us.¹⁰⁷ This part also foretells that we should do what Christ has done for us through communion with Christ which requires our conformity to his image, but in a different mode and end (*alio modo & fine*), because Christ did so as our Mediator in the most perfect manner, most sacredly and irreproachably. In the fourth axiom, Polanus says that Christ incarnated and assumed human flesh "for us (*pro nobis*)," suffered and died "for us," ascended into heaven "for us," and now intercedes in heaven "for us,"¹⁰⁸ with appeal to the teaching of orthodox antiquity (*orthodoxa vetustas*), such as that found in Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Cyril, Ambrose, and Augustine.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁷ Polanus, *In Danielem Prophetam*, pars secundus, 183.

¹⁰⁸ Polanus, *In Danielem Prophetam*, pars secundus, 202.

¹⁰⁹ Justin Martyr, *Apologia prima*, in *PG* 6, cols. 423-424; idem, *Apologia secunda*, in *PG* 6, cols. 453-454; Irenaeus, *Contra haereses*, l.ix.3, in *PG* 7, cols. 541-542; Cyrillus, *Homilia diversiae*, x, in *PG* 77, cols. 1059-1060; Theodoretus, *Graecarum affectionum curatio*, in *PG* 83, cols. 1087-1088; Augustine, *Tractatus in Joannis evangelium cxxiv*, in *PL* 35, col. 1929; Ambrosius, *Expositio in psalmum cxviii*, in *PL* 15, col. 1252.

Thus, Polanus's interpretation of Daniel 4:27 evidences the humanistic loyalty of *ad fontes*, the vigorous consultation with the rabbinic sources for confirming the textual authenticity, the strong adhesion to the philological analysis of each text, the tendency toward the elicitation of doctrines from exegetical results of a given text and apologetic concern against the Roman Catholics and the practical emphasis on the ministry of the church through the right biblical interpretation and its accommodation to doctrinal issues. There are more notable characteristics of Polanus's exegesis of other places in the book of Daniel. He employs, for example, the Aristotelian fourfold causality as a useful method to elicit doctrinal theses from the exegetical result of Daniel 2:17-18,¹¹⁰ and compares the genuine uses to the abuses of biblical exegesis especially in Daniel 3:27 and 4:34-35, often using a rhetorical syllogism to clarify and refute the abuses,¹¹¹ with critical reference to Bellermine's doctrinal distortion of some exegetical results to advocate for the papacy.¹¹² Polanus also keeps in dialogue with the church fathers, for example, in his exegesis of Daniel 9:24. Given his commentary on Daniel, the character of Polanus's biblical interpretation is logical, doctrinal, apologetical, and, moreover, patristic. It is also observed that Polanus has increasing dependence on the church fathers and makes more rigorous use of them.

4.3.3. Commentary on Hosea (1601)

In the preface to his commentary on the book of Hosea, Polanus presupposes, with appeal to Basil the Great, that Scripture divinely inspired and handed down to the church

¹¹⁰ Polanus, *In Danielem Prophetam*, 77-78.

¹¹¹ Polanus, *In Danielem Prophetam*, 165-167, 205-212.

¹¹² Polanus, *In Danielem Prophetam*, 367-373, 380-382, 387-390.

through the prophets and apostles is the unique *principium* of theological approval and the supreme judge of all ecclesiastical disputes, and that both the Old and the New Testaments should be interpreted by expounding the true meaning of a text and its use in balance. As the method of teaching was used in the Reformed academies and thus absolutely in the commentary on Daniel, Polanus interprets the book of Hosea “with logical and theological analysis (*logica & theologica analysi*).”¹¹³

The motivation for Polanus to interpret the book of Hosea, as shown in his preface of this commentary, was his strong desire for the edification and resipiscence of the Reformed church, not just in Basel but also in other countries, such as Austria, Bohemia, Moravia, and Germany. Polanus identifies Israel described by Hosea not with the Roman Church but with the universal church. Using the authoritative voice of Gregory the Great who himself was a celebrated Roman pope, Polanus makes a theological thesis that Peter is not the rock upon which the church is established; Christ himself is that rock because Peter is also the one who must be and was edified upon this rock by Christ.¹¹⁴ This issue of Christ as rock will be discussed in more detail in the chapter five.

Prolegomena in analysis of this book concerns the authority of the book and its summary or argument. The divine and canonical authority of the book is testified by internal and external divine testimonies: the former is the inspiration of the Holy Spirit whereby to persuade the mind of the faithful, while the latter consists in the approval of Christ and apostles in Scripture itself, the consent with the divine norm of other prophets (especially Jer. 28:7), and the certain event which evidences that the predictions of Hosea

¹¹³ Amandus Polanus, *Analysis libri Hoseae prophetae* (Basel, 1601), praefatio, α3-α4.

¹¹⁴ Polanus, *Analysis libri Hoseae prophetae*, praefatio, α5-α6; Gregorius Magnus, *Commentarium in septem psalmos poenitentiales*, in *PL* 217, cols. 936.

must be revealed by God.¹¹⁵ There are two parts of the book: inscription or title and prophecy itself. The title of the book, יוֹתָם אֶתֶּזוּ יְחִזְקִיָּה מֶלֶכִי יְהוּדָה וּבִימֵי יַרְבְּעָם בֶּן-יֹאָשׁ מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל, discloses two things of introductory importance: two efficient causes (*causas efficientes duas*), principal (Jehova or the word of Jehova) and administrative (Hosea), and the time when the prophecy was made publicly known.

Hosea's prophecy for the Israelites or the content of the book is a severe reprehension for their idolatry which resulted in its due punishment and their consolation according to the most charming prediction and promise of their rescipiscence and Christ's reign.¹¹⁶

The general way in which Polanus interprets each verse of the book consists of three parts: the philological analysis of a given text basically with the collation of the original Hebrew and the Vulgate texts, the theological analysis in a logical form of invention and judgment, and the accommodation of the exegetical result to elicit common places and apply them to the Christian life. This hermeneutic pattern is most illustrated in his exegesis of Hosea 4:15-19.¹¹⁷

As in his commentary on Daniel, Polanus first distinguishes his mastery not just of biblical languages but also of other ancient languages, providing his own Latin translation of the text as grounded in *Biblia sacra* of Tremellius and Junius, certifying it in its Hebrew text and comparing it with other erroneous renderings. In the first part of verse 18 (*Refractarium est merum eorum*), he translates a Hebrew word קָר into "to be refractory (*refractarium esse*)," with critical reference to the very inappropriate (*valde aliens*) translation of both the Vulgate (*separatum est convivium eorum*) and the Septuagint

¹¹⁵ Polanus, *Analysis libri Hoseae prophetae*, 1-2.

¹¹⁶ Polanus, *Analysis libri Hoseae prophetae*, 4-5.

¹¹⁷ Polanus, *Analysis libri Hoseae prophetae*, 99-106.

(ἡρτίσεν χαναναίους), the latter being more deteriorative (*deterior*). Kimchi and the Chaldean paraphrase substitute סַר for the word שאבי that means “to stink or putrefy (*foetere* or *putrescere*),” while the Targum Jonathan uses סַר י instead of סַר.¹¹⁸ Polanus acknowledges that the word סַר, though having the proper meaning of *vinum merum*, may be also metonymically translated into *convivium*. Regarding a grammatical issue, he finds faults with the Vulgate in that the word סַר is an imperative mode of סַר and thus should be rendered into *afferte*, instead of its infinitive form *afferre* in the Vulgate, so that its personification may be preserved as it is in the Hebrew text.¹¹⁹ Thus, Polanus’s exegetical analysis reveals his prior interest in the grammatical and syntactical sense of the text, followed by taking its figurative and modified sense into account. It is worth noting that Polanus, in commentary on the book of Hosea, consults the Masoratic text, the Chaldean paraphrase, the Aramaic Targums, the rabbinic and Talmudic sources, the *Biblia sacra* of Tremellius and Junius, the Septuagint, and the Vulgate.¹²⁰ Also notably, Polanus’s frequent correction of the Vulgate does not mean his disregard of it.

Second, Polanus exerts a logical analysis of the text by formulating its content into several arguments based on God’s dissuasion of Judah from the imitation of and association with Israel’s vainest idolatry.¹²¹ As the spiritual sense resident in the text, the first argument is that the Israelites are refractory to Jehova. The second is that they will become plunder with none to rescue and spoil with none to restore. The third is that they

¹¹⁸ But in the same place of the Targum Jonathan, סַר י is not found but לִשׁ. See Alexander Sperber, ed., *The Latter Prophets according to Targum Jonathan, The Bible in Aramaic*, vol. 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1962), 393.

¹¹⁹ Polanus, *Analysis libri Hoseae*, 100-101.

¹²⁰ For Polanus’s use of those sources, note especially his *Analysis libri Hoseae prophetae*, 37, 72-73, 83, 86, 100, 106-107, 120-121, 152-153, 211, 251, 259, 265-266, 276, 295-296.

¹²¹ Polanus, *Analysis libri Hoseae prophetae*, 102-103.

will not be separated from idols as if they would enter into the most exacting and indissoluble association with them. The fourth is that the Israelites are devoted to drinking wine which, in a metonymical sense, renders them refractory to God and the eagerness of idolatry to be augmented in them. The fifth is that there are offerings (*munera*) that ought to be carried and given to God alone but they broke the just law of offering. The sixth is that they will quickly fall into an unexpected ignominy for their idolatry. Polanus makes these arguments from the text, also following the rule of the *collatio locorum* in that they are aligned in harmony with other biblical texts such as Genesis 28:19, Deuteronomy 6:13, 10:20, Joshua 4:20, 1 King 12:29, and Amos 4:4.

From these arguments, thirdly, Polanus elicits four *loci* with regard to the unified scope of the whole Scripture, concerning 1) not imitating the idolaters and avoiding association with them, 2) the consequent vacillation of the church, 3) prohibiting all kinds of oaths before and through idols, and 4) the office or duty of church ministers and magistrates.¹²² Notably, these *loci* are not merely theoretical but also very praxis-oriented. In short, Polanus's commentary on the book of Hosea, similar to that on the book of Daniel, illustrates the threefold scheme of exegesis, that is, philological investigation, logical analysis, and theological doctrine and its use in Christian life.

4.3.4. Commentary on Ezekiel (1608)

In the dedicatory letter of his commentary on the book of Ezekiel, Polanus begins with a general assumption that “the Hebrew tradition approves the difficulty of Ezekiel's prophecies.” Here the point he shares with Theodoret of Cyrus is that, with the explanation

¹²² Polanus, *Analysis libri Hoseae prophetae*, 103-105.

of obscurities and difficulties in Scripture, no one must lay any other foundation of the church except Christ who is already laid by the prophets and apostles.¹²³ Since several things in Scripture, indeed, may be regarded as obscure and difficult on account of the innate blindness of our mind (*ob nativam mentis nostrae caecitatem*) and thus they are not disclosed by themselves, we have to invoke in earnest the Father of lights to graciously reveal his wonderful and great things to us through the witnesses of other biblical texts. With this in mind, Polanus comments on the spiritual aspects of his exegetical method. He recognizes that “without divine grace” he would be incapable of his work and therefore “was in the habit of mingling prayers and vows in [his] study,” recognizing that God is “close to those who call on him.” Still, he does not confuse his own spiritual illumination with a special revelation: at the same time, Polanus notes that his method was one of collating passages of Scripture for the sake of having one passage aid in the interpretation of another.¹²⁴

Such an exegetical relying upon divine grace, for Polanus, does not necessarily entail any repugnance or conflict with his intense method of logical and theological analysis for the interpretation of Scripture, a method by which he attempts to recognize and expound even many unnatural things, the obscurity of visions, and other arduous things. In analyzing the book of Ezekiel, he notes, the weakness of subtlety and the firm cognition of

¹²³ Amandus Polanus, *In librum prophetiarum Ezechielis commentarii* (Basel, 1608), epistola, α2-α3; Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretatio in Ezechielis prophetiam*, in PG 81, cols. 807-816.

¹²⁴ Polanus, *In librum prophetiarum Ezechielis*, epistola, α3: “reipsa expertus sum, nihil me sine divina gratia praestare posse. Proinde his studiis miscere preces & vota solebam, & fretus promissione Dei qui invocantibus se propinquum se fore dixit, humiliter collatis locis Scripturarum aliis dulcissima Sancti Spiritus eruere sensa studio habui. Non profiteor me lucem oraculis & visionibus divinis intulisse...sed radiis divinae lucis ex oraculis & visionibus Prophetis collustari animum meum desideravi & gavisus sum.”

unintelligibility frightened him away from undertaking this task, but he began with the guidance of Christ, the great leader and supporter of biblical exegetes.

As in other biblical commentaries, Polanus separates the commentary on Ezekiel into prolegomena and body. Prolegomena deals with the causes and difficulties of Ezekiel, as well as with the summary and partition of the whole book. The principal efficient cause of the book, just as for all other prophets, is Jehova and the Holy Spirit, who is the author and inspirator of Ezekiel, as already affirmed by the patristic voice of Augustine¹²⁵ and most firmly verified by the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit and the threefold external testimony of Scripture itself, the wonderful harmony with all other prophetic writings, and the events predicted by the inspired mouth of Ezekiel from God. Polanus, though well aware of the argument that Ezekiel wrote other books as rooted in the testimonies of Athanasius and Josephus, declares that we know only one book to be found.¹²⁶ And he describes, following Clement of Alexandria, that the administrative cause of the book is Ezekiel himself, as revealed in its title *סֵפֶר יְהֵזְקִאל*, who is not Nazarus the Assyrian, a teacher of Pythagoras.¹²⁷ The preliminary (*προκαταρκτική*) cause or occasion of the prophecies in the book is the historical context of the prophet Ezekiel from 640 to 539 BC. The matter of those prophecies is divine, excellent, and admirable, concerning the mutation and subversion of earthly kingdoms and the edification, amplification, and state of Christ's kingdom. The form of the prophecies is a blend of some visions and some oracles, and

¹²⁵ Polanus, *In librum prophetiarum Ezechielis*, 1-2; Augustine, *Confessiones*, in *PL* 32, col.723.

¹²⁶ Polanus, *In librum prophetiarum Ezechielis*, 3; Athanasius, *Synopsis Scripturae sacrae*, in *PG* 28, col. 366; Flavius Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* (London: Wordsworth, 2006), X.v.

¹²⁷ Polanus, *In librum prophetiarum Ezechielis*, 3; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, in *PG* 8, cols. 775-776.

their twofold goal of them is, as usual, to restore the glory of God, as the principal goal, and the salvation of the church, as the subordinate one.¹²⁸

Then Polanus describes the exegetical difficulties of Ezekiel's prophecies resulting from a series of reasons: 1) the concealed and recondite meaning of visions, 2) the variety of histories since the study of the history of God's people requires previous awareness of Tyrian, Persian, Chaldean, Seleucid, Egyptian, Edomean, and Sidonian histories, 3) the obscurity of geographical references, and 4) the ambiguity of chronology in many places.¹²⁹

With the summary and partition of Ezekiel, he features the book as oracles that Jehova who has always cherished the church exhibited to Ezekiel with paternal love. The content of the book has two major components: prophecies of judgmental catastrophes imposed upon the unrepentant Israel vindicating their rebellion against God especially by listening to false prophets and practicing idolatry; and promises of the consolation of God's people mitigating the severity of divine judgment done by sentencing the righteous punishment of the church's enemies, and by confirming the restoration of God's people through bringing them back not only from corporeal captivity but also from spiritual bondage, a restoration manifested in the incarnate Son of God.¹³⁰

¹²⁸ Polanus, *In librum prophetiarum Ezechielis*, 4.

¹²⁹ Polanus, *In librum prophetiarum Ezechielis*, 5-6: "Causae difficultatis occurrunt istae: prima est visionum sensus abstrusus & occultus; unde ingens interpretationum differentia nata est. Secunda est historiarum varietas: nam praeter historiam populi Dei requiritur cognitio historiae monarchiarum plurimarum Chaldaeae, Persicae, Aegyptiae, Edomeae, Sidoniae, Tyriae, Selucidarum, &c. Tertia est Chorographiae obscuritas ob nomina Chorographis communibus ac maxime Gentilibus non ita usitata. Quarta est Chronologiae plurimis in locis ambiguitas."

¹³⁰ Polanus, *In librum prophetiarum Ezechielis*, 6.

As usual in his other biblical commentaries, Polanus, in interpretation of each chapter, first identifies the *scopus* or *argumentum* of the chapter and generally divides it into its summary and parts, concomitant with the triplex scheme of exegesis, philological interpretation or translation, logical analysis producing some theses and arguments, often followed by disputational dialogue in a pattern of objection and response, and the use of exegetical results for elicitation of doctrines (*loci communes*) and the Christian moral life. As for the hierarchy of authorities in interpreting difficult visions and obscure dreams, Polanus appeals the testimonies of more evident and better known scriptural places, the church fathers, the Reformers and the medieval doctors.

There are, however, some notable characteristics of this commentary on Ezekiel that are quite distinct from his other biblical commentaries. First, given that this commentary was written after the publication of his patristic dogmatic work, *Symphonia catholica* (1607), Polanus here quotes a greater number of the church fathers to testify to his exegesis.¹³¹ Second, he tends to exposit the later part of Ezekiel with great emphasis on ecclesiology, a doctrine that mainly deals with the renewal of the church including its foundation, office, ministry, reformation, amplification, perfection, and so forth.¹³² Third, the commentary on the book of Ezekiel proceeds in a chapter-by-chapter analysis from the twelfth chapter to the end. I do not offer his actual pattern of exegesis in interpreting a particular text of Ezekiel, because his pattern in this commentary is almost identical to those found in other commentaries as formerly shown.

¹³¹ Particularly note Polanus, *In librum prophetiarum Ezechielis commentarii*, 21-22, 46-54, 243-244, 729-733, 793-796.

¹³² The doctrine of the church takes a huge portion of the *In librum prophetiarum Ezechielis commentarii* (747-900).

In conclusion, examination of Polanus's rules of biblical interpretation and his biblical commentaries confirms that he is a representative of early orthodox-era pre-critical exegesis. First, his exegesis remains in accord with the Reformation conviction of *sola scriptura* in that he assumes the self-authenticating character of Scripture as the supreme norm of biblical exegesis. Second, Polanus maintains a literal, grammatical, and historical sense as the true, genuine, and unique meaning of Scripture, a meaning that refers to what is properly understood by the letter itself or by the words themselves according to the intention of the Holy Spirit. Third, the task of the biblical exegesis for Polanus is not undertaken in isolation but in consistent relation to the formulation of doctrine, theological system, and the life of the church as a whole. Fourth, in this vein, his exegetical method presents in general a threefold formula: 1) philological examination by means of the comparative studies on diverse ancient versions of Scripture and cognate languages, 2) logical and theological analysis by employing the use of right reason, and 3) the duplex accommodation of the exegetical results to the formulation of doctrine and practice in the life of individuals and the church. In addition, given that Scripture is *sui ipsius interpres* or *commentarium*, the obscure and ambiguous texts should be understood by collation of other clearer and more evident texts in Scripture, possibly in continuous dialogue with the best of the exegetical tradition from the catholic orthodox fathers, through the sound medieval doctors, up to other pious contemporaries. Finally, it is remarkable that Polanus's reception of the church fathers in his biblical exegesis is characterized by their major role as *testes veritatis*. The fathers serve to verify Polanus's philological, logical, theological, and practical interpretation of Scripture and to identify his relationship to the catholic

consensus of the fathers at the time that he affirmed *sola scriptura* as held by the Reformers.

Part Three: The Relation of *Symphonia* and *Syntagma*

Our inquiry into Polanus's reception of the church fathers in Part 2 was focused on his theological methodology and exegesis. In Part 3, I will examine Polanus's patristic theology as reflected in the *Symphonia* and its function in the formulation of his Reformed dogmatics as shown in the *Syntagma*.

Chapter Five: *Symphonia Catholica*

The focus of our analysis in this chapter is primarily on Polanus's patristic work clothed in the form of dogmatics, *Symphonia catholica* (1607), which has not been duly researched or evaluated.¹ Substantiated in this unresearched work is Polanus's passionate concern for the doctrinal identification of both orthodoxy and catholicity of the Reformed church. For this reason, the *Symphonia* does not provide a merely theoretical description of how to use the church fathers, how to deal with their authority, how to discern their authenticity, and what kinds of difficulties are met in dealing with them. Nor does it concern any biographical and synoptical description of the fathers and their works or literary history. Rather, it focuses on the doctrines, morals, and discipline in the writings of the fathers to establish that the teaching of Reformed church is truly orthodox and catholic. This character of the work, however, does not mean that Polanus disregarded or ignored

¹ A partial study of *Symphonia catholica* with regard to Polanus's quotation of Athanasius and Cyprian was recently undertaken by Aza Goudriaan in "Athanasius in Reformed Protestantism: Some Aspects of Reception History (1527-1607)," *Church History and Religious Culture* 90/2-3 (2010): 257-276 and "Cyprian's *De ecclesiae catholicae unitate*: Why Did Reformed Theologians Consider It a Useful Book (1559-1655)?" in *Cyprian of Carthage: Studies in His Life, Language and Thought*, eds., Henk Bakker, Paul van Geest, and Hans van Loon (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 225-241.

the general assumptions concerning the fathers that he shared with other Reformed orthodox of his day. An understanding of his approach to patristic theology, therefore, requires a contextual investigation against the patristic scholarship of the period when patristic writings were vigorously published and studied by both the Protestant orthodox and the Roman Catholics as part of their polemical and apologetic work. For this reason, our examination begins with drawing a contour of the patristic scholarship in the period of early orthodoxy, especially as it unfolded in his Reformed contemporaries like Daniel Tossanus, Abraham Scultetus, and Gaspard Laurent, and then deals with Polanus's patristic theology as revealed in the *Symphonia*.

5.1. Patristic Theology of Polanus's Reformed Contemporaries

5.1.1. Daniel Tossanus (1541-1602)

At the beginning of his *Synopsis de patribus*, Daniel Tossanus² presented two arguments representative of an extreme anti-traditional Protestantism: 1) it is enough for theology students to be thoroughly versed in sacred scriptures; 2) the voluminous works of the ancient fathers and medieval doctors, as a vast and fathomless ocean, should be avoided, given that they lead our mind to greater doubt and perplexity instead of light and knowledge in the understanding of Scripture. Tossanus, however, professor of theology at Heidelberg and an exegete who annotated on the whole of Scripture, criticized proponents of those arguments in the preface to his synopsis or compendium of how to read and use

² For a considerable biography and the work of Tossanus, see Friedrich Wilhelm Cuno, *Daniel Tossanus der Ältere, Professor der Theologie und Pastor 1541-1602* (Amsterdam: Scheffer, 1898).

the church fathers, *Synopsis de patribus* (1603), because of their superciliousness.³

Echoing a maxim of Cicero, he argued that to be ignorant of what already transpired in biblical interpretation was to be a child in biblical truth. The point was not mere rhetoric. Tossanus was in fact both critiquing extreme forms of Protestantism and answering the Roman Catholic complaint that Protestant theology has rejected the church's tradition and ceased to be catholic. He also, perhaps obliquely, entered the debate characteristic of the era, between those who argued the authority of antiquity and those who held for modernity, by arguing the case for a moderated respect for tradition.

The commemoration of antiquity and the enlargement of their examples confer not just delight but also authority and credit to faith and life. As witnessed in Irenaeus, the Heidelberg professor considered it to be an ancient and laudable custom (*tum vetus tum laudabilis consuetudo*) that, if any question arises in theological disputation, we should inquire into and fully recognize the judgment and consent of the earliest churches which stood in conversation with the doctrines of the apostles.⁴ Here again we encounter the Protestant version of what Oberman identified as the medieval Tradition I: Scripture and theology are understood as belonging to a context of churchly and therefore traditional interpretation. In the Protestant version of the model, Scripture and tradition are more separable than in the medieval version and tradition has become part of a structure of subordinate norms in which there can be disagreement and even error but which nonetheless have a relative authority.⁵

³ Daniel Tossanus, *Synopsis de patribus, sive praecipuis et vetus tioribus ecclesiae doctoribus, nec non de scholastici* (Heidelberg, 1603), praefatio, 5.

⁴ Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, in *PG* 7a, cols.855-857.

⁵ Cf. Muller, *PRRD*, 2:53, 75, 99, 295, 332.

Tossanus presents some necessary cautions in reading of the fathers similar to those that Polanus had in mind in the *Symphonia* and *Syntagma*.⁶ First, those who read the fathers without being well exercised in scriptures are like someone blind groping in darkness or sailing in a vast expanse of ocean without either the north-star or compass. Second, faith should be built only upon the apostolic and prophetic scriptures as the firmest foundation. Third, we should not imitate those who, without any exception, embrace and magnify all the writings and sayings of the fathers uncritically. The point he makes here is that we must discern the ages of the church and distinguish fathers from fathers, and even in the same father what is true from what is false, and what is authentic from what is erroneous, irreptitious, and inserted.⁷ We also have to inquire whether there is any need of reading the fathers and medieval doctors and what degree of authority we should attribute to them.⁸ In addition, Tossanus recommends that we reverence only those fathers who are commended “by purity of doctrine, innocency of life, and constancy in martyrdom (*doctrinae puritate, innocentia vitae, constantia in partyriis*)”⁹ which are the *criteria* whereby to discern who deserves to be called a “church father.”

Tossanus presents some rules by which we may discern the true antiquity and purity of the fathers. The first rule is that all antiquity and tradition that put aside the truth God taught us by his prophets and apostles is to be reckoned as nothing but “long-established

⁶ Tossanus, *Synopsis de patribus*, praefatio, 6.

⁷ Tossanus, *Synopsis de patribus*, praefatio, 6: “Ecclesiae tempora discernimus, & patres a patribus, & in uno & eodem patre, quae vera, quae falsa, quae authentica, quae irreptitia & e Monachis infarta sunt, distinguimus.”

⁸ Tossanus, *Synopsis de patribus*, 7.

⁹ Tossanus, *Synopsis de patribus*, praefatio, 7.

errors (*erroris vetustas*),” as Cyprian said.¹⁰ The second rule is that, since Scripture is perfect and provides the sufficient instruction of everything pertaining to our salvation and the full knowledge of the truth, our faith suffered in temptation finds rest only in the testimonies of Scripture, not in the patristic writings. Third, since the reading of the fathers may lead partly to the knowledge of church history and its direction and partly to the accommodation of many pious precepts and consolations to our faith and life, it is better to read them than not, according to the principle of Jerome, which is “to read the ancients, test everything, retain things that are good, and never retreat from the faith of the true catholic church.”¹¹ Fourth, although the fathers are truly catholic and praiseworthy, it is madness simply to accept all the sayings of the fathers, because the fathers themselves often contradict each other and often digress even from scriptural truth. For example, Augustine was not in agreement with Cyprian with regard to baptism by heretics; Tertullian, bewitched by the Montanists, wrote some treatises against the tenets of the church; and Lactantius was much addicted to the opinions of the Chiliasts and Platonists.¹²

Tossanus indicates the same problems in decisions of the general or universal councils. They have also often erred and those truths which had been well constituted by one council were sometimes overthrown by another council. A quite good example that

¹⁰ Tossanus, *Synopsis de patribus*, 8; Cyprianus, *Ad Pompeium contra epistolam Stephani de Haereticis baptizandis*, PL 3, col. 1134: “consuetudo sine veritate vetustas erroris est.”

¹¹ Tossanus, *Synopsis de patribus*, 11; Jerome, *Minerio et Alexandro, Opera omnia*, tom. 4 (Basel, 1516), fo. 89: “Quarum omne studium est, imo scientiae supercilium, aliena carpere, et sic veterum defendere perfidiam, ut perdant fidem suam. Meum propositum est antiquos legere, probare singula, retinere quae bona sunt, et a fide Ecclesiae Catholicae non recedere.”

¹² Tossanus, *Synopsis de patribus*, 12: “Quapropter Augustinus, cum objectus esset ei Cyprianus de Baptismo haereticorum, respondit, se non habere Cypriani epistolas pro Canonicis...Constat enim Cyprianum de Baptismo haereticorum dissensisse ab Ecclesia: Tertullianum fascinatam a Montanistis, contra Ecclesiam nonnullos tractatus scripsisse, ut de Monogamia: Lactantium & alios, tum Chiliastarum, tum Platoniorum opinionibus nimis fuisse deditos.”

Tossanus provides is the unbiblical sentence pronounced at the Nicene council against the marriage of priests – an obvious point of polemic with Rome.

Fifth, the corruption of theological doctrine occurred less in the time of the fathers who lived in the first 500 years after Christ than in the ages following, even though in the later period there were some who retained the apostolic doctrine on many points. Tossanus here builds on the assumption, present already among the Reformers, that there had been moments of decline in the life and teachings of the church, evidenced by a distinction between the earlier, better scholastics and the later problematic teachers. The earliest fathers produced purer doctrine, whereas later church fathers evidence a decline in relation to the truths of Scripture. Some ask what is to be done when doctrinal *loci* are produced by those first fathers which seem somewhat to confirm the opinions of the Roman Catholics or the errors of others, for example, prayer for the dead, the sacrifice of the mass, the free choice of human will, and the sinlessness of Mary. In this regard, Tossanus makes some arguments. First, the proof of such opinions must be derived from the scriptures, especially from Paul's regulation, "we can do nothing against the truth but all for the truth." Second, we should compare many places together. Third, we must consider how and *secundum quid* any one thing is spoken by the fathers. Fourth, we should distinguish authentic writings from the spurious and dubious ones.

With an initial distinction between the public and private writings of the fathers in the second part of the *Synopsis de patribus*, Tossanus asserts that the former includes the apostolic Creed, which is nearly (*fere*) in total agreement with scriptural words themselves (*totum ipsius scripturae verbis constat*) and thus has authority above all other creeds and confessions as "their fountain and norm (*fons & regula*)," two prior-Nicene provincial

councils (198 and 278 AD), and the four ecumenical councils (first Nicaea, first Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon).¹³

He applies the rules of reading the fathers to these four universal synods, making four arguments as follows. First, the reason for trust in these synods is not in themselves but in the scriptures that have never erred in things, words, and sentences and thus which alone are to be trusted because of themselves (*solis credi propter se*). Second, the certainty of the four synods and the decrees of faith produced in them do not consist in the authority of humans or conciliar places but in the perpetual consent of the whole church from the time of the apostles. Third, ecumenical councils have no power of making new articles of faith but only explain the ever-existent doctrines of faith with the authoritative aid of Scripture and propose them against heretics. Finally, given that the councils, even the ecumenical ones, have decreed some things partly pious and partly impious, they ought to be examined and searched, particularly concerning what in them agrees with the divine word and what does not.¹⁴

In his chapter on private patristic writings, Tossanus provides a biographical and literary survey of the fathers, dealing with four aspects of each father: a brief description of his life, an introduction of his writings, a distinction among them between some that are pious and authentic and others that are counterfeit and problematic, and his theological perspective. The life of Ambrose,¹⁵ for instance, included his being called to be a bishop of Milan with the full consent of the people and reportedly baptizing Augustine. His works are partly moral (especially concerning the offices of Christians, the institution of virginity,

¹³ Tossanus, *Synopsis de patribus*, 14-15.

¹⁴ Tossanus, *Synopsis de patribus*, 15-16.

¹⁵ Tossanus, *Synopsis de patribus*, 27-31.

widows, repentance, flight from the world, and the good we receive by death), and partly doctrinal (namely, writings on the vocation of the gentiles, faith, the Holy Spirit, faith against the Arians, and the sacrament).

According to Tossanus, the more learned argue that among Ambrose's writings the treatise on the calling of the gentiles was not authored by him for a number of reasons: 1) Ambrose did not speak anywhere purely of divine predestination; 2) he mentioned some Pelagians who lived after his death; 3) Augustine, who cited many things out of Ambrose, did not cite this book against the Pelagians; and 4) difference in style with other works of Ambrose.¹⁶ Tossanus, however, comments that the author of this writing, whoever he might have been, was a learned man who was deeply conversant with scriptures. As to the value of Ambrose's writings, Tossanus adds that Ambrose, by reason of his ignorance of the Greek and Hebrew tongues, erred often in his expositions. He adds that Ambrose, though vehement in commending virginity, was opposing the Roman Catholics who commanded virginity and compelled it by force, thereby distinguishing Ambrose's view from arguments for monasticism and celibacy. In Ambrose's writing on the sacraments, Tossanus points out, there are some ambiguous or superstitious things with regard to unction in baptism, and also to the issue of water being mixed with the wine in the cup at the Lord's Supper. Further, against the Roman Church's view, Ambrose may be argued to have acknowledged in the book only two sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper. In the disputation of how the bread is made the body of Christ, he did not imply transubstantiation but declared that there appeared a similitude only, and not true flesh and

¹⁶ Tossanus, *Synopsis de patribus*, 28.

blood, and that we must believe according to the word of Christ (*verbo Christi*) that the sacrament is taken outwardly, while grace and virtue are taken inwardly.

It is also worth noting that Tossanus deals with the medieval authors in his treatise on how to use the church fathers. The reason that they have been called “school teachers (*scholastici doctores*)” is that “they taught chiefly in school (*quod in scholis potissimum docerent*).”¹⁷ The doctrines of Augustine and his method of teaching were for the most part received till 1020 A.D. when “scholastic theology began to be inflamed and afterwards departed from its first simplicity and purity, on account of very useless and perplex questions full of philosophical sophistries, and also of definitions and sentences accommodated to the corruptions of those times.”¹⁸ Tossanus identifies Peter Lombard’s *Sententiae*, heavily dependent on the writings of the fathers, as “the foundation and compendium of the whole scholastic theology (*basin & compendium totius Scholasticae Theologiae*).” According to Tossanus, many necessary things are found in Lombard that, rightly understood and explained, may oppose the Roman Catholics, though Lombard tended to confirm Christian truths by the authority of the fathers rather than by scriptural testimonies. For those who would find some defects in Lombard, Tossanus advises them to read Lambert Daneau’s commentary on the *Sententiae*.¹⁹ Tossanus’s approach to patristic and medieval theology, characterized by both praise and censure, allowing for critical reception and use, is paralleled in Polanus’s approach to the tradition.

¹⁷ Tossanus, *Synopsis de patribus*, 37.

¹⁸ Tossanus, *Synopsis de patribus*, 39-40: “Ante magna ex parte viguerat doctrina Augustinij & ejus docendi ratio: sed sub annum 1020 Scholastica Theologia conflari caepit: quae ab illa puritate & simplicitate defecit ad inutiles & perplexas magna ex parte quaestiones, philosophicis argutiis plenas, ad definitiones & sententias, ad corruptelas illius temporis accommodatas.”

¹⁹ Cf. Lambert Daneau, *In Petri Lombardi Episcopi Parisiensis librum primum Sententiarum... Commentarius triplex* (Geneva: Eustathium Vignon, 1580).

5.1.2. Abraham Scultetus (1566-1625)

A close classmate of Polanus at Breslau and a student of Tossanus at Heidelberg,²⁰ Abraham Scultetus wrote a massive biographical and doctrinal work on patristic literature with the analytic and synthetic method, *Medullae patrum theologiae syntagma*, to vindicate the theology of the ancient fathers in the early church flourishing before and after the Nicene Council, with reference to the pontifical corruption, and to show that the Reformed church alone belonged to the antiquity of evangelical doctrine and truth.²¹ On the original intention of this work, however, Scultetus says in his autobiography that “I have analytically unraveled the books of the most ancient church fathers who flourished from the time of the apostles to that of the Nicene Council, and described the marrow of their theology, which was my *scopus*.”²²

²⁰ Cf. Samuel Clarke, *The Marrow of Ecclesiastical Historie* (London, 1650), 484-486; Gustav Adolf Benrath, *Die Selbstbiographie des Heidelberger Theologen und Hofpredigers Abraham Scultetus (1566-1624)* (Baden: Evangl. Presseverband Karlsruhe, 1966), 15-16, 110-111. In his letter to Johann Jacob Grynaeus, Scultetus said to him about Polanus that “Amandus was prosperous and loved by all good people.”

²¹ Note the full title of the work, *Medullae theologiae patrum syntagma, in quo theologia priscorum primitivae Ecclesiae doctorum, qui ante et post Concilium Nicaenum floruerunt, methodo analytica et synthetica expressa, atque a Roberti Bellarmini, Caesaris Baronii, Gregorii de Valentia, aliorumque pontificiorum corruptelis ita vindicatur, ut liquido appareat, penes solas reformatas ecclesias esse doctrinae et veritatis evangelicae antiquitatem, authore D. Abrahamo Sculteto* (Frankfurt: Haeredes Jonae Rhodii, 1634). The *Medulla* has not been paid due attention except by Irena D. Backus in “The Fathers and Calvinist Orthodoxy: Patristic Scholarship. The Bible and the Fathers according to Abraham Scultetus (1566-1624) and Andre Rivet (1571/73-1651): The Case of Basil of Caesarea,” in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. Irena D. Backus, vol. 2 (Boston and Leiden: Brill, 2001), 839-865; idem, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378-1615)* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 218-227.

²² Abraham Scultetus, *De cvrrievlo vitae, inprimis vero de actionibus pragensibus Abrah. Scvlteti* (Emda, 1625), 23: “Eodem tempore vetustissimorum Ecclesiae Patrum, qui a temporibus Apostolorum ad Concilium usque Nicenum floruerunt, Libros, Analytice retexui, & qui scopus meus erat, MEDULLAM Theologiae ipsorum inde expressi, quae aliquot annis post Ambergensis Chalcographi typis est descripta.” For the German translation of this work, see Gustav Adolf Benrath, *Die Selbstbiographie des Heidelberger Theologen und Hofpredigers Abraham Scultetus (1566-1624)* (Baden: Karlsruhe, 1966).

The *Medulla* consists of four parts which were published in 1598, 1605, 1609, and 1613, all of which were collected and printed in one volume in 1634.²³ As the writer of the preface to the first part of the *Medulla* (1598), David Pareus evaluates Scultetus as more important than other editors of patristic literature, such as Rhenanus, Gallasius, Vives, Danaeus, Elias, and Clichtovaeus, since Scultetus, with critical dexterity, exposes from the marrow (*medullitus*), illustrates, expounds, and vindicates in a small volume not just one father but the general multitude of all the Greek and Latin orthodox fathers who had worked in the early church from Christ to the Nicene council. He also describes their writings which had gone unread since that time.²⁴

The Greek and Latin fathers with whom Scultetus deals in all the four parts of the work are Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tatianus, Irenaeus, Theophilus Antiochenus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origenes Adamantius, Tertullianus, Cyprianus, Arnobius, Lactantius, Eusebius Pamphilus, Gregorius Nyssenus, Luciferus Calaritanus, Nemesius, Basilus Coetaneus, Macarius Aegyptius, Optatus Milevitanus, Basil the Great, Hilary, Foebadus, Didymus, and Marius Vintorinus. Scultetus devotes one whole book (*liber*) to the life and theology of a father, each book including a brief biographical description of the father, a doctrinal analysis of his writings, sometimes followed by the discussion of their literary authenticity (usually in the context of debate against Bellarmine and seen in the books of Gregory of Nyssa and Basil the Great), and the synthesis of his theology.

Scultetus argues that his age is a most wretched period of history, given that the exposition of patristic literature by Bellarmine and others has become depraved, distorted,

²³ See Benrath, "Bibliographie der Schriften Scultets," in *Die Selbstbiographie des Heidelberger Theologen und Hofpredigers Abraham Scultetus*, 131-143.

²⁴ Abraham Scultetus, *Medullae theologiae patrum* (1598), praefatio, fol. (:):4r.

and mutilated, for the sake of defending the errors of the Roman *curia* and vindicating the Roman Church's superstition.²⁵ Encouraged by his colleague Bartholomaeus Pitiscus to produce a proper analysis of the works and thought of the fathers,²⁶ Scultetus adopted a topical method, using logical analysis and aphorisms to counter the polemics of Bellarmine and the distortions of Baronius, Gregory of Valencia, and others. He argues that Bellarmine mistreats the patristic literature as follows. Bellarmine sometimes changes the significance of his source arbitrarily; he disturbs the word order by means of some new petty distinctions; if finding the text theologically disagreeable, he would accuse one and the same author, even one and the same book, of counterfeit, but, if favorable, he would quote it as worthy of faith; he converts the affirmed patristic thought into a thought which is to be denied and vice versa; he takes away secretly a context in the middle of a discourse as if the context were a violently made impression that was not held by the reasoning of antecedents and consequents; he has interest in those which has been never counted in a number of writings approved by faith, writings in which the genuine records of the fathers were contained; he tends to choose a "putrid" Latin edition of a Greek patristic source, if expedient to a pontifical cause, even in preference for its authentic Greek codex.²⁷

In contrast to the controversial method of Bellarmine, Scultetus suggests an approach employing "brief and evident aphorisms about the fruitful reading of the fathers."²⁸ By

²⁵ Scultetus, *Medullae*, epistola, fol.)(3v.

²⁶ Scultetus, *Medullae*, epistola, fol.)(3v: "Qua de re cum mecum annis abhinc septem contulisset spectatae pietatis & eruditionis vir Bartholomaeus Pitiscus Sereniss. Electoris Palatini Friderici IV. concionator, civis & Symmysta multis mihi nominibus honorand: facile mihi persuasit: ut, quod mihi literatum in Academia otio perfruenti, ab aliis Theologiae studiis reliquum esset temporis, id omne in lectionem Orthodoxorum priscae aetatis Scriptorum conferrem: & uno eodemq; labore ex iis tum de doctrinae sinceritate, tum de toto statu veteris Ecclesiae cognoscerem."

²⁷ Scultetus, *Medullae*, epistola, fol.)(3v.

²⁸ Scultetus, *Medullae*, aphorismi, fol. (:)1r.

way of instruction in the use of these aphorisms, Scultetus points out that an understanding of *loci communes* and a careful reading of the sacred writings are absolutely necessary for anyone who would devote himself to theological study. This approach not only conformed to the positive expository methods of the era—*loci communes*, analysis, and *aphorismi*—it also permitted Scultetus to counter the Roman polemics with an overtly positive didactic approach rather than a counter-polemic. We note also the affinities with Ramist method. Of enduring usefulness are the reading of the church fathers and the indefatigable consideration of ecclesiastical history. The title of “church fathers,” called “church doctors (*doctores ecclesiae*)” or “ecclesiastic writers (*ecclesiastici scriptores*)” in Scultetus’s time, may be ascribed to those Christians who lived from the apostolic time to the year 800 and interpreted Scripture and who for that reason were distinguished from the church doctors of following time who commented on Lombard and confused philosophy with theology, whence they acquired the name of scholastics.²⁹ The argument is more nuanced but substantially in accord with Tossanus.

The fundamental principle of legitimately discerning, properly presenting, and candidly judging the patristic literature, Scultetus asserts, is that, whereas Scripture was produced by God, the writings of the fathers originated with human beings. On this principle, he provides a series of rules about how to read and receive the church fathers. First, we believe in Scripture because of itself (*propter sese*), but we accept the patristic writings insofar as they are consentaneous with Scripture. Second, it is an impious act to

²⁹ Scultetus, *Medullae*, aphorismi, fol. (:)(1r: “Patres hodie vocantur Doctores Ecclesiae, qui a temporibus Apostolorum ad annum Christi octingentesimum vixerunt, & interpretati sunt Scripturam: unde & Ecclesiastici Scriptores dicuntur: atq; hac ratione a Doctoribus Ecclesiae subsequentium temporum distinguuntur, qui interpretati sunt Petrum Lombardum, & Philosophiam cum Theologia confuderunt, unde Scholasticorum nomen acquisiverunt.”

take us away from the manifest testimonies of Scripture into the writings of the church fathers. Third, the goals of reading the fathers and God's word must be distinct in that the former reinforces faith and inflames the pious to the true worship of God, while the latter produces faith. Fourth, the church fathers and their writings have as much authority as their agreement with Scripture.³⁰

Scultetus further argues that patristic writings are to be distinguished among themselves in terms of efficient causes, forms of teaching, matters, times, and different circumstances. The writings of the fathers, according to efficient causes, may be considered as genuine (*germana*), spurious (*supposititia*), or entirely dubious (*prorsus dubia*): some writings are genuine which are certainly attributed by the universal church or many to a specific author, while some writings are spurious which do not have the name of its author set in its front and are not written by the author.³¹ The causes of spuriousness are diverse according to its difference. Since certain people, whether with good or bad intentions, insert some fragments into the more ancient edition of a given work, the work must be rejected, still with consideration to the gradation of spuriousness.³²

³⁰ Scultetus, *Medullae*, aphorismi, fol. (:)(1r: "Discretio legitima est, qua lucubrationes Patrum a Scriptura sacra primum, deinde inter sese distinguuntur. A Scriptura sacra: ut animo Lector probe infixum habeat axioma hoc: Scripturam sacram a Deo, scripta Patrum ab hominibus profecta. Itaque. 1. Scripturae nos credere propter sese: Patrum scriptis propter consensum cum illa. 2. Nefas esse provocare a manifestis Scripturae testimoniis ab scripta Doctorum Ecclesiae. 3. Alio fine legenda esse scripta Patrum, alio verbum Dei. Hoc ut habeat in quo FIDES in tentationibus acquiescat: illa ut externo Doctorum Ecclesiae consensu internum Spiritus S. de veritate Evangelica testimonium roboret, historiam Ecclesiae cognoscat, piis sanctorum hominum exhortationibus ad verum Dei cultum inflammetur. 4. Tanto majoris scriptum quodq; vetus esse auctoritatis, quanto majorem habet cum Scriptura consensum."

³¹ Scultetus, *Medullae*, aphorismi, fol. (:)(2r: "Ratione causarum efficientium dupliciter. Primum enim quaedam causas efficientes sive autores suos prae se ferunt, & vel sunt germana illorum autorum scripta, vel supposititia, vel prorsus dubia. Germana sive γνήσια, sunt, quae ab universa Ecclesia aut pluribus certe non suspectis viris auctori tributa sunt: aequae perfecte talia sunt, vel interpolata a Monachis: id quod non paucis veterum libris contigit. Supposititia sunt, quae ab autore cujus nomen praefixum habent non sunt scripta. Sic toti saepe libri, nonnunquam fragmenta libris γνήσιος addita sunt supposititia."

³² Scultetus, *Medullae*, aphorismi, fol. (:)(2r.

And Scultetus suggests various methods to discern whether a patristic writing is spurious, namely, by means of its particular style, subject matter for discussion, and collation of times.³³ The pronouncement with respect to the particular style of the authority of patristic writings may be well illustrated in the example of Augustine who attributed to Cyprian a letter, in which an error concerning baptism is contained,³⁴ on the ground that the style of the letter had a proper appearance by which the letter could be explicitly known as belonging to him. To discern the spurious according to the subject matter is a mode in which a patristic writing, when its subject matter is not harmonized with its author or with the author's time, would be regarded as spurious. A good case of this mode is found in a book supposedly assigned to Clement, a disciple of the apostles: the book is inspected to be filled with charming fables and mere incantations, which are quite foreign to the period and disciples of the apostles. The collation of times is also available and according to Scultetus is the most reliable mode of discerning spurious writings. For instance, he holds that the authorship of *De anima et spiritu* should not be attributed to Augustine but to Boethius, on the ground of his inference that the author of the work must be posterior to Augustine at least by ninety years.³⁵

Like Tossanus, with the division of patristic literature into public (epistles and decrees of general, particular, national, and provincial councils) and private (epistles and

³³ Scultetus, *Medullae*, aphorismi, fol. (:)(2r.

³⁴ Scultetus, *Medullae*, aphorismi, fol. (:)(2v.

³⁵ Scultetus, *Medullae*, aphorismi, fol. (:)(2v. As Thomas pointed out, the *De spiritu et anima*, though long attributed to Augustine, is "now known to have been composed during the latter half of the twelfth century very probably by Alcher, a Cistercian monk of the Abbey of Clairvaux" Cf. Teresa Regan, "A Study of the '*Liber de Spiritu et Anima*'; Its Doctrine, Sources and Historical Significance" (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1948), abstract; Thomas Aquinas, *Quaestio disputata de anima* (Rome: Textum Taurini, 1953), a.12. ad.1: "liber iste de spiritu et anima non est Augustini, sed dicitur cuiusdam Cisterciensis fuisse."

decrees of Roman pontiffs, and individual fathers), Scultetus argues that the former is of greater authority than the latter, since the general councils apply to all Christians, the national to a certain nation, and the provincial to a certain region. Public writings, moreover, do not base their authority on the amplitude of their contemporary endorsement but on their agreement with Scripture universal councils, therefore, are as liable to error as local synods.³⁶

As to the form of teaching, Scultetus distinguishes patristic literature into rhetorical declamations and theological doctrines: we should not discern or judge a rhetorical declamation of a patristic writing by the measure of theological doctrine. Concerning the content of material, the philosophical writings of the fathers should be distinct from their theological ones given that these latter have doctrinal and homiletical discussions. This distinction between the philosophical and the theological issues raised by the fathers is significant given that, arguably, there was no specifically confessional philosophy held by the Reformed orthodox despite their generally Peripatetic approach. Scultetus distinction, then, points toward the philosophical eclecticism of early Reformed orthodoxy. For a degree of authority in relation to *tempus*, he maintains, as a universal rule (*regula universalis*), that “what is more ancient may be *almost* always considered as more pure, and vice versa,” considering Augustine as a sole exception because he has surpassed not a few of his predecessors in the purity of doctrine.³⁷ Finally, Scultetus considers the mode of other circumstances. His point of the issue stands in association with a custom of dialogue

³⁶ Scultetus, *Medullae*, aphorismi, fol. (:)(3r.

³⁷ Scultetus, *Medullae*, aphorismi, fol. (:)(4r: “puriora semper fere habeantur, quae antiquiora, & contra. Dico FERRE: quia quo minus haec regula universalis sit, solus Augustinus facit: qui non tantum se posteriores, sed ex antecessoribus quoque non paucos puritate doctrinae videtur superasse.”

in which, while we sometimes say in the atmosphere of benevolence and love, we often keep silent in fear. Taking Augustine as his witness, Scultetus observes that this great bishop of Hippo confessed making some errors with regard to purgatory and prayer for the repose of departed believers through excessive abundance of love, thinking of his friends and his most beloved mother Monica. He would not disapprove that there are a number of such errors which are found not just in Augustine but in the other fathers.³⁸

Scultetus also makes a brief comment on the collation of doctrine: the writings of a father can be compared among themselves (*inter se*), or with others (*cum aliis*). Through the comparison of the writings *inter se*, we may know which articles of faith are in harmony with each other. They would be said to clearly harmonize with themselves, when they declare “one and the same thought of one and the same doctrine in all or several writings (*vel in omnibus suis scriptis vel pluribus eandem & unam de uno & eodem dogmate sententiam profitentur*).”³⁹ Although one or two obscure or even contrary words may occur, it does not necessarily remove the harmony of thought, because the obscure words should be elucidated through the clearer words, and one thought of fewer numbers is to be expounded according to another thought of greater numbers.

The third work of prudence offers the candid evaluation of the patristic writings, since the rule of equity requires that we neither unevenly grade those fathers who equally said many splendid words of Scripture nor reject them due to several ostensible defects and errors. Bearing human flesh and blood, Scultetus observes, the church fathers admitted that they were liable to human weakness and willing to make themselves distinct from the

³⁸ Scultetus, *Medullae*, aphorismi, fol. (:)(4r.

³⁹ Scultetus, *Medullae*, aphorismi, fol. (:)(4r.

canonical scriptures.⁴⁰ Scultetus' view of the church fathers as described in the *Medullae patrum theologiae syntagma* is not different in essence from that of Polanus as shown in our discussion of his theological method and exegetical theology, but will be more clearly seen in the next two chapters on the *Symphonia* and the *Syntagma*.

5.1.3. Gaspard Laurent (1556-1636)

Renowned as a rector of the Geneva academy and great compiler of Reformed confessions of faith,⁴¹ Gaspard Laurent wrote *Catholicus et orthodoxus Ecclesiae consensus, ex Verbo Dei, Patrum scriptis, Ecclesiae reformatae confessionum harmonia* (1595),⁴² which is different, in goal and form, from the biographical and literary manuals of the church fathers attempted by Tossanus and Scultetus. In this work, Laurent intends to provide a thorough discussion of the whole Scripture in a continuous prayer, a discussion that is “both concerning truth and for the sake of truth (*tum de veritate, tum pro veritate*)” that the church fathers spoke.⁴³ The *Catholicus et orthodoxus* is designed in particular, as evidently seen in the title of the work, to demonstrate the true catholic and orthodox consensus of the church on the ground of Scripture, patristic literature, medieval doctors, and the harmony of the Reformed confessions, to the effect that the Reformed church alone

⁴⁰ Scultetus, *Medullae*, aphorismi, fol. (:)(4v).

⁴¹ Gaspard Laurent, *Corpus et syntagma confessionum fidei* (Geneva, 1612). The aim of Laurent in this work is to show the essential and harmonious unity of faith in the diversity and multiplicity of confessions, including the first and the second Helvetic confessions, the Gallican confession, the Anglican confession, the Scottish confession, the Czengerin confession, the Polonian confession, the Bohemian confession, and some Lutheran confessions.

⁴² Gaspard Laurent, *Catholicus et orthodoxus Ecclesiae consensus, ex Verbo Dei, Patrum scriptis, Ecclesiae reformatae confessionum harmonia* (Geneva, 1595). Compare with Eustachius Fidansa et al., *Sanctarum autoritatum veterum catholicae ecclesiae patrum* (Colonia, 1559).

⁴³ Laurent, *Catholicus et orthodoxus Ecclesiae consensus*, epistola, ii.

stands in great concord with the biblical and ecclesiastical testimonies as orthodox and catholic.⁴⁴ It is surprising that Laurent's concern of theological polemics seems not primary but secondary.⁴⁵

In constitution, this Genevan Reformed thinker collects abstracts from the writings of the church fathers under doctrinal headings, but placing the biblical testimonies of each doctrine prior to the patristic witnesses. Each doctrine in the *Catholicus et orthodoxus*, thus, is discussed with a list of references of Scripture, the church fathers, the medieval doctors, and the Reformed confessions. It is of interest to note that Laurent presents the order of placement for constituting the doctrinal harmony in Christian religion: the Old and the New Testaments, early orthodox fathers and medieval doctors,⁴⁶ ancient Creeds, and the Reformed confessions composed in the sixteenth century.⁴⁷

In the preface to the *Catholicus et orthodoxus*, Laurent remarks that it is useful to have the same doctrine of faith presented in diverse styles in creeds, confessions, catechisms, sermons, commentaries, and *loci communes*. Every doctrine manifested in any of these styles, however, must be related to Scripture, the integral norm of truth, since, as

⁴⁴ Laurent, *Catholicus et orthodoxus Ecclesiae consensus*, epistola, iiij: "Operaepretium fuerit igitur Synopsin conscribere quae veram religionem ex S. Scriptura atque ex veterum monumentis depromptam nude proponat, cui & harmonia reformatae Ecclesiae confessionum annectatur."

⁴⁵ Different from Laurent, Rivetus attempted to proclaim the orthodox catholicity of the Reformed faith in opposition to the Roman Catholicism in a manifestly polemical way in which he introduced the positions of the orthodox catholic church and the Pontificate on a given question of theological doctrines and put them into debate. See Andrea Rivetus, *Catholicus orthodoxus oppositus catholico Roman churchae* (Apud Commelinum, 1630).

⁴⁶ Laurent names as orthodox fathers Athanasius, Basil, Nazianzenus, Ambrosius, Jerome, Augustinus, Chrysostomus, Irenaeus, Justinus martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Cyrillus Alexandrinus, Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus, Epiphanius, Eusebius, Theodoritus, Theodoretus, Tertullianus, Arnobius, Lactantius, Cyprianus, Hilary, Nyssenus, Origenes, Vigilus, Saluianus, Fulgentius, Gregorius, Damascenus, Bertramus, and Bernardus, and as medieval doctors Gratianus, Lombardus, Thomas, Duns Scotus, and Durandus. See Laurent, *Catholicus et orthodoxus Ecclesiae consensus*, §§.ij.

⁴⁷ Laurent, *Catholicus et orthodoxus Ecclesiae consensus*, avctores ex quibvs constitvitvr huius concordiae in religione synopsis. §§.ij-§§.iiij.

Augustine declared, the authority of Scripture is far greater than the whole capacity of human beings.⁴⁸ On this ground, the fathers, however highly honored in their human authority on theology, should be testified to by Scripture, the ultimate norm of all Christian truths. Laurent was aware of the fact that there were many patristic writings whose authorship was wrongly attributed to Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, and Basil; not a few patristic writings were textually contaminated, perverted, and corrupted.⁴⁹ Unfortunately, the good patristic sources were also corrupted even by some pious magistrates in the new editions of that time. But questions of attribution or textual accuracy matter not much for Laurent, who was convinced that those problems led him to stand more firmly on the unshakable foundation, that is, the Word of God, who, *contra* insidious errors, willed to institute such a firm foundation in Scripture against which nobody can dare to speak.⁵⁰

It is worth noting that in the work Laurent deals just with eight selected loci, such as *De verbo Dei*, *De Deo*, *De Providentia Dei*, *De capite Ecclesiae*, *De Iustificatione*, *De Libero arbitrio*, *De Sacramentis*, and *Contra Idololatriam, Imaginum cultum et Superstitiones*, without taking into account *De praedestinatione*, *De creatione*, *De peccato*, *De bonis operibus*, and so forth. Also notably, he does not provide his own thought or explanation in the discussion of each doctrine; he just collects testimonies relevant to the doctrine and arranges them without change, even their paraphrases, from Scripture, the

⁴⁸ Laurent, *Catholicus et orthodoxus Ecclesiae consensus*, epistola, vi; Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim*, in *PL* 34, II.v.9: “maior est quippe Scripturae huius auctoritas, quam omnis humani ingenii capacitas.”

⁴⁹ For a very careful survey on the patterns of corruptions in the publication of patristic literature by the Roman Catholics, see Thomas James, *A Treatise of the Corruptions of Scripture, Councils and Fathers* (London, 1611).

⁵⁰ Laurent, *Catholicus et orthodoxus Ecclesiae consensus*, epistola, xi; Augustine, *In epistolam Ioannis ad parthos tractatus decem*, in *PL* 35, II.i.

church fathers, medieval doctors, ancient Creeds, and Reformed confessions. The *Catholicus et orthodoxus* seems a massive compilation of doctrinal statements extracted from the wide range of the trustworthy Christian literature, represented in a concise form of dogmatics. Laurent's work has the same purpose and style as that of Polanus but with the minor differences of scale and commentary.

5.2. Patristic Theology in Polanus

In general, Polanus agrees with Tossanus, Scultetus, and Laurent on some assumptions about patristic literature that are commonly shared in the Reformed circle: there are many problems of authorial attribution and textual accuracy in patristic literature; every doctrine of each father must be weighed according to the supreme and ultimate authority of Scripture as to its orthodoxy; patristic thought in general is more supportive, whether constructively or polemically, of the Reformed church that, therefore, ought to be seen as orthodox and catholic, rather than the Roman Catholic Church. With these assumptions of patristic thought in mind, Polanus wrote the *Symphonia catholica* which covers all the doctrine of the Reformed church in great harmony with the orthodox and catholic teachings of the ecclesiastical writers ranging from the apostolic fathers, medieval doctors, general councils, the collections of Canon law, the Roman pontiffs, the Reformers, and even his contemporaries. This section is devoted to this monumental system of patristic thought, investigating the causes of its publication, its sources, an analysis of its structure and character, and some selected theological *loci*.

5.2.1. The causes of the *Symphonia catholica*

In the epistolary preface to the *Symphonia catholica* published on October 28, 1607, Polanus pronounced his conviction, evidently inspired by Johann J. Grynaeus, about the catholic *consensus* in doctrinal truth between the Reformed and the ancient apostolic churches, on the ground that every true Christian belongs to the same house of one God, the pillar and support of truth, which is built upon the immovable foundation of the same rock, our Lord Jesus Christ. With an appeal to Adrianus I, who loved Augustine's sermons, Polanus declares that the true foundation of the church is not only "one and the same Jesus Christ (*unum & eundem Jesum Christum*)" but also "one and the same gospel of Jesus Christ (*unum & idem de Jesu Christo Evangelium*)."⁵¹ Although Tertullian wrote and Cyprian confirmed that Peter was said to be the rock upon which the church should be established,⁵² Polanus comments they did not directly point to "the person of Peter (*non personam Petri*)" but the firm rock (*firmam petram*) of his "faith, confession, and doctrine concerning Christ" in the manner of figurative speech and metonymic trope.⁵³ In the same vein, Polanus appeals to Germanus who insisted in his epistle to Thomas, an episcopal of Claudiopolitan, that "the true faith in the doctrine of Jesus Christ is the foundation and

⁵¹ Amandus Polanus, *Symphonia catholica* (Basel, 1607), epistola, 2: "Quicumque verus Christianus est & vivus lapis domus spiritualis, domus Dei quae est columnae ac stabilimentum veritatis; is nullam aliam petram, cui tanquam fundamento solidissimo atque; immobili ecclesia catholica superstruitur, agnoscit & confitetur, quam Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, in quo totum aedificium congruenter coagmentarum crescit ut sit templum sanctum Domino"; Matías de Villanuño, "Adriani I. Epistola ad Episcopos Hispaniae contra Elipandum Ep. Toletanum," in *Summa Conciliorum Hispaniae*, vol. 2 (Matriti: Apud Joachimum Ibarra, 1785), 176-177: "Hoc nec Petrus confessus est, nec sancta Ecclesia super firmam fundata petram, id est, fidei fundamentum, quod Christus est, confitetur: quam Christus protegit & defendit."

⁵² Tertullian, *Liber de Praescriptionibus adversus haereticos*, in *PL* 2, col. 38a; idem, *De Monogamia*, in *PL* 2, col. 939c; Cyprian, *De unitate ecclesiae catholicae* in *D. Caecilii Cypriani Carthaginiensis episcopi et gloriosissimi martyris opera*, tom.2 (Geneva, 1593), 296.

⁵³ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, epistola, a3r.

rock, which our Savior meant” by saying “On this rock I will build my church.”⁵⁴ Peter’s confession, “You are the Christ, the Son of the living God,” was not even from his human flesh but originally from the will of God the Father. Peter did not make us believe in Christ and his teaching. The issue of Peter’s primacy will be discussed later in this chapter.

Polanus boldly proclaims with Irenaeus that “the ground and pillar of our faith will be truthfully handed down to us by the pleasure of God in Holy Scripture.”⁵⁵ Identifying the importance of Scripture as the primary source of final authority, he asks with Baptista Mantuarus whence Scripture has so much weight of authority that those who read and hear it with admiration may be so powerfully drawn into assenting to Scripture.

I have often pondered whence the Scripture itself is so persuasive; whence it does so powerfully influence the souls of the listeners; whence it has such great efficacy that it may lead all [of them] not only to receive an opinion but solidly to believe? This cannot be ascribed to the evidence of reason, which it does not produce, nor unto the industry of art, with words smooth and fit to persuade, which it does not use; see then if this be not the cause of it, that we are persuaded comes from its primary truth or verity. But whence are we so persuaded but from itself alone, as if its own authority should effectually draw us to believe it? But whence, I pray, does it have this authority? We saw not God preaching, writing, or teaching it; but yet as if we had seen him, we believe and firmly hold that the things which we read proceeded from the Holy Spirit.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, epistola, a3v.

⁵⁵ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, epistola, a4r; Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, in *PG* 7a, col.844.

⁵⁶ Amandus Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, epistola, a4r; Baptista Mantuarus, *De patientia* (Brescia, 1496), III.ii: “Saepenumero, mecum cogitavi, unde tam suadibilis esset ista Scriptura, ut tam potenter influat in animos auditorum; unde tantum habeat energiae, ut non ad opinandum sed ad solide credendum omnes inflectat. Non est hoc imputandum rationum evidetiae quas non adducit, non artis industriae et verbis suavibus et ad persuadendum accommodatis quibus non utitur. Sed vide an id in causa sit quod persuasi sumus earn a prima veritate fluxisse. Sed unde sumus ita persuasi nisi ab ipsa, quasi ad ei credendum non sua ipsim trahat autoritas. Sed unde quaeso hanc sibi autoritatem, vindicavit? Neque enim vidimus nos Deum conscionantem, scribentem, docentem; tamen ac si vidissemus, credimus et tenemus a Spiritu Sancto fluxisse quod legimus.”

This quotation leads us to the self-authenticating feature of Scripture, divinely inspired and illuminated by the Holy Spirit. Polanus further discusses that Scripture not only retains the weight of divine authority, but it also truly pours out truth into the minds of those who investigate Scripture with careful eagerness, who are delighted with the authority of Scripture and the grace of the Holy Spirit, and who are of a simpler mind. In addition, the readers of Scripture who are also thirsty for the dogmatic truths of the pious fathers, if they inquire with the right mind, may easily discover *in Scripture* all things that concur with those truths.⁵⁷ The reason is that the origin of the true catholic fathers with regard to the doctrines of Christian religion lies in Scripture alone and that the fathers are truly catholic who themselves would like to declare only the testimony of divine Scripture, which alone is sufficient to grant us the wisdom that leads to salvation through faith which is in Christ.⁵⁸

Given the sufficiency of Holy Scripture with regard to salvation, Polanus was asked about the motives or reasons for his attempt in the *Symphonia catholica* to demonstrate the orthodoxy and catholicity of the doctrines of the Reformed church by appealing to the fathers, councils, canonical laws, ecclesiastical history, and other human documents. In response, the first cause Polanus manifests is that “the papists accuse us unceasingly as if we have departed from the doctrine of the ancient catholic church and chosen novel

⁵⁷ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, epistola, a4v.

⁵⁸ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, epistola, a5r: “Quam ob causam veri Catholici de dogmatibus religionis Christianae ex sola Scriptura agere studio habent, si negotium illis cum iis qui Scripturae Sacrae autoritatem admittunt. Sic olim Catholici quae, vel ubi esset Ecclesia, Scripturarum DIVINARUM TANTUMMODO TESTIMONIIS se acturos profitebantur.”

doctrines which we might follow, wherefore they do not stop calling us heretics.”⁵⁹ It is interesting to note that, though he could have just disregarded such a biased and untenable accusation by the Roman Catholics, Polanus wrote the *Symphonia*: the reason is his conviction that “our doctrine must be in agreement with the divinely inspired Scripture [and] the apostolic doctrine, and hence that our churches, having the same faith as the apostles of Jesus Christ, may be truly apostolic and catholic, in Tertullian’s word, for the consanguinity of doctrine.”⁶⁰ For this reason, it is hard to say that the publication of the *Symphonia catholica* was aimed primarily at defending the Reformed church against the Roman Church’s accusation, and secondarily to verify and enhance the orthodox and catholic doctrines in the Reformed church. It is true that the production of the *Symphonia* was indeed polemically prompted by the Roman Church’s condemnation of the Reformed church as heretic. However, Polanus did not begin to open the pages of patristic writings in order to help confront such a condemnation. It seems to me more credible that the character of the *Symphonia* was primarily constructive and secondarily polemical in terms of Polanus’s intention, as clearly evidenced in his preface where he states he wrote the *Symphonia* because he chose to follow (*optavi imitari*) the example of the apostolic and catholic fathers (*exempla eorum*) with devotion to the glory of God and propagation of truth, engaging himself in the edification of the church.⁶¹

⁵⁹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, epistola, a5r-v: “Ac prima quidem causa est, quod perpetuo nos accusant Papani, quasi a veteris Catholicae Ecclesiae doctrina discesserimus & nova nobis dogmata quae sequeremur elegerimus, unde nos non desinunt haereticos appellare.”

⁶⁰ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, epistola, a5v: “[D]octrina nostra consentiat cum Scripturis divinitus inspiratis, cum doctrina Apostolica, ac proinde Ecclesiae nostrae in eadem fide cum Apostolis Jesu Christi conspirantes sint vere Apostolicae & Catholicae pro consanguinitate doctrinae, ut verba Tertulliani.”

⁶¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, epistola,)(3v.

The second reason for composing the *Symphonia* is that Polanus himself needed to be proficient at the study of patristic literature and indeed recognized that the consent of many ancient fathers might correct the Roman Church's errors, lead us to embrace all dogmatic truths, and strengthen us in them. This recognition should be grounded in Vincentius of Lerins' canon of catholicity, namely, a threefold formula of universality, antiquity, and consent, a canon which Polanus fully approved.

Moreover, in the catholic church itself, all possible care must be taken that we preserve an idea which is believed everywhere, always, and by all (*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*): this, as a matter of fact, is truly and properly catholic, which, as the name itself and reason declares, comprehends all universally. But this may eventually be if we follow universality, antiquity, consent. However, we shall follow universality if we confess that one faith to be true, which the whole church throughout the orb of the earth confesses; antiquity, thus truly, if we do not retreat by any means from those senses which our pious ancestors and fathers have publicly clarified; consent, in the same manner, if we continually follow the consentient definitions and determinations in the antiquity itself of all, or undoubtedly of all priests and teachers equally.⁶²

In addition to Vincentius's thought of catholicity, Polanus further confirms that the only foundation for universality, antiquity, and consent is the canon of Holy Scripture, than which there is no more wisdom and no better work. "The church," he continues, "ought to be the true interpreter of Holy Scripture according to the proportion of faith but neither one

⁶² Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, epistola, a6r; Vincentius, *Pro catholicae fidei antiquitate et veritate* (Venetia, 1549), A3: "In ipsa item catholica ecclesia magnopere curandum est, ut id teneamus, quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est: hoc est etenim vere proprieq; catholicum quod ipsaui nominis, ratioq; declarat, quae oīa vere uniuersaliter comprehendit. Sed hoc ita demum sit: si sequamur uniuersitatem, antiquitatem, consensioinem. Sequemur autem uniuersitatem hoc modo: Si hanc unam fidem ueram esse fateamur quam tota per orbem terrarum confitetur ecclesia: Antiquitatem uero ita, si ab his sensibus nullatenus recedamus, quos sanctos maiores ac patres nostros celebraisse manifestum est: Consensionem quoq; itidem, si in ipsa uetustate, oīum uel certe pene omnium sacerdotum pariter & magistrorum definitiones, sententiaeque sectemur."

which distorts the meaning of Scripture nor one which invents new rituals or dogmas leading beyond Scripture.”⁶³ To oppose Scripture is impious, and to go beyond it is superfluous. This fact requires us to discern which ancient fathers we disregard or follow. When we come upon them, we must heed them with the grace of caution. In this regard, Polanus illustrates a bad example of how to read the fathers in which, on the grounds that several ancient fathers sometimes fell into the most serious errors of some doctrines, Bellarmine and other Roman Catholics would like to accept those interpretations of the fathers which they like and reject those which they dislike, especially with regard to meritorious works of humans, satisfaction for sin through fasting, and expiation of sin by charity.⁶⁴ Thus, agreement with the ancient fathers is good but only about the truth which God, the Father of the fathers (*Pater patrum*), is teaching us in Scripture through the prophets and the apostles. The *Symphonia* was intended to give the theological benefit of such agreement with many authorities to the people of God in his day.

The third reason for writing the *Symphonia* is that, in support of remembrance, Polanus had to prepare for himself a memory tool, the *Symphonia*, which he would be able to use in two ways. First, the tool is useful in the analysis and interpretation of the sacred scriptures, because Polanus does not want to depart from the fathers when they did not depart from the scriptures.⁶⁵ This thought was from Paul’s word that “the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets,” and it was also from its application that scriptural

⁶³ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, epistola, a6v.

⁶⁴ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, epistola, a7r; Robert Bellarmine, *De Verbo Dei*, in *Opera omnia* vol. 1 (Neapoli, 1836), 102.

⁶⁵ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, epistola, a8r: “Commonitorium mihimet parare necesse habuerim, quo uti possem tum in Scripturae Sacrae analysi & interpretatione, in qua a Patribus non cupio discedere, ubi ipsi a Scriptura non discedunt.”

interpretations are subject to the judgment and censure of other interpreters. Second, the patristic *compendium* is also useful in the treatment of disputes in which the truth is confirmed by the agreement of the fathers for those who are weaker in faith and those who have high regard for human documents, and in which the adversaries who are reckless of the fathers in authority are repressed.⁶⁶ According to Polanus's own estimation, the noble readers of his day were well pleased and satisfied to buy and read the *Symphonia* for several reasons: 1) the readers are the extraordinary lovers of the true catholic church; 2) the writings of the fathers are magnificent; and 3) the work testifies that we are one with the fathers in love; in other words, all of us are the brothers of Christ in the family of one parent, God the Father, bound together by the Holy Spirit, the sharers of the same faith, and co-heirs of the same hope. In spite of his high esteem for the ancient fathers, Polanus does not fail to note that our convictions about truth are not primarily preserved by patristic authority, but by the Father of the fathers, God, sufficient to both the fathers and us.⁶⁷

5.2.2. Sources of *Symphonia Catholica*

Quite distinct from Tossanus, Scultetus, and Laurent, Polanus provides the readers with specific information of patristic and medieval sources in more detail in the *Symphonia*. He says that there are several editions of each patristic or medieval source in his day, the editions which were published in diverse places, different times, and various forms. For the better verification and accessibility of the readers, he made a bibliographical index for each source which he read and used in the *Symphonia catholica*, including its author's name,

⁶⁶ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, epistola, a8r.

⁶⁷ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, epistola, a8r-v.

language, the office and year of its publication, and form of the edition. The indication of language in which a given patristic source was published is made only for those fathers who wrote originally in Greek. The bibliographical index of the *Symphonia* is notable in four respects. First, Polanus, without making any theological distinction between Latin and Greek fathers as usual in his day,⁶⁸ listed them together in alphabetic order, next to the introductory epistle. Second, he does not make a chronological distinction of the bibliographical list according to the age of ancient fathers, the Middle Ages, or the Reformation period. Third, Polanus uses more patristic, conciliar, medieval, and Reformation sources in the *Symphonia* than those listed in the index. Finally, the bibliographical information of other sources that are not listed in the index is given in the place where Polanus uses a quotation from them in discussion of each thesis. The authenticity issue of the sources Polanus uses is not intensively examined in the whole dissertation, but only sporadically and informally in the analysis of some theological *loci* of the *Symphonia*.

5.2.3. Analysis of *Symphonia Catholica*

5.2.3.1. Structure

The components of the *Symphonia* are three: introductory epistle, three indexes, and body. The first index specifies detailed information of the main sources that Polanus consults in the work to demonstrate the catholic harmony of doctrine between the Reformed church and the ancient fathers. The second index provides an alphabetical listing

⁶⁸ Cf. Irena D. Backus, "Calvin and the Church Fathers," in *The Calvin Handbook*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 125-137.

of the sixty-eight topics of theological commonplaces (*locorum communium theologicorum*) discussed in the work. The third index lists the theses of each *locus communis* or chapter. The whole body of the work deals in total with fifty-four *loci communes* and 378 theses. The discussion of each thesis begins with the concise presentation of the thesis statement advocated by the Reformed church, followed (sometimes by the declaration or explanation of thesis and then) by the consensus of the fathers (*consensus patrum*)⁶⁹ that is supported by a great number of patristic testimonies from both Latin and Greek fathers, often by the conciliar canons, and by the testimonies of the Reformers. Each patristic quotation is appropriately expounded by Polanus's short comment on it when he thought it necessary to remove a plausible misunderstanding and make clear its desultory reading, in which case the quotation did not fully support or verify the thesis under discussion or it might be misused or abused by the Roman Catholics or by thinkers from other confessional backgrounds.

The theological system of the *Symphonia* assumes a dogmatic form in which the Reformed dogmatics begins with the discussion of theological principles, the doctrines of Scripture and God, and then considers the parts of theology ranging from the doctrine of *opera Dei* in general to that of the last things. Unlike Laurent's similar work, *Catholicus et orthodoxus*, the *Symphonia* covers almost the whole realm of dogmatic enterprise worked on the Reformed orthodox in the period of early orthodoxy, but it does not provide the detailed level of doctrinal and polemical discussion done by them. It is undeniable that the concept of *principium* as shaped and developed in the Reformed orthodox dogmatics is not

⁶⁹ The diverse Latin phrases that Polanus uses in the *Symphonia* to indicate the same meaning of "the consent of the fathers" are *consensus patrum*, *consensus vetustatis*, *consensus antiquitatis*, *consensus veterum*, *testimonia veterum*, *testimonia antiquitatis*, *testimonia vetustatis*, and *confirmatio ex antiquitate*.

found in the theology of the ancient fathers. Still, it is true that the fathers firmly held God as the beginning and end of all things, certainly of doing theology, and also held Scripture as the unique criterion in accord with which Christians should decide what they believe and do, for what they live, and how they live.⁷⁰ Polanus's beginning of discussion with the doctrine of Scripture in the *Symphonia* should be understood as his respect for such a patristic thought of "theological *principium*" as described above.

It is quite plausible to think that, if those doctrines discussed in the *Symphonia* are enough to verify the doctrinal harmony between the apostolic or catholic tradition and the Reformed churches, other specified doctrines not included in the work might not be viewed by Polanus as essential to validate Reformed theology as orthodox and catholic. The theological significance of the *Symphonia* is that the work serves as the basic catalogue of theological doctrines or doctrinal theses necessary for the theological classification of churches and the distinction of a church as Reformed or truly catholic and orthodox. It is a catalogue that the Reformed circle should check before beginning a theological companionship with any other churches. Polanus may say that the conviviality among the churches should not be shaken by the more subtle difference in the doctrines beyond those of the *Symphonia*.

5.2.3.2. Some characteristics of the *Symphonia*

The use of the church fathers in the *Symphonia* has some notable characteristics. Basically, Polanus does not make many comments on the authenticity of patristic writings

⁷⁰ For the theological and philosophical meaning of *principium* in ancient philosophers and fathers, see chapter 3.

which he used and listed in the first index of the *Symphonia*. This, however, does not mean that he is careless in discerning which writings of which fathers are worthwhile to read and consult. Quoting Ignatius' writings, for example, Polanus used those which were published in Greek and Latin, and included in the first volume of *Monumentum S. patrum orthodoxographa* (2 vols., Henric Petrina, 1569) which his father-in-law had edited, even though at least five other editions of Ignatian works were available in his day.⁷¹ Polanus' choice of the edition in the *Symphonia* basically depends on his preference for the most recent publication of a patristic writing. One reason is for the convenience of the readers in that the more recent editions are more available. The other is that a more recent publication by the Protestant thinkers in early orthodoxy was a more critically advanced version of its previous one as a product of their theological elaboration to solidify the confessional identity of the Protestant church by transfusing into it sound doctrines possibly derived from the catholic and orthodox fathers of the primitive church and *simul* to refute and defeat the continuous attacks of the Roman Catholics who regarded the Protestant church as heretically deviating from the orthodox line of the catholic church.

Polanus does not always follow the rule of choosing more recent publication. In Polanus' view, Grynaeus' edition, published in both Greek and Latin, was more trustworthy and readable and that such an edition was moreover filtered by the Reformed netting of his theological father. In the case of John of Damascus, though the more recent

⁷¹ Ignatius' writings are found in Ignatius, *Gloriosi Christi martyris Ignatii Antiocheni antistitis* (Basel, 1520) and (Strassburg, 1527), Clement et al., *Epistolae antiquissimae, ac sacris institutionibus plenae* (Colonia, 1526), Nicolaus, *Postilla super epistulas sancti Pauli* (Köln, 1478), Ignatius, *Ignatii cvi etiam nomen theophoro* (Dilingia, 1557), Dionysius Areopagita, *D. Dionysii Areopagitae opera omnia* (Köln, 1557), and Athenagoras et al., *Theologorum aliquot graecorum veterum orthodoxorum libri graeci et iidem latinitate donati* (Zürich, 1559-1560).

editions of his writings were available in the early seventeenth century,⁷² Polanus chose the Greek and Latin parallel edition published in 1559. Similar cases are found in Bernard's *Opera* and Isidorus' *De summo bono*.⁷³ It is also notable that, when both Greek and Latin texts of patristic sources were available, he showed linguistic preference for the text of the original Greek with its Latin translation, particularly in the cases of Epiphanius, Origen, Gregory of Nazianzus, and John of Damascus.⁷⁴ In other cases, Polanus simply gravitated toward Basel editions of the fathers, perhaps as exemplifying the right of access to patristic thought by Protestants and thereby underlining the catholicity of Protestantism.

As well as preferring the original language, Polanus pays special attention to certain marks of heretical corruption, such as “forging false treatises, or corruption of the true, changing of scriptures, or altering of authors' words, contrary to their meaning.”⁷⁵ These marks, according to Thomas James' critical and careful comment, were found in the sixteenth century printing of the patristic works by the Roman Catholics, especially in Rome.⁷⁶ As clearly seen in the first index of the *Symphonia*, in fact, Polanus does not consult with any patristic writing that was published at Rome.

⁷² The early seventeenth-century editions of John of Damascus' writings are used in *Refutatio dogmatis de fictitia carnis Christi omnipresentia*, ed. Jean Crespin (Geneva, 1571), and *Physique françoise, comprenant en treize livres ou traittez, assavoir l'un d'Aristote, onze de Basile, et un de Jean Damascene*, ed. Lambert Daneau (Geneva, 1581).

⁷³ See Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, β.

⁷⁴ See Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 9-15.

⁷⁵ Thomas James, *A Treatise of the Corruptions of Scripture, Councils and Fathers*, the dedicatory epistle. In an advertisement to a Christian reader, Thomas still advises that it is good to adjoin unto “some few texts corrupted of later and middle-aged writers, as well to manifest the beginning, continuance, and progress of their corruptions throughout all ages.”

⁷⁶ See Thomas James, *A Treatise of the Corruptions of Scripture, Councils and Fathers*, the dedicatory epistle.

Andrea Rivetus and Jean Daillé concurred that the church fathers should not be quoted and seen, regardless of their historical and literary context.⁷⁷ Polanus should not be exempt from this statement of the two French Huguenot theologians so that he is required to show due respect to the contextual understanding and use of patristic writings. It is quite true that he indeed does not provide detailed information of the historical context and literary genre of a given quotation taken from the fathers or the medieval doctors. Yet, this is not an evidence of suspect in which Polanus might not know the background, against which the quoted text was written, or that he might not pursue the contextual meaning originally intended by the author but just look for the doctrinal adulterations of the ancient fathers as the foil witnesses for his doctrinal thesis. On the contrary, Polanus himself kept a sharp blade of criticism to the Roman Catholics, especially Jesuits like Bellarmine, for their overestimation and underestimation of the patristic works in heavy dependance on their usefulness for their own theological purpose, often going beyond or disregarding the contextual meanings of the patristic texts. Polanus shows a general tendency of picking and choosing any of the patristic writings, regardless of their genre or fame, only if it is conducive to the verification of the orthodox and catholic harmony between the church fathers and the Reformed church in doctrines. This tendency reflects Grynaeus's approach to the use of the patristic sources, that is, the orthodox content of those sources is most important to Grynaeus.

To illustrate more characteristics of the *Symphonia*, as well as those described above, I will choose and examine some *loci*, especially, the doctrines of Scripture, predestination,

⁷⁷ Cf. Irena D. Backus, "The Fathers and Calvinist Orthodoxy: Patristic Scholarship," in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, ed. Irena D. Backus, vol. 2 (London, Leiden: Brill, 2001), 839-865; idem, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378-1615)* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 235-243.

and church. The first topic, Scripture, illustrates how Polanus used patristic sources in the most hotly debated issue in early modern era, particularly with regard to tradition or the church fathers, between the Protestant and Roman Catholic churches. The doctrine of predestination is the best example to show Polanus's patristic theology in theological tension between the Reformed and the Lutheran churches within Protestantism. In the discussion of ecclesiology, finally, we may see the doctrinal harmony between the true apostolic and the Reformed churches, especially in opposition to the papacy and the imperial intervention in the composition of the episcopate. The diverse characteristics of Polanus's patristic theology are revealed in the discussion of each doctrine.

In all of the topics he approaches in the *Symphonia*, Polanus proceeds by identifying the topic in his chapter heading and developing it in a series of theses, some of which, like his thesis on Peter and the foundation of the church,⁷⁸ are accompanied by more detailed explanations. After each thesis, he offers what he identifies as the *consensus patrum*, identifying the fathers whose position illustrates the catholicity of Reformed doctrine, giving fairly precise citations of the actual works being cited, and quoting the father, often at some length. What is clear throughout the *Symphonia* is the selectivity of citation. Polanus's *consensus patrum* was not designed to offer a full array of all possible patristic comments on particular doctrines. Rather it was intended to show, by way of a carefully chosen set of patristic quotations relevant to each thesis the correctness of the Reformed understanding of the doctrine and, by extension, the error of the Roman Catholic position. Of course, Polanus shared this approach with his Reformed contemporaries, notably Laurent and Scultetus. As will be seen in the following sections, Polanus's citations were

⁷⁸ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 455.

selected typically with two issues in mind. He either cites a patristic text to show, positively, that Reformed doctrine is reflected in the ancient consensus or he cites a text to show, more or less negatively, that Roman Catholic polemicists like Bellarmine mistook or distorted its meaning when using it to undermine Protestant doctrine. Thus, for example, Polanus cites Chrysostom at some length when arguing his case for the authority of Scripture, but omits reference to Chrysostom's sermons on Romans in the chapter on predestination—clearly because of Chrysostom's more synergistic tendencies. Polanus's *consensus patrum*, then, is a limited and structured consensus designed to make a theological point. It stands in a somewhat ironic contrast to Jean Daillé's demonstration of a general lack of consensus among the fathers, and it raises the question, partially answered in Polanus's chapter on ecclesiology, of how Protestant orthodoxy could both appeal to and reject the fathers in its claim of catholicity.

5.2.4. The Doctrine of Scripture

In the *Symphonia*, Polanus deals with twenty-three doctrinal theses concerning Scripture that, he believes, were already inseeded and moreover affirmed in the thought of the church fathers, which was not yet clothed with the systematic form of dogmatics finely developed by the Protestant thinkers of the early modern era. These theses, he emphasizes, neither can nor ought to be considered as heretical or newly invented by the Protestants but as most evidently catholic and orthodox, given that they are founded on Scripture and consistently handed down by the pious fathers. The doctrinal theses of Scripture listed in the second index below are in great harmony between the Reformed church and the fathers.

1. Whatever in the Old Testament is beyond the Hebrew Canon is not canonical but apocryphal: certainly, the six chapters added to the book of Esther, the book of Baruch, additions to Daniel, the book of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus of Jesus Sirach, and the books of Maccabees. 2. The whole truth concerning faith and good works, necessary for salvation, can and ought to be drawn from Holy Scripture. 3. The controversies of Christian religion are ended only by the sacred writings. 4. Holy Scripture delivers publicly, clearly, and perspicuously all things that are necessary for salvation, that is, the whole doctrine of faith and Christian life necessary for salvation. 5. The interpretation of Holy Scripture is done by Scripture itself, because Scripture expositis itself. 6. Holy Scripture is not to be interpreted by the church fathers: the interpretation of Scripture is not to be judged by the fathers, nor are the fathers the interpretive norm of Holy Scripture, because all writings of the fathers are to be inspected and judged by Holy Scripture. What is said of the individual fathers is recognized, in the same manner, concerning their companies and councils. 7. The ignorance of Holy Scripture and not Holy Scripture is the cause of heresy. 8. Holy Scripture is perfect, that is, it contains the integral and perfect doctrine of faith and good works necessary for the eternal salvation that may restore the people of God to perfection. 9. Holy Scripture or Christ or God speaking in Holy Scripture is the judge of scriptural interpretation and religious controversies, because Holy Scripture is the Word of Christ, the Word of God. 10. Ecclesiastical controversies, whether of scriptural interpretation or any leader of religion, must be adjudicated and ended neither by the fathers, and councils, nor by the decrees of Roman pontiffs, but by Holy Scripture. 11. Holy Scripture is the principle and norm that, just like the voice of the supreme judge, God, decides and settles all interpretations of Scripture and all the controversies of religion from the universal and individual councils and the fathers approved by Scripture. 12. The believers, through the internal persuasion of the Holy Spirit, recognize that Holy Scripture is truly divine and certainly unique. 13. Holy Scripture receives its authority from God, not from the church; conversely the church [receives its authority] from Holy Scripture. 14. Holy Scripture is the *principium*, self-authenticating and

indemonstrable (αὐτόπιστον & ἀναπόδεικτον), indemonstrably and confidently worthy by itself; wherefrom it is proved by itself and testifies of itself most shiningly among all things: the testimony of Scripture for itself is far more certain, evident, and firm than that of the church. 15. We should not adhere to the expressions or letters of Holy Scripture but inquire and consider [its] true and genuine meaning. 16. To adhere to the expressions of Holy Scripture, ignorant of its intention or meaning, pertains to the heretics or those who are not firmly prepared. 17. Heretics keep themselves away from sacred scriptures; they teach that scriptures are not perfect, they do not have sufficient authority, they are ambiguous, and by them truth cannot be found, apart from tradition. 18. The Canon of Holy Scripture was well established by the time of the apostles. 19. No version of the Bible, and undoubtedly the Latin of Vulgate edition as well, is authentic, but truth should be inquired and demonstrated conclusively in the Hebrew and Greek fountain. 20. Holy Scripture must be truly read by the laity. 21. Holy Scripture is written by the will and command of God. But this is refused by Bellarmine. 22. The truth shouts through Holy Scripture, since Scripture is not a speechless letter but speaks: therefore it is to be heard. 23. The understanding of Holy Scripture is the gift of God; thus, it is not a prerogative or *potestas* exclusively attached to the episcopal position.⁷⁹

The church fathers of the first thesis whom Polanus carefully takes as witnesses are Melito, Augustine, Athanasius, Jerome, Rufinus, Origen, Gregory of Nazianzus, Damascenus, and Nicholas of Lyra. With regard to the Wisdom of Solomon, it is notable that the first witness, Melito, who was an antistes of the church of Sardis and whose fragments Polanus cites from Rufinus' Latin translation of Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica* originally written in Greek, included "Salomonis Proverbia, quae & Sapientia" (Σολομῶνος Παροιμίαι ἢ καὶ Σοφία) in his canonical list of the Old Testament books.⁸⁰

⁷⁹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, index tertius, 1-2.

⁸⁰ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 2-3; Eusebius, *Avtores historiae ecclesiasticae* (Basel, 1544), IV.xxvi (p. 95); Mileto, S. *Melito Sardium Episcopus*, in PG 5, 1213-1215.

From this, one may consider “*quae & Sapientia*” as another canonical book of Solomon distinct from his Proverbs. Using the mouth of Rufinus, whom Polanus considers to be the proper interpreter of Eusebius, however, Polanus argues that Melito did not mean by *Sapientia* that pseudepigraphical book which Jerome put in the list of apocrypha. As a relative pronoun, Polanus states, the Latin word *quae* does not refer to any other *Sapientia* of Solomon seemingly considered by Melito but refers to the very same Proverbs and therefore “*Salomonis Proverbia, quae & Sapientia*” must refer to one and the same book.⁸¹ In order to get the proper intention of a church father in his text, then, Polanus tends to use and compare the interpretations of other fathers on the text.

In addition, Polanus affirms that the true and genuine canon was stabilized and confirmed in the time of the apostles, in dependance on Augustine’s testimony that “distinct from the books subsequent [to the apostolic times] is the excellence of the canonical authority of the New and the Old Testaments which has been confirmed from the apostolic ages through the successions of bishops and the extension of the churches.”⁸² With emphasis on the apostolic antiquity of the canonical authority, Polanus insists that the whole Christian church ought to perceive and receive Athanasius and the Council of Laodicea. In the council under the great influence of Athanasius was established the list of the New Testament canonical scriptures, except the Revelation of John. It is, in Polanus’s eyes, plausible that some canonical lists of Scripture composed by the fathers or the general councils following the apostolic ages omitted some in the list as confirmed in the

⁸¹ Cf. Edmon Louis Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture in Patristic Biblical Theory: Canon, Language, Text* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 21-25. In regard to Melito’s intention, Gallagher argues that “Melito commences the practice of composing canon lists for the OT that almost exactly reproduce the Jewish list of books.”

⁸² Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 3; Augustine, *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, in *PL* 42, cols.248-249.

times of the apostles. With this in mind, Polanus elucidates that the Laodicean list lacking the book of Revelation does not signify that the book of Revelation must be excluded from the Canon but means that the council might consider the book to be not recommendable for the congregation to read *just* on account of its difficulty (*ob difficultatem*).⁸³ The Council of Laodicea would provide the canonical lists for the church to *read*, simultaneously warning that “no private psalms or any uncanonical books should be *read* in church but only the canonical ones of the New and the Old Testaments.”⁸⁴

In support of such understanding as described above, Polanus appeals to Jerome as a witness who, concerning the readability of apocryphal books not yet listed in the biblical Canon, reports that “the church reads the books of Tobit, Judith, and Maccabees but does not accept them within the canonical scriptures.... The church reads [them] not for establishing the authority of the ecclesiastical doctrines but for edifying the laity.”⁸⁵ John of Damascus is also appealed for reinforcement of this thought, and Rufinus is named as an orthodox father subscribing to the perfect list of the canonical scriptures including the Revelation of John.⁸⁶ Thus, Polanus reveals that, among the fathers, there are diverse lists of the Canon according to their different intentions.

⁸³ See Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 5-7.

⁸⁴ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 5. Cf. For its Greek text, see B.F. Westcott, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament* (Edinburgh, 1881), 533: “Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμοὺς λέγεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, οὐδὲ ἀκανόνιστα βιβλία, ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ κανονικὰ τῆς καινῆς καὶ παλαιᾶς διαθήκης.”

⁸⁵ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 7; Jerome, *Prologus Galeatus*, in *PL* 28, cols. 555-557. According to Polanus, there were those who attempted to elude this quotation of Jerome “as if he might not be talking about the Canon of Christians but of the Jews.”

⁸⁶ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 8, 15-17; Rufinus, *Commentarius in symbolum apostolorum*, in *PL* 21, col. 374; John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa*, in *PG* 94, cols. 1178-1180. According to Rufinus, many orthodox fathers regarded apocryphal writings as *non canonici sed ecclesiastica*.

It is notable that Polanus does not involve the authenticity issue of the Laodicean catalogue which is not satisfactorily resolved but still under debate, even though the source with which he consults presents two different manuscripts of the Laodicean council which do not contain the list of canonical scriptures.⁸⁷ It might be possible for Polanus not to use the Laodicean list of the canonical scriptures for the reason that Revelation was not included in the list, but he did. This shows that he did not choose or use only those patristic sources which might justify his theological thesis but rather tried to cite and expound the pivotal witnesses of antiquity, whose voice might even threaten his argument.

Special attention should be given here to Polanus's eclecticism as found in his patristic quotations. He, for example, cited Augustine many times as the most authoritative witness among the church fathers for the catholic harmony in doctrine between the apostolic and the Reformed churches. But, in his discussion of the canonical scriptures, he has neither requested the witness of the third council of Carthage, which was held under the personal leadership of Augustine, nor consulted Augustine's famous triplex criteria of canonization: those books which are received by all catholic churches are preferred to those which some of them do not receive; those sanctioned by the greater numbers and the greater authority are preferred to those held by the smaller number and less authority; when some writings are held by more catholic churches with less authority and others are held by fewer catholic churches with greater authority, the authority of both writings should be regarded as equal.⁸⁸ From this, an inference is quite plausible: the reason for

⁸⁷ See Laurentius Surius, *Tomus primus conciliorum omnium, tum generalium, tum provincialium atque particularium* (Coloniae Agrippinae, 1567), 451-459.

⁸⁸ For Augustine's canonical standard, see Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, in *PL* 34:40-41: "In canonicis autem Scripturis Ecclesiarum catholicarum quam plurimum auctoritatem sequatur, inter quas sane illae sint, quae apostolicas Sedes habere et epistolas accipere meruerunt. Tenebit igitur hunc modum in

Polanus not to appeal to Augustine's *criteria* and the Carthagean canonical list might be that the Carthagean council, even though forbidding the public reading of uncanonical books in church and affirming the Revelation of John as canonical, included all the *uncanonical* apocrypha in the Old Testament.⁸⁹ However, this inference is not true. The reason is given at length in the *Syntagma*. This will be treated in chapter six. The most certain reason, we can say here, is Polanus's assumption that Augustine, though truly being the greatest theologian, still was a human being who could err and, like other fathers, he has to be weighed against the absolute authority of Scripture. In this regard, Polanus echoes Jerome, who insisted that we ought to affirm from Holy Scripture alone whatever human beings say.⁹⁰

In the discussion of the second thesis, the great emphasis of patristic testimonies cited by Polanus is put on the importance of learning and teaching only what Scripture reveals about God and His work. "The special treasure (οὐσία) of our high priesthood," Dionysius the Areopagite stated at the Second Council of Nicaea, "is the oracles which have been divinely delivered to us, that is, the true knowledge of the divine scriptures."⁹¹ In this regard, Clement of Rome states that "to elucidate the sense of Scripture by itself is to grasp truth," and Justin Martyr affirms that "it is in no other way possible to learn

Scripturis canonicis, ut eas quae ab omnibus accipiuntur Ecclesiis catholicis praeponat eis quas quaedam non accipiunt. In eis vero quae non accipiuntur ab omnibus, praeponat eas quas plures graviusque accipiunt, eis quas pauciores minorisque auctoritatis Ecclesiae tenent. Si autem alias invenerit a pluribus, alias a gravioribus haberi, quamquam hoc facile invenire non possit, aequalis tamen auctoritatis eas habendas puto."

⁸⁹ Cf. Laurentius Surius, *Tomus primus conciliorum omnium*, 503-511. Different from his discussion of the apocrypha, Polanus, in his discussion of the sufficiency of Scripture, devotes large space to the quotations of Augustine, especially from *Contra litteras Petiliani donatistae*. See Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 29-31.

⁹⁰ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 32; Sophronius Eusebius Jerome, *Commentarios in Psalterium* in *Omnia opera*, tom. 8 (Basel, 1516), fo. 69.H.

⁹¹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 21-22; Laurentius Surius, *Tomus tertius conciliorum omnium*, 192; Dionysius the Areopagite, *De divinis nominibus*, in *PG* 3, col. 587-588.

anything of God and the true religion except from the prophets who teach and edify us with divine inspiration.”⁹² It is notable that Polanus does not seem reluctant to quote the thoughts of the fathers, like Dionysius and Clement of Rome, only if in agreement with the orthodox teaching. The two fathers did not explicitly call the New Testament “Scripture” and their quotations of the Old Testament were not found in the Protestant Canon, generally referring to the Wisdom of Solomon and Judith.⁹³ And in defense of Justin’s omission of the apostles in the above quotation, Polanus explains that Justin Martyr “did not exclude the apostles who declared no other gospel than God who was formerly promised through his prophets in Holy Scripture.” Justin attributes divine authority equally to the Old and the New Testaments, by saying that “the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets (τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστολῶν ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν)” are to be read in Sunday worship.⁹⁴

It is also noteworthy that even the medieval doctors are taken by Polanus as a witness for the Reformed statement about the sufficiency of Scripture in harmony with the apostolic fathers. A testimonial of Duns Scotus supports Polanus that “our theology *de facto* comes from nothing but those which are contained in Scripture and from those which are able to be elicited from it.”⁹⁵ As for the canonical issue, however, Duns Scotus is not suitable to be cited because, in consonance with Augustine, he implied the supremacy of

⁹² Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 22; Justin Martyr, *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, in *PG* 6, cols. 311-312.

⁹³ Cf. Burce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 40-43; Paul Rorem, *Biblical and Liturgical Symbols within the Pseudo-Dionysian Synthesis* (PIMS, 1984), 11-26.

⁹⁴ Justin Martyr, *Apologia prima*, in *PG* 6:429-430.

⁹⁵ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 32-33; Johannes Duns Scotus, *Scriptum...super sententias tomus primus* (Venetij, 1506), Prologus Q3:10. It is interesting that Polanus did not use a more recent edition of Duns Scotus’ commentary of *Sentences*, *Scriptum super Sententiae Pristine Integritati restitutum*, which was published in four volumes at the same place in 1515.

the catholic church over the authority of the canonical scriptures in that “it is unreasonable to accept some of the Canon and not the others, when the catholic church, from which by trusting I receive this Canon, receives the whole equally as certain.”⁹⁶ Polanus quotes Durandus of St. Pourçain as a witness supportive of the Reformed confession of the scriptural sufficiency. Durandus stated that the method of teaching what should be taught was “not to go beyond the measure of faith (*mensuram fidei*) which Holy Scripture pronounces,” but he also made a comment provocative of the Reformed orthodox and rather supportive of the Roman Church’s view on biblical interpretation, that is, “the interpretation of something dubious in Holy Scripture belongs to the holy catholic church of Rome.”⁹⁷ Thus, some medieval thinkers, such as Duns Scotus and Durandus, were not uncritically taken by Polanus as witnesses, but their sound thoughts that might verify the catholic integrity of the Reformed doctrine were carefully quoted, without criticizing any of their problematic aspects. Notably, at least in the *Symphonia*, Polanus would see the doctrinally positive side of the medieval sources, without any polemical disputation against medieval theologians.

Dealing with the third thesis, Polanus pays special attention to the Council of Nicaea by pointing out that it is “according to the scriptures (*secundum Scripturas*)” that the 318 fathers enunciated against Arius in the council that “Christ is God from God, light from light, the true God from the true God, born from the Father, not created, and of the one

⁹⁶ Augustine, *Contra epistolam Fundamenti*, PL 42: 176: “Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me catholicae Ecclesiae commoneret [CSEL: commoveret] auctoritas”; Johannes Duns Scotus, *Ordinatio: Prologus*, in *Joannis Duns Scoti doctoris subtilis, ordinis minorum opera omnia*, vol. 8 (Paris, 1891), 88: “irrationabile est aliquid Canonis recipere et aliquid non, cum Ecclesia catholica, cui credendo Canonem recipio, recipiat totum aequaliter ut certum.”

⁹⁷ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 33; Durandus of St. Pourçain, *In quatuor Sententiarum libros questionum* (Paris, 1508), praefatio.

substance with the Father.”⁹⁸ This point was not newly made by Polanus but had already been made by the fathers, especially by Ambrose and Athanasius who asserted that the faith of the catholic church (ἡ τῆς καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας πίστις) which the fathers confessed in the Nicene council was made only out of the holy writings against the impious doctrines of the Arians.⁹⁹ The fathers would search and listen to “the decisive voice of Christ (*vocem Christi decisivam*) not from anywhere else but in Holy Scripture.”¹⁰⁰ By these quotations, Polanus would say that, as the measure of faith, the Creed reflects the sense of the whole Scripture and should, thus, not be exceeded in the exegesis of any given biblical text and in the discussion of any given doctrine. Also notably, he points out that what we are to find in the writings of the fathers is their continual and consistent appeal to the holy writings of the prophets and the apostles to think with, speak in, walk with, and remain within the limit of their divinely inspired testimonies.

Polanus’s following quotation from Chrysostom’s *Opus imperfectum Matthaei Euangelium* with regard to the Reformed polemic against the Roman Church’s doctrine about the authority of Scripture and church should be also given special attention:

[At that time] whence the impious heresy, *which is the army of anti-Christ*, shall prevail over those churches, there can neither be any proof of the true Christianity,

⁹⁸ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 35.

⁹⁹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 35; Ambrosius, *De fide Gratianum Augustum*, in *Opera omnia*, tom. 2 (Basel, 1538), 59-60: “Deus igitur ex deo, lumen de lumine, uetus deus de deo uero, ex patre natus non factus, usius substantiae cum patres. Sic nempe nostri secundum scripturas dixerunt patres, qui etiam sacrilega dogmata ideo suis inserenda putauere decretis, ut Arrij perfidia ipsa se proderet”; Athanasius, *Epistola ad Jovianum*, in *PG* 26, col. 816: “Θελησάσης τοίνυν τῆς σῆς εὐσεβείας μαθεῖν παρ’ ἡμῶν τὴν τῆς καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας πίστιν, εὐχαριστήσαντες ἐπὶ τούτοις τῷ Κυρίῳ, ἐβουλευσάμεθα μᾶλλον πάντων τὴν παρὰ τῶν Πατέρων ἐν Νικαίᾳ ὁμολογηθεῖσαν πίστιν ὑπομνήσαι τὴν σὴν εὐσέβειαν.... Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀληθὴς καὶ εὐσεβὴς εἰς τὸν Κύριον πίστις φανερὰ πᾶσι καθέστηκεν, ἐκ τῶν θείων Γραφῶν γινωσκομένη τε καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένη.”

¹⁰⁰ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 36.

nor can there be any place of refuge for the Christians, who are willing to recognize the truth of faith, except Holy Scripture The Lord is cognizant of the fact that there will be such a great confusion of things in the last days: for that reason he commands, let the Christians, who live in the confession of Christian faith and are willing to accept the certainty of the true faith, flee to no other thing but to the scriptures. Otherwise, if they have regard to other things, they should be tempted to evil and destroyed, not understanding what the true church may be.¹⁰¹ (Italics added)

By using this quotation, Polanus stresses that the only infallible criterion for ascertaining the true church is Scripture, which thus becomes the sole and safest sanctuary for Christians. In Polanus' own time, Chrysostom's authorship of the treatise was debated: "Erasmus had not only declared the *Opus imperfectum* spurious but had pointed out its Arianism."¹⁰² Still, Erasmus' verdict was not entirely accepted. Thomas James made a strong argument that this incomplete work used by Polanus was not ascribed to Chrysostom, acknowledging that there were some Roman Catholics who urged this book was his.¹⁰³ James's reason for rejecting Chrysostom's authorship of the work is that James found some doctrinally poisonous words which had been in all ancient editions but were missing in some later editions of his day, the words that seem to savor of Arianism. Still he

¹⁰¹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 36-37. Cf. Iohannes Chrysostomus, *Opus imperfectum in Matthaevi Euangelium*, in *Omnia opera septimus tomus* (Basel, 1525), 110v: "Quia in tempore hoc, ex quo obtinuit haeresis illas ecclesias, nulla probatio potest esse verae christianitatis, neque refugium potest esse christianorum aliud volentium cognoscere fidei veritatem, nisi scripturae divinae.... Qui ergo vult cognoscere, quae sit vera ecclesia christi, unde cognoscat, nisi tantummodo per scripturas. Sciens ergo dominus tantam confusionem rerum in nouissimis diebus esse futuram: ideo mandat, ut christiani qui sunt in christianitate, volentes firmitatem accipere fidei verae, ad nullam rem fugiant, nisi ad scripturas. Alioqui si ad alias respexerint, scandalizabuntur, et peribunt, non intelligentes quae sit vera ecclesia."

¹⁰² See Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 38; Erasmus, *Tertius tomus operum Diui Ioannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani, in quo Homiliae in Matthaem et Ioannem: praeterea commentarii digni lectu in Matthaem incerto autore* (Basle, 1530), 473.

¹⁰³ See James, *A Treatise of the Corruptions of Scripture, Councils and Fathers*, part.II, 33-39.

did not attribute the authorship of the work to any Arian writer but to “a very ancient writer whose books have been much regarded and observed by venerable antiquity.”¹⁰⁴

Unlike Thomas James but in agreement with Aquinas and John Jewel, Polanus affirms that Chrysostom is the author of the *Opus imperfectum in Mattaei Evangelium*.¹⁰⁵ “This *Opus* of homilies,” he also claims, “ought not to be rejected by the Roman Catholics, which has deserved to be cited with praise in the canonical law.”¹⁰⁶ This claim has polemic connection with the Roman Office of the Inquisition that put this *Opus* on the Index of Prohibited Authors and Books (*Index Auctorum et librorum prohibitorum*), which was published at Rome in 1559.¹⁰⁷ Beneath the title of the *Opus* in the *Index* is the concise evaluation that it was “wrongly attributed to Chrysostom” (*Chrisostomo falso attributum*). But Polanus, in opposition to this evaluation, inserted the italic part (*quae est exercitus Antichristi*) into the quoted text, a part that originally appears in a paragraph prior to the text.¹⁰⁸ By this insertion, he would emphasize the systematic heresy of the papacy not just against the Reformed church but ultimately against Christ himself. Polanus’ own verdict

¹⁰⁴ James, *A Treatise of the Corruptions of Scripture, Councils and Fathers*, part.II, 36. Likewise, Ussher did not specify the exact name of the author. See James Ussher, *Historia dogmatica de scripturis et sacris vernaculis* (London, 1690), 73-74.

¹⁰⁵ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 36-37; Thomas Aquinas, *Catena Aurea IV super libros Evang.* (Paris, 1517), 92r; John Jewel, “A Treatise of the Holy Scriptures,” in *The Works of the very learned and reverend father in God John Jewel* (Lond, 1609), 34. According to Thomas James, Sixtus Senensis “doth rather incline vnto this opinion.” See James, *A Treatise of the Corruptions of Scripture, Councils and Fathers*, part.II, 36; Sixtus Senensis, *Bibliotheca sancta* (Colonia, 1586), 470-471. Humphrey Lynde is also one of those who considered Chrysostom to be the author of the *Opus*. See Humphrey Lynde, *Via Devia: The By-Way: Mis-leading the weake and unstable into dangerous paths of Error, by colourable shewes of Apocryphall Scriptures, unwritten Traditions, doubtfull Fathers, ambiguous Councells, and pretended Catholike Church* (London, 1630), 624-625. The modern patristic scholars, nevertheless, have concluded that the treatise is indeed spurious and probably written by a Latin or Western Arian in the fifth or sixth century.

¹⁰⁶ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 37.

¹⁰⁷ See the list of the prohibited books under the letter O in the *Index Auctorum et librorum prohibitorum* (Roma, 1559).

¹⁰⁸ Iohannes Chrysostomus, *Opus imperfectum in Matthaevi Euangelium*, 110v: “Id est, cum videritis haeresim impiam *quae est exercitus Antichristi* stantem in locis sanctis Ecclesiae.” (Italics are mine)

on the question of authorship both follows his rather typical choice of a Basel edition of the fathers and suited the goals of his polemic.

The discussion of the fourth thesis reveals that Polanus would clarify the meaning of the patristic quotation by using bifurcation. Polanus devotes the first three pages to cite Augustine's texts. Notable is this sentence: "the Holy Spirit has arranged the Holy Scriptures so magnificently and wholesomely that with some more explicit passages he might satisfy our hunger, and with the more obscure might remove fastidiousness, since almost nothing is elicited out of those obscure passages which may not be uncovered in the plainest language elsewhere."¹⁰⁹ Making a distinction of the more obscure passages in Scripture into something necessary for salvation and something other, Polanus understands the quotation in such a way that Augustine discusses there "a tiny bit" (*particulam*) just for the sake of "something other" but more fully in different places: "in the passages apparently depicted in Scripture are to be found all (*omnia*) that concerns faith and the manner of living" (*fidem moresque vivendi*).¹¹⁰ The two quotations seem to conflict with each other. The right understanding of the second one, Polanus reasons, is that the word *omnia* does not refer to "everywhere" (*ubique*) in Scripture because Scripture instructs us about faith and the manner of living more obscurely "somewhere" (*alicubi*). He still adheres to the fact that there is nothing necessary for faith and the manner of living that Scripture does not teach in other places explicitly and perspicuously. On this ground, he could declare with Chrysostom that "all things that come from the divine scriptures are

¹⁰⁹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 38; Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, II.vi.

¹¹⁰ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 39; Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, II.ix.

clear and plain; the necessary things are all manifest.”¹¹¹ Augustine provides Polanus with a different expression on the same issue that “if the passages of this kind [clear and plain] were not found in the sacred scriptures, there would be no means by which the dark passages might be illuminated and the obscure passages might be clarified.”¹¹²

Polanus also appeals to Augustine to ascertain the Reformed teaching of the different levels of scriptural comprehension: every biblical text is not plain or obscure on the same level, and each text is not equally manifest or ambiguous to the learned and the unlearned.¹¹³ It, however, is untenable that this Reformed teaching implies that every scriptural verse tells different things or things different *to* each individual. In consonance with Augustine, Polanus insists that “Holy Scripture does not have in the obscure passages something different (*alia*) from what is in the plain passages, but only has it in a different way (*aliter tantum*).”¹¹⁴

Most provoking to the Roman Catholic writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries may be the fifth thesis of viewing Scripture as its own interpreter (*scriptura sui ipsius interpres*). For Polanus, this view of biblical exegesis was not invented newly in the sixteenth century by the Protestants but was already proclaimed and ingrained in the patristic thought, from the early second century onward. To demonstrate this, a series of testimonies are quoted from Clement of Rome, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Chrysostom, Basil the Great, Athanasius, Ambrose, Augustine, the Frankish emperors

¹¹¹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 42-43; Chrysostomus, *In epistulam II ad Thessalonicenses*, in *PG* 62, col.485: “πάντα σαφῆ καὶ εὐθέα τὰ παρὰ ταῖς θείαις Γραφαῖς, πάντα τὰ ἀναγκαῖα δῆλα.”

¹¹² Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 39; Augustine, *De unitate ecclesiae*, in *PL* 43, col.378.

¹¹³ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 39-40; Augustine, *Epistolae secundum ordinem temporum*, cxxxvii.1, in *PL* 33, col.516.

¹¹⁴ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 40.

Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, Origen, Jerome, and Hilary.¹¹⁵ As the first advocate of the *scriptura sui ipsius interpres*, Clement of Rome describes that the sense of Scripture should not be inquired from without (*extrinsecus*), since it is most proper to grasp the meaning of truth from Scripture itself (*ex ipsis*).¹¹⁶ In the same vein, Origen provides a plausible analogy: “just as all the gold outside the temple is not sanctified, so every sense which is outside Holy Scripture, however admirable it may seem, is not sacred, because it is not sustained by the sense of Scripture, which sanctifies only that sense which it has in itself, as the temple does its own gold.”¹¹⁷ On the ground that “by the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be confirmed,” Origen writes in another place, he would establish the word of his understanding of biblical texts “by taking two witnesses from the Old and the New Testaments, by taking three witnesses from the gospel, from the prophets, and from the apostles.”¹¹⁸ For this reason, Hilary, the last patristic witness of the fifth thesis, identifies the best reader (*optimus lector*) of Scripture as one who looks for the understanding of the scriptural texts from Scripture rather than imposing a meaning upon them, a reader who takes away a meaning rather than brings it and who does not force upon the words the appearance of that meaning which before reading he presumed to be

¹¹⁵ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 48-56.

¹¹⁶ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 48.

¹¹⁷ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 54; Origen, *Commentarii...in evangelium Matthaei*, xxv, in *Origenis Adamantii operum pars secunda* (Basel, 1536), 141: “Sicut enim omne aurum quodquod fuerit extra templum non est sanctificatum: Sic omnis sensus qui fuerit extra diuinam Scripturam, quamuis admirabilis uideatur quibusdam, non est sanctus, quia non continetur a sensu Scripturae, quae solet eum solum sensum sanctificare, quem habet in se, sicut templum proprium aurum.”

¹¹⁸ Origen, *Homiliae Origenis in Hieremiam*, i, in *Origenis Adamantii operum pars prima* (Basel, 1536), 657: “in ore duorum uel trium testium stabit omne uerbum, magis conuenit ad interpretantis probatioinem, que ad quorumcunque hominum numerum: ut firmem uerbum intellectus mei accipiens duos testes de nouo & ueteri testamento, accipiens tres testes, de euangelio, de propheta, de apostolo.”

understood.¹¹⁹ Thus, the patristic quotations made by Polanus signify that the church fathers held to the idea of “sola scriptura” and their ultimate appeal for the authority of biblical interpretation was given to Scripture alone and that the fathers would breathe in their writings with the spirit of the Old and the New Testaments. The church fathers never intended themselves to be the judge or touchstone of biblical exegesis, but rather were willing to be judged and rectified by Scripture alone. This is the point Polanus would make in the next thesis.

Augustine is taken again as a principal witness of the sixth thesis, who once made a sincere request to his readers and correctors that “let not the former love me more than the catholic faith, let not the latter love himself more than the catholic verity.”¹²⁰ He went on to ask the readers not to yield themselves to his writings unrestrainedly as they do with the canonical scriptures and to ask the correctors not to amend his writings with their own ideas but from the divine text. Augustine, indeed, did not allow his readers to follow him farther than he followed the scriptural truth. With this humbleness of Augustine, Polanus stresses that human beings, however distinguished they may be for piety and learning, are not capable of perfectly understanding Scripture without any errors but under progress, sometimes defending their pertinacity in error probably till the final day of this life.¹²¹

¹¹⁹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 55-56; Hylarius, *De trinitate*, in *Opera complura sancti Hylarii Episcopi* (1511), I.iii: “Optimus lector est, qui dictorum intelligentiam exspectet ex dictis potius quam imponat, et retulerit magis quam attulerit; neque cogat id videri dictis contineri quod ante lectionem praesumerit intelligendum.”

¹²⁰ Augustine, *De trinitate*, in *PL* 42, III.ii, col. 869: “Verumtamen sicut lectorem meum nolo esse mihi deditum, ita correctorem nolo sibi. Ille me non amet amplius quam catholicam fidem; ille se non amet amplius quam catholicam veritatem. Sicut illi dico: Noli meis litteris quasi Scripturis canonicis in servire, sed in illis et quod non credebas cum inveneris incunctanter crede, in istis autem quod certum non habebas nisi certum intellexeris noli firme retinere; ita illi dico: Noli meas litteras ex tua opinione vel contentione, sed ex divina lectione vel inconcussa ratione corrigere.”

¹²¹ Augustine, *De dono perseverantiae*, in *PL* 45, cols. 1028-1029.

To see another attitude of Polanus toward patristic thought, close attention should be paid to his quotation of the two arguments made by Augustine. The first is that “if peradventure there be found any deviation from the truth in writings since the completion of scriptural canon, we may freely correct it by the graver discourse of more skillful theologians or by the collective intervention of councils.” The second argument is that “the national or provincial councils ought, indisputably, to yield to the authority of plenary councils which are collected out of the whole Christian world and which may be amended by later councils.”¹²² Augustine seems here to put emphasis on the higher authority of wiser theologians and of larger councils against the Donatist teaching of the baptism, while Polanus would make a different point that there occur significant differences among the fathers or councils in the understanding of truth and thus that all of them could err and undoubtedly be corrected by the indisputable truth of Scripture. One may accuse Polanus of distorting the contextual meaning of the quotation intended by its author. It, however, would be safer to say that Polanus did not decontextualize the original text of the citation, as the whole scope of *De baptismo* basically appeals to Scripture for its final authority. Thus, Polanus’s understanding of a quotation shows respect for the larger meaning in its broader context.

The seventh thesis is intended, not just constructively to prod the Reformed body to realize the significance of properly knowing Scripture for the establishment and

¹²² Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 59; Augustine, *De baptismo contra Donatistas*, II.iii, in *PL* 43, cols. 128-129: “episcoporum autem litteras quae post confirmatum canonem vel scriptae sunt vel scribuntur, et per sermonem forte sapientiosem cujuslibet in ea re peritioris, et per aliorum episcoporum graviorem auctoritatem doctioremque prudentiam, et per concilia licere reprehendi, si quid in eis forte a veritate deviatum est: et ipsa concilia quae per singulas regiones vel provincias fiunt, plenariorum conciliorum auctoritati quae fiunt ex universo orbe christiano, sine ullis ambagibus cedere: ipsaque plenaria saepe priora posterioribus emendari.”

solidification of the true catholic and orthodox faith, but also to criticize the Roman Catholics for their ignorance or distortion of the proper interpretation of Scripture. In his epistle to Eustochius, Jerome wrote on the basis of Paul's phrase "Christ is the power of God and His wisdom" that "ignorance of Scripture is ignorance of Christ."¹²³ It is interesting to see that Polanus, though having read and known Jerome's *Opera*, did not take the above quotation directly from his *Opera* but from the *Jus canonicum* (1591) on purpose. Polanus's requotation was aimed at insinuating the self-contradiction of the Roman Catholics because, though they were well aware of the quoted text and moreover included it in their canon law with legal authority, their learned ignorance of Scripture might lead them to the ignorance of Christ. Having this in view, Polanus refers the readers to the origin of heresy by presenting the patristic testimonies: in sum, heresy does not come from the Word but from its wrong interpretation.¹²⁴

In his discussion of the eighth thesis Polanus engages not only with the ancient fathers but also actively with medieval theologians such as Aquinas, Hugo of Cher, and Cajetan, the last two of whom are not listed in his bibliographical index. Polanus's use of medieval doctors against the Roman Catholic church is standard procedure among early Reformed Orthodox theologians, once again identifying Polanus as a representative of early Reformed Orthodoxy. Medieval doctors are used by Polanus for supporting the doctrines of the Reformed in a polemic context against the Roman Catholics. The

¹²³ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 61; Jerome, *In primvm commentariorvm Esaiæ ad Evstochivm virginem proemivm*, in *Omnia opera*, vol.5, fo.2: "Si enim iuxta apostolum Paulum christus dei uirtus est, deiq; sapientia: & qui nescit scripturas, nescit dei uirtutem eiusq; sapientiam: ignoratio scripturarum, ignoratio christi est."

¹²⁴ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 61; Hylarius, *De trinitate*, II.iii: "Extiterunt enim plures, qui caelestium verborum simplicitatem pro voluntatis suae sensu, non pro veritatis ipsius absolute suscipere, aliter interpretautes quam dictorum virtus postulare. De intelligentia enim haeresis, non de Scriptura est: & sensus, non sermo sit crimen."

quotations made by Polanus come from their interpretations of 2 Timothy 3:16. According to Aquinas, the effect of Scripture is quadruplex: teaching the truth, reproof of falsehood, rescuing from evil and inducing good, and perfecting human beings.¹²⁵ Hugo and Cajetan echo Aquinas when they say that the whole Scripture is perfect, and concerns all things necessary for the salvation of God's people. Against those Roman Catholics, who held to the unwritten tradition in parallel to the "imperfect" Scripture, Polanus argues with regard to the notion of the human-perfecting Scripture that "if Scripture perfects human beings, it is necessary that Scripture be perfect, because what is imperfect by itself cannot make others perfect."¹²⁶

The ninth thesis relates to the patristic way in which the conflict of biblical interpretation and religious controversies are judged or resolved. In his disputes with the Donatists on where the true universal church was, Augustine would terminate the matter by appealing to Scripture as the sole supreme judge: "Let us not hear, I say this, you say that; but let us hear this that the Lord says. There are sure scriptures of the Lord, to the authority of which both of us consent, both of us submit, and both of us serve: let us search the church there and let us plead our case."¹²⁷ Prior to Augustine, Polanus states, Optatus Milevitanus, the successor of Montanus in the primatial see of Carthage, would solve the theological controversy against Parmenius concerning whether baptism ought to be

¹²⁵ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 66; Thomas Aquinas, *Super II Epistolam B. Pauli ad Timotheum lectura* (Taurini, 1950), lectio 5: "Sic ergo quadruplex est effectus sacrae Scripturae, scilicet docere veritatem, arguere falsitatem: quantum ad speculativam; eripere a malo, et inducere ad bonum: quantum ad practicam. Ultimus eius effectus est, ut perducat homines ad perfectum. Non enim qualitercumque bonum facit, sed perficit."

¹²⁶ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 66.

¹²⁷ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 68; Augustine, *De unitate ecclesiae*, col. 394: "non audiamus, Haec dicis, haec dico; sed audiamus, Haec dicit Dominus. Sunt certe Libri dominici, quorum auctoritati utrique consentimus, utrique edimus, utrique servimus: ibi quaeramus Ecclesiam, ibi discutiamus causam nostram."

repeated, by appealing to Christ as “the highest judge”; we do not need to knock at heaven’s door to find him since we have his testament at hand in the gospel.¹²⁸ Likewise, Jerome avouches the importance and final authority of Scripture by expounding on the ground of Paul’s phrase, “he who receives you receives me,” that “what Paul speaks is spoken by Christ” and that thus “our Lord and Saviour shows us and speaks in the scriptures of his princes... not to intend that a few might perceive it, but all people.”¹²⁹

It is notable to see Polanus’s quotation of Cyprian’s word: “the Father also testifies from heaven saying ‘Hear him,’ that Christ alone ought to be heard... Neither is it becoming to follow the practice of human beings but the truth of God; since God speaks by Isaiah the prophet that ‘they worship me in vain, teaching human commandments and doctrines.’”¹³⁰ Polanus, though knowing and referring to the Geneva edition of Cyprian’s *Opera* published in 1593, took this quotation on purpose from the canonical law. By so doing, he also attempts to remind the Roman Catholics of Cyprian’s rigorous advocacy for Scripture and Christ speaking in it as the supreme and final judge who should be respected in all religious and doctrinal controversies, and he makes sure that Cyprian, willingly called by the Roman Catholics as one of their highest appeals, rather rebuked them for

¹²⁸ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 71; Optatus Milevitanus, *Contra Parmenianum Donatistam*, in *PL* 11, cols. 1028-1029: “ergo in terris de hac re nullum poterit reperiri iudicium; de coelo quaerendus est iudex. Sed ut quid pulsamus ad coelum, cum habeamus hic in Evangelio testamentum?”

¹²⁹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 72; Jerome, in *Opera omnia*, vol.8, fo. 61: “Et quod Paulus loquitur, loquitur Christus. Qui enim vos recipit, me recipit: Dominus ergo noster atque Salvator narrat nobis et loquitur in scripturis principum suorum.”

¹³⁰ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 74-75; Giovanni Paolo Lancellotti, ed., *Corpus juris canonici*, vol. 1 (Colonia, 1605), VIII.ix (23); Cyprian, *Epistola LXIII*, in *D. Caecilii Cypriani opera*, tom. 1, 177: “Et quod Christus debeat solus audiri, pater etiam de coelo constestatur, dicens Hic est filius meus dilectissimus in quo bene sensi, ipsum audite...Neque enim hominis consuetudinem sequi oportet, sed Dei veritatem: cum per Esaiam prophetam Deus loquatur & dicat, Sine causa autem colunt me, mandata & doctrinas hominum docentes.”

“changing by human tradition what was divinely instituted (*quod diuinitus institutum sit, humana traditione mutare*)” in Scripture.¹³¹

In the same vein, Polanus appeals to Augustine who claimed Christian freedom in religious affairs from the authority even of his great forefathers. With respectful reference to the ancient writings of the pious and learned Ambrose, Jerome, Athanasius, and Gregory, Augustine stated in his epistle to Fortunatianus: “We ought not to esteem the reasonings of any person whatsoever, even if he is catholic and of high reputation, as much as the canonical scriptures so that it may not be unlawful for us, without infringing upon the honor which they deserve, to disapprove and reject anything in their writings, if perchance we shall find that they have pondered opinions differing from that which others or we ourselves have, by the divine aid, understood to be the truth.”¹³² This is the way in which the great bishop of Hippo treated the patristic literature written before his time, and he even advised his intelligent readers to deal with his own writings in this way. Polanus would take Augustine’s attitude toward the church fathers as the best example of patristic theology. And Augustine’s observation that the fathers had different thoughts from each other encourages Polanus to argue that all the religious controversies “neither can nor ought to be settled (*decidi nec possunt nec debent*)” by patristic authority but by the canonical authority of Scripture.¹³³ This is also the case with the councils and Roman

¹³¹ Cyprian, *Epistola LXIII*, 177.

¹³² Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 77; Augustine, *Epistola CXLVIII ad Fortunatianum*, in *PL* 33, cols. 628-629: “Neque enim quorumlibet disputationes, quamvis catholicorum et laudatorum hominum, velut Scripturas canonicas habere debemus, ut nobis non liceat salva honorificentia quae illis debetur hominibus, aliquid in eorum scriptis improbare atque respuere, si forte invenerimus quod aliter senserint quam veritas habet, divino adjutorio vel ab aliis intellecta, vel a nobis. Talis ego sum in scriptis aliorum; tales volo esse intellectores meorum.”

¹³³ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 77; Augustine, *De videndo deo liber, seu epistola CXLVII*, in *PL* 33, col. 597; idem, *Contra Cresconium grammaticum partis Donati*, in *PL* 43, col. 490.

pontiffs. Polanus acknowledges that general councils, representing the whole universal church, must be truly considered as “the best witness of tradition, the best expounder of Scripture, the best determiner of a question.”¹³⁴ But it should be also perceived that they may err or can be of different opinions among themselves as “human invention,” thus hardly being competitive with the divinely inspired Scripture that has sovereign authority.¹³⁵ Also supportive of Polanus’s sureness of Scripture as the supreme judge of all religious polemics is Theodoret of Cyrus who shouted, opposing all pretensions of human traditions besides Scripture; “Do not tell me of human logisms and syllogisms: I rely upon Scripture alone.”¹³⁶

Concerning the priority in the authority of Scripture over any universal council or Roman pope, Polanus is willing to dialogue with medieval thinkers, such as Jean Gerson, Panormitanus, and Johann Francis Pico, who are supposedly contributory to the papacy. Viewing Gerson as “an extraordinary scholar (*doctor eximium*),” Polanus used the Basel edition of *Prima pars Joannis Gersonis*, which was published at 1518. His short quotation from Gerson is this: “The gospel is more trustworthy to an unauthorized individual than a pope or council.”¹³⁷ An interesting point is that the quoted text is not Gerson’s own word as such but its summary made by Polanus. The context of the original text of the quotation is that an individual person deeply versed in scriptures with a doctrinal assertion of more canonical authority deserves to be regarded more than the declaration of the pope, and that

¹³⁴ Jeremy Taylor, *Ductor dubitantium or the Rule of Conscience* (London, 1660), II.iii.14 (p. 475).

¹³⁵ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 81; Augustine, *Contra Maximinum Arianorum Episcopum*, in *PL* 42, col. 772.

¹³⁶ Theodoret of Cyrus, *Eranistes etoi polymorphos*, in *PG* 83, cols. 45-48: “Μὴ μοι λογισμοὺς καὶ συλλογισμοὺς ἀνθρωπίνους προσενέγκῃς. Ἐγὼ γὰρ μόνῃ πείθομαι τῇ θεῖα γραφῇ.”

¹³⁷ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 81: “Plus credendum simplici non autorisato Euangelium alleganti, quam Papae aut Concilio.”

such an individual may reject and oppose the decree of that general council which inclines to that part which is contrary to the scriptures.¹³⁸ This thought is condensed into one sentence by Polanus as quoted. In doctrinal association with the medieval doctors, Polanus testifies the confession of the Reformed church, that is, the canonical authority of Scripture was accepted by the church as the sufficient and infallible rule of faith and life for the whole church and for every single member unto the end of the world, and thus no human authority, however trustworthy and reasonable, ought to be equalled to it.¹³⁹

With the same end, Polanus appeals to Abbas Panormatinus (or Nicolo de Tudeschi),¹⁴⁰ the most influential canonist of the fifteenth century and an Italian Benedictine archbishop, who stated that “in things of faith the *dictum* even of one private person ought to take precedence over the sentence of a pope, if he were moved by the better authority of the Old and the New Testaments.”¹⁴¹ Notable in his quotation is that Polanus omits a word *rationibus* from its original text, probably, to put more emphasis on the issue of scriptural authority. The most significant reason that Polanus took Panormatinus as a witness is that the Italian canonist publicly acknowledged that the pope

¹³⁸ Johannes Gerson, *De examinatione doctrinarum*, in *Prima pars Joannis Gersonis* (Basel, 1518), I.iv: “Jungatur huic considerationi cum sua declaratione duplex veritas. Prima staret quod aliquis simplex non autorisatus esset tam excellenter in sacris literis eruditus quod plus esset in casu credendus doctrinali suae assertioni quam [papae] declarationi. Constat enim plus esse credendum evangelio quam papae. Si doceat igitur talis eruditus veritatem aliquam in evangelio contineri vbi papa nescire vel vltro erraret: patet cuius praefendum sit iudicium. Altera veritas. Talis eruditus deberet in casu si et dum celebraretur generale concilium cui et ipse praesens esset illi se opponere. Si sentiret maiorem partem ad oppositum evangelij malicia vel ignorantia declinare.”

¹³⁹ Johannes Gerson, *De examinatione doctrinarum*, I.v-II.i: “Post approbationem et auctorisationem quatuor evangeliorum per dictam ecclesiam, plus esst credendum evangelio quam alteri cuicumque humanae auctoritati...Scriptura nobis tradita est tanquam regula sufficiens et infallibilis pro regimine totius ecclesiastici corporis et membrorum usque in finem saeculi.”

¹⁴⁰ Here and in the following, I will use “Panormatinus.”

¹⁴¹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 81: “Nam in conceruentibus fidem etiam dictum unius privati esset praefendum dicto papae, si ille moveretur melioribus auctoritatibus novi et veteris testamenti quam papa”; Abbas Panormatinus, *De electione c. Significasti*, in *Commentaria primae partis in primum decretalium librum* (Venice, 1592), 108r, col.1.

could not just err but, much more importantly, could be a heretic and be judged with regard to heresy (*quod Papa potest esse haereticus, & de haeresi iudicari*).¹⁴² Panormatinus also made a reasonable argument about a general council: “A general council represents the whole universal church, yet in truth the universal church is not there really but representatively because the universal church is constituted in the sum total of all the faithful, whose head and guaranty is Christ himself.”¹⁴³ Having this in mind, he further argues that, on the ground that Christ prays for the church that it shall not fail, we cannot say that a general council is unable to err. The reason is that true faith in Christ is not an exclusive possession of the general council but may remain in one single person (*uno solo*) who did not attend the council. Even when the general council erred, we do not need to worry as if faith has failed in the church, because of that possibility in which the right of the universal church can reside in the single person.¹⁴⁴

A similar critical thought of the pope and general council is found in Polanus’s quotation from Pico.¹⁴⁵ Pico was an extreme syncretist who intended to combine all kinds of religions and philosophies, either Christian, Jewish, or pagan into his “own doctrine (*proprium*).” The rule that led him to be such a syncretistic theologian was that a scholar, “in unrolling every kind of writers, may pass over no enticing commentations” available to

¹⁴² Abbas Panormatinus, *De electione c. Significasti*, 108r, col.1.

¹⁴³ Panormatinus, *De electione c. Significasti*, 108r, col.1: “licet concilium generale representet totam ecclesiam vniuersalem, tamen in veritate ibi non est vere vniuersalis ecclesia, sed repraesentatiue, quia vniuersalis ecclesia constituitur ex collectione innum fidelium, vnde omnes fideles orbis constituunt istam ecclesiam vniuersalem, cuius caput & sponsus est ipse Christus.”

¹⁴⁴ Panormatinus, *De electione c. Significasti*, 108r, col.1.

¹⁴⁵ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 81-82: “De firmitate iudicii tum Conciliorum, tum Pontificum, non exstat hactenus ullum decretum; quod vel ex eo apparet, quod Johannes de Turre cremata nullum profert, etsi magnus Pontificiae autoritatis assertor. Itaq; haec propositio apud ipsum Concilium legitime congregatum in causis fidei falsum iudicare non potest, veritatem indubiam non continet.”

him, a rule that was utterly observed by Aristotle whom for that reason Plato called *the* reader.¹⁴⁶ After this rule, Pico resolved himself “to range through all masters of philosophy, to examine all kinds of books, and to become acquainted with all schools.”¹⁴⁷ As a result, he learned a vigorous dialectic in Duns Scotus, a balanced solidity in Aquinas, a neat precision in Giles of Rome, a penetrating acuteness in Francis of Meyronnes, an antique and grand amplitude in Albert the Great, a constant and venerable solemnity in Henry of Ghent, an merely unshakable firmness in Averroes, a thoughtful seriousness in Avempace, a divine Platonic sublimity in Avicenna, a rich and copious philosophy in Simplicius, an elegant and compendious writing in Themistius, a learned and self-consistent thought in Alexander of Aphrodisias, a smooth and agreeable speech in Ammonius, the wealth of topics and the complexity of religion in Porphyry, an occult philosophy and the mysteries of the barbarians in Iamblichus, and the divine speech of divine things and the humanity of human things in every part of Plotinus.¹⁴⁸ In addition, he found a considerable agreement between Plato and Aristotle, Aquinas and Scotus, Averroes and Avicenna, as well as between the Jews and the Christians. Pico may be the first to combine the Jewish cabbala with this syncretism into Christianity, with a conviction that “there is no science which may certify the divinity of Christ more than a magical and cabalistic science.”¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁶ Johannes Pico della Mirandola, *Oratio de hominis dignitate*, in *Opera Joannis Pici* (Strassburg, 1504), fo. 88r: “Fuit enim cum ab antiquis omnibus hoc observatum, ut omne scriptorum genus evolventes, nullas quas possent commentationes illectas preterirent, tum maxime ab Aristotele, qui eam ob causam ἀναγνώστης, id est lector, a Platone nuncupabatur, et profecto angustae est mentis intra unam se Porticum aut Achademiam continuisse.”

¹⁴⁷ Pico, *Oratio de hominis dignitate*, fo. 88r.

¹⁴⁸ Pico, *Oratio de hominis dignitate*, fo. 86r-v.

¹⁴⁹ Pico, *Oratio de hominis dignitate*, fo. 90r; idem, *Quaestio quinta de magia naturali: & Cabala hebraea*. Also see the cabalist dogmas selected from Johannes Pico’s commentaries on them, *Cabalistarvm selectiora, obscurioraque dogmata, a Ioanne Pico ex eorvm commentationibvs pridem excerpta* (Venice,

A problematic thing is the fact that Pico said that “all wisdom has flowed from the barbarians to the Greeks and from the Greeks to us,” and moreover, with reference to Moses as the greatest of all philosophers who was versed in all the sciences of the Egyptians, that “the most holy theology” is “the mistress of philosophy (*domina sua*).”¹⁵⁰ With this in view, he urges that those who have been received into the sanctuary should “serve the holy things of philosophy, like diligent Levites.”¹⁵¹ It is surprising, however, that these doubtful arguments from Pico did not persuade Polanus to reject the extraction of even some sound thoughts from Pico’s theology. Rather, Polanus did not hesitate to quote, still in an eclectic manner, Pico’s critical thoughts on the *inviabile* authority of the popes or general councils. Such eclecticism on Polanus’s part must be rooted in his preference for the orthodox content of theological literature to its fame and also his conviction that whatever is right and good is produced by and comes from God alone who is the Father of lights.

Special attention should be given to Polanus’s discussion of the eleventh thesis, since he quotes an epistle of Zephyrinus, the pope of Rome (199-217), to all the bishops of Sicily, where the pope said that “Just as the night does not extinguish the stars in the sky, the universal iniquity does not obscure the minds of the faithful adhering to the foundation

1569). Cf. John Gieseler, *A Text-Book of Church History*, vol.3, trans. John Hull and ed. by Henry Smith (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1858), 473-475.

¹⁵⁰ Pico, *Oratio de hominis dignitate*, fo.86r, 88v: “Quando omnis sapientia a Barbaris ad Graecos, a Graecis ad nos manavit...Idcirco in ea veram quietem et solidam pacem se nobis prestare non posse, esse hoc dominae suae, idest sanctissimae theologiae, munus et privilegium.”

¹⁵¹ Pico, *Oratio de hominis dignitate*, fo.86r: “Qui mores iam composuerunt, in sanctuarium recepti, nondum quidem sacra attractent, sed prius dyaletico famulatu seduli levitae philosophiae sacris ministrent.”

of Holy Scripture.”¹⁵² The main theme of the epistle is that we ought to ponder and pay careful attention to Scripture and the divine precepts contained in it, in order that, in the court, we may not appear to be transgressors of the divine law but its fulfiller.¹⁵³ For the sake of the oppressed, moreover, Zephyrinus presents a twofold function of Scripture: Christians must be nurtured (*nutriantur*) by the divine teachings of the apostles, defended (*defendantur*) by their authority, and thus relieved of their oppressions. With this in mind, Polanus uses the quoted phrase, first *constructively*, to inspire the Reformed church to be more completely versed in the apostolic teachings and then *polemically* to blame, with the certified voice of the ancient pope, the Roman Catholics for retreating far away from the scriptural foundation.

After discussing all the theses of Holy Scripture, Polanus makes a short comment: “Thus far the agreement of our [Reformed church] and the orthodox fathers has been revealed in the controversial theses between us and the Roman Catholics with regard to Holy Scripture.”¹⁵⁴ This closing comment of the first chapter reminds us of the consistent goal of Polanus’s collecting, reading, investigating, using, and reformulating the massive writings of the ancient fathers, the medieval doctors, even popes and cardinals into a neatly systematized frame of such detailed theses: to evidence the doctrines of the Reformed

¹⁵² Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 84; Giovanni Paolo Lancelloti, ed., *Corpus juris canonici*, vol. 1 (Colonia, 1605), “Sicut stellas celi non extinguit nox, sic mentes fidelium inherentes firmamento sacrae scripturae non obscurat mundana iniquitas.”

¹⁵³ Zephyrinus, *Epistolae Decretaque*, in *PG* 10, cols.9-10: “Ideirco meditari vos oportet, et Scripturas et praecepta divina quae in Scripturis continentur diligenter attendere, ne transgressores legis Dei, sed impletores appareatis.”

¹⁵⁴ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 111: “Hactenus monstratus consensus noster & Patrum orthodoxorum in Thesibus de Sacra Scriptura, inter nos & Papistas controversis.”

church to be truly orthodox and catholic, and then to surmount the ungrounded aspersion cast by the Roman Catholics on the whole Protestant church.

5.2.5. The Doctrine of Predestination

Polanus's discussion of predestination in the ancient fathers, the medieval doctors, and the Reformers is better understood if we look at it within the conceptual framework of his distinction between the internal and external works of God. Even in the *Symphonia*, Polanus makes a dogmatic distinction of the divine works into the internal and the external: the former is distinguished again into decree in general and the predestination in particular, and the latter into creation and providence.¹⁵⁵ Interestingly, this *interna-externa* distinction was not yet introduced in his early dogmatic work, *Partitiones theologiae* (1590), but was later made more systematically and discussed at some length in his *Syntagma* (1610). In this case, therefore, the *Symphonia* occupies a clear place in the development of Polanus' thought. The introduction of this scholastic distinction into the dogmatic system of the *Symphonia* implies that the structure of Reformed dogmatics developed in the seventeenth century was not yet formally established in the patristic literature but, in Polanus's view, was thematically germinated there. It is notable that the generation of the Son and the procession of the Holy Spirit are discussed in the locus of the internal works of God in the *Syntagma* but not in either the *Symphonia* or the *Partitiones*. In other words, Polanus rather freely adapts the patristic materials to distinctions and frameworks of interpretation that had been developed later on.

¹⁵⁵ In the *Partitiones*, Polanus did not use the distinction of the *opera Dei interna* and *externa*, but instead that of the *opera Dei aeterna* and *definiti temporis*, and more importantly that of *decretum Dei* and *executio decreti Dei*. See Polanus, *Partitiones theologiae* (Basel, 1590), 15.

The first thesis of the internal works of God in general is that “the internal works of God are not really different from the divine essence itself, just as the essential proprieties do not differ from it.”¹⁵⁶ For this, Polanus takes two quotations from the homilectical work of Bernard and the doctrinal work of Augustine. Bernard wrote that “[Boethius] might perceive in a pious and catholic sense the true and pure simplicity of divine substance, in which there can be nothing that is not itself, and God himself.”¹⁵⁷ The quoted text of Bernard was a part of his sermon about the Trinity in relation to the divine simplicity and essence, with reference to the teachings on the Trinity by Augustine and Boethius, especially describing how sober and catholic the exposition of Boethius about the Trinity is. For Boethius and Bernard, there is not anything (*aliquam rem*) in God that is not God, because the divine substance or essence is totally the same as God himself, that is, the totality of who God is.¹⁵⁸ Whatever has been done in God should have direct connection with the divine essence. As the second witness of the first thesis, Augustine’s text of divine simplicity was quoted by Polanus in the same vein.

Notably, the issue of the theological connection between the internal works of God and simple divine substance has not been taken as a matter of controversy between the Reformed orthodox and the Roman Catholics. Polanus did describe the *opera Dei interna* but not in a polemic manner against the Roman Church’s thought of it. This reminds us

¹⁵⁶ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 137: “Opera Dei interna non differunt realiter ab ipsa essentia divina, sicut & proprietates essentielles ab ipsa non differunt.”

¹⁵⁷ Bernard, *De imagine sive verbo Dei, et anima quae ad imaginem est*, LXXX, in *Opera* (Basel, 1566), col. 736: “Bonus corrector, qui veracissime de veritate loqueretur, qui pie catholiceque sentiret de vera et mera divinae simplicitate substantiae, in qua nihil esse possit, quod ipsa non sit, et ipsa Deus.”

¹⁵⁸ Bernard, *De imagine sive verbo Dei*, col. 736: “Nam dicente auctore, «Cum dicitur, Deus, Deus, Deus, pertinet ad substantiam:» noster commentator intulit, «Non quae est, sed qua est.» Quod absit, ut assentiat catholica Ecclesia, esse videlicet substantiam, vel aliquam omnino rem qua Deus sit, et quae non sit Deus!”

that the principal aim of the *Symphonia* intended by its author is the demonstration of the catholic and orthodox harmony between the true *apostolic* fathers throughout the history of the church, including here Bernard and Luther, and the Reformed church in doctrine, presumably as an exercise toward the establishment of Polanus's full system, an aim that is not by necessity polemic or disputative. In this sense, the *Symphonia* appears the result of an attempt to find and follow the best of Christian tradition that was most veracious about the canonical scriptures. Nevertheless, it should not be ignored that the polemic disposition of the *Symphonia* is inherent in many places of the work.

The second thesis is the immutability of divine council or decree, a thesis that Polanus argues was already held by the fathers such as Ambrose, Augustine, and Bernard. Making such a brief discussion of the decree or internal works of God, Polanus presents the thirteen theses concerning predestination as follows.

1. Predestination must be proclaimed and taught in the church of God.
2. Some people are predestined to life, and the others to eternal death.
3. The unique cause of election to eternal life is the good pleasure of God.
4. Our faith is not the cause of election: we were elected that we might believe, not because we would believe.
5. The merit of Christ is not the efficient cause of our election to eternal life even though it is the efficient cause of our eternal life.
6. An election to eternal life neither may nor can be made ineffective and changed by our sins.
7. None of the elect are lost or able to be lost.
8. The number of the elect to the eternal life is certain and definite.
9. The church of the elect is neither seduced nor able to be seduced.
10. The reprobate are rightly said to be predestined to eternal destruction.
11. The efficient cause of eternal reprobation is not sin.
12. Foreknowledge is not said only to the reprobate, but also to the elect; still more frequent to the elect.
13. None of the reprobate can be saved.

Each thesis is argued on the basis of quotations from the fathers.

Among the theses listed above, the second thesis concerning double predestination needs to be given special attention, because it is supported by a great number of witnesses, ranging from the patristic period to the time of Reformation, not all of which attest Polanus's version of the doctrine with utter clarity. The first patristic witness, occupying half of all the testimonies, is Augustine, who insisted upon the cognition of God as the *summum bonum* that God could "well use even evils for the damnation of those whom He justly predestined to punishment and for the salvation of those whom He benevolently predestined to grace."¹⁵⁹ The same thought is found in his exposition of the two kingdoms, which consist in the two kinds of human beings, the one predestined to eternally reign with God while the other to suffer eternal punishment with the devil.¹⁶⁰ In his exegesis of John 10:26 "You are not of my sheep," he made a similar comment that Jesus saw some of the Jews predestined to everlasting destruction, not to eternal life.¹⁶¹ Polanus also cites several places from Augustine in favor of a decree of reprobation. Whereas he has clear precedent in Augustine for language of a double predestination to life and to death, the language of parallel election and reprobation is not present and the concept is argued by inference. This

¹⁵⁹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 142; Augustine, *Enchiridion*, in *PL* 40, col. 279: "bene utens et malis, tanquam summe bonus, ad eorum damnationem quos juste praedestinavit ad poenam, et ad eorum salutem quos benigne praedestinavit ad gratiam." The same thought is found in his account of the two kingdoms, which consist in the two kinds of human beings, of which the one is predestined to reign eternally with God, and the other to suffer eternal punishment with the devil. In his exegesis of John 10:26 "You are not of my sheep," Augustine made a similar comment that Jesus saw some of the Jews predestined to everlasting destruction, not to eternal life. Unlike Polanus's reception of Augustine, Barth blames Augustine for his departure "from the biblical testimony" by advocating the double predestination, yet arguing that Augustine's predestination does not include reprobation. See Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, vol. 2-2, VII.xxxiii.1, 17.

¹⁶⁰ Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, in *PL* 41, XV.i (col. 437): "ipsius generis humani: quod in duo genera distribuimus; unum eorum qui secundum hominem, alterum eorum qui secundum Deum vivunt. Quas etiam mystice appellamus civitates duas, hoc est duas societates hominum: quarum est una quae praedestinata est in aeternum regnare cum Deo; altera, aeternum supplicium subire cum diabolo."

¹⁶¹ Augustine, *In Joannis evangelium tractatus*, xlvi, in *PL* 35, col. 1742: "Quomodo ergo istis dixit, *Non estis ex ovibus meis?* Quia videbat eos ad sempiternum interitum praedestinos, non ad vitam aeternam sui sanguinis pretio comparatos."

use of the materials reflects the hermeneutical procedures of the era, namely, the drawing of conclusions from the collation and examination of texts when the doctrinal point is not made directly in a particular text. One work that Polanus cites is an Augustinian treatise *De praedestinatione & gratia*. The treatise, published in the sixteenth century as Augustine's work in the *Opera omnia*, edited by Erasmus, has been identified in more recent studies as not actually by Augustine: rather it probably reflects the thought of Prosper of Aquitaine.¹⁶²

From Isidorus of Seville, Polanus presents a slightly different version of predestination that “predestination is double: either of the elect to rest (*ad requiem*) or of the reprobate to death.”¹⁶³ Three things should be noted. First, Isidorus did not use the phrase *ad vitam* but *ad requiem*. Second, he makes an explicit use of the terms *electum* and *reprobum* to more clearly express double predestination. Third, his description of predestination presupposes his major theological theme of God as *summum bonum*. This is not irrelevant to the fact that Polanus also placed the lengthy locus of the *summum bonum* prior even to the theological principles. The quotation taken from the decree of the third council of Valence (855) also advocates double predestination in a slightly different way: “We admit the predestination of the elect to *life* and the predestination of the impious to death.” In terms of the election, Polanus adds, the divine mercy precedes the merited good of the elect and in respect of condemnation God's just judgment on the impious is followed

¹⁶² The work in question, the *Liber de praedestinatione & gratia, qui intitulatur de voluntate Dei*, can be found in *D. Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi, Opera omnia ... repurgatorum à mendis innumeris, per Des. Erasmus Roterodamum*, 10 vols. (Basel: Froben, 1528-29), vol. 7, pp. 824-833; and see A. Zumkeller, “Die pseudoaugustinische Schrift ‘De praedestinatione et gratia,’ Inhalt, Überlieferung, Verfasserfrage und Nachwirkung,” in *Augustinianum*, 25/1-2 (1985), pp. 539-563.

¹⁶³ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 143; Isidorus, *De summo bono* (Basel, 1505), II.vi, fol.xxx: “Gemina est praedestinatio/ siue electorum ad requiem/ siue reprobarum ad mortem.” Isidorus' sentence is quoted verbatim by Hincmar. See Hincmar of Rheims, *De praedestinatione et libero arbitrio*, in *PL* 125, col. 89.

by the deserved evil of the latter.¹⁶⁴ From this, reprobation is clearly identified as a part of predestination. Thus, Polanus argues that the view of predestination as double was clearly established by the church fathers.

As in the case with other citations of patristic works by Polanus (and also by his contemporaries, whether allies or opponents), the statements of the fathers have been read through the lens of centuries of doctrinal development. Polanus's own theology is defined by distinctions drawn in many cases from the medieval scholastics and debated in his own time. This is certainly the case with his doctrine of predestination, in which he clearly sets forth predestination as consisting in election and reprobation and worries through issues of negative and positive reprobation. As will be noted below, Polanus recognized that the issue of supra- and infralapsarian definitions of the decree did not have patristic precedent. His patristic citations, then, do not precisely document all of the details of his own theology which, as noted earlier, is eclectic. What they provide is an indication of the background of his doctrine in the thought of Augustine and in the later Augustinian tradition.

The most interesting part of the second thesis is that Polanus took even the "father" of the Protestant Reformation and origin of Lutheran church, Martin Luther, as a witness to affirm the doctrine of double predestination and thereby attest the doctrinal harmony of the fathers and the Reformed church in terms of double predestination. The quotation from Luther follows below:

¹⁶⁴ See Hincmar's quotation in his *De praedestinatione et libero arbitrio*, col. 60: "fidenter fatemur praedestinationem electorum ad vitam, et praedestinationem impiorum ad mortem: in electione tamen salvandorum misericordiam Dei praecedere meritum bonum, in damnatione autem periturorum meritum malum praecedere iustum Dei iudicium." Quoting this phrase, Turretin also declares that "the definition of predestination is no less suitable to reprobation than to election." See Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, trans. George M. Giger, vol. 1 (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1992), IV.vii.6 (333).

It belongs to the same God Incarnate to weep, deplore, and lament over the perdition of the impious, even while the will of the Majesty purposely leaves and reprobates some to perish. Nor is it for us to ask why he does so, but to stand in awe of God, who can do and wills to do such things.¹⁶⁵

Polanus could have used a text preceding the quotation, a text in which Luther more clearly implies the double predestination: “God the Incarnate...was sent for this purpose, to will, say, do, suffer, and offer to all people all necessary for salvation; albeit he offends many who, abandoned or hardened by God's secret will of Majesty, do not receive him thus willing, speaking, doing and offering.”¹⁶⁶ But he did not so, since he wanted to let some of the Lutherans, who believed that Luther's teaching of predestination did not concern the issue of reprobation but only election, recognize that their theological origin, Luther, had taught reprobation as a part of predestination. Regarding the Lord's Supper, Polanus knew that there had been the most serious controversy (*gravissima controversia*) between two eminent Protestants in the church (*duos summos in Ecclesia viros*), Luther and Oecolampadius, but he had a theological solidarity with the latter.¹⁶⁷ However, this knowledge did not cause Polanus to entirely oppose Luther's thought but he, though keeping due doctrinal distance from him, had affiliation with Luther in such a way that “from Luther of great renown we do not disparage anything which in the majority and

¹⁶⁵ Martin Luther, *De servo arbitrio*, in WA 18:689-690: “Huius itidem Dei incarnati est flere, deplorare, genere super perditione impiorum, cum voluntas maiestatis ex proposito aliquos relinquat et reprobet, ut pereant. Nec nobis quaerendum, cur ita faciat, sed reverendus Deus, qui talia et possit et velit.”

¹⁶⁶ Luther, *De servo arbitrio*, WA 18:689: “Volui et tu noluisti, Deus, inquam, incarnatus in hoc missus est, ut velit, loquatur, faciat, patiat, offerat omnibus omnia, quae sunt ad salutem necessaria, licet plurimos offendat, qui secreta illa voluntate maiestatis vel relictis vel indurati non suscipiunt volentem, loquentem, facientem, offerentem, [Joh. 1, 5] sicut Iohan. dicit: Lux in tenebris lucet et tenebrae eam non comprehendunt. [Joh. 1, 11] Et iterum: In propria venit, et sui non receperunt eum.”

¹⁶⁷ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum* (Basel, 1597), 461.

other points of that doctrine we do not refuse by any means.”¹⁶⁸ Polanus’s high respect for Luther’s view of predestination is also found in his analysis of Malachi where he uses Luther’s voice to feature the causal and temporal priority of predestination to faith: “who may believe flows from predestination or election.”¹⁶⁹

For the fourth and fifth theses of predestination, Polanus uses the church fathers, medieval doctors, and even the Reformers for its attestation, discussed especially in opposition to the Lutheran view on the causes of election. There were a number of Lutherans in the seventeenth century who understood the causes of election differently from those with the Reformed view. For example, Aegidius Hunnius, “the originator of the formula of *intuitu fidei* and of the formula *intuitu Christi meriti fide apprehendendi*,”¹⁷⁰ points out against the “hallucination” of the “Calvinists” and Huber and with John of Damascus’ distinction between the *voluntas antecedens* and the *voluntas consequens* of God, that election or predestination of our salvation is not to be considered in the bare antecedent will of God but in his consequent will and that we could not think of predestination without previous consideration to faith in Christ apprehended by the elect and to the disbelief of the reprobate.¹⁷¹ Johann Gerhard, likewise, maintained that the cause of our election should not be established and thus searched in the absolute will of God and

¹⁶⁸ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, 461: “Caeterum dum palmam in causa Eucharistica Oecolampadio tribuimus: de Luther laudibus nihil detrahimus, quas in plerisque alijs capitibus Theologiae illi nequaquam inuidemus.”

¹⁶⁹ Polanus, *Analysis ilbelli prophetae Malachiae* (Basel, 1597), 37.

¹⁷⁰ Aegidius Hunnius, *Articulus de providentia Dei, et aeterna praedestinatione* (Frankfurt, 1603), a2v, 110-111; Robert Preus, “The Doctrine of Election as Taught by the Seventeenth Century Lutheran Dogmaticians,” *Quartalschrift: Theological Quarterly* 55 (October, 1958): 229-261.

¹⁷¹ Aegidius Hunnius, *Articulus de providentia Dei, et aeterna praedestinatione*, a4v, 135: “Cur autem electionem seu praedestinationem salutis non in nuda antecedente voluntate Dei, sed consequente ponendam arbitremur.... Atq; adeo non stabilit Apostolus decretum illud stoicum, de quibusdam absolute sine respectu Christi fide apprehendendi electis, caeteris vicissim adsq; intuitu incredulitatis illorum reprobatis.”

more clearly that Christ's merit is the cause of our election. Opposing Polnaus' exquisite distinction that "to be chosen in Christ (*in Christo*) is not the same as to be chosen on account of Christ (*propter Christum*)" and Piscator's exposition of Christ's merit as a means with which God carries out His decree of election in time, Gerhard does not distinguish *in Christo* from *propter Christum* by saying that we are chosen in Christ, that is, on account of Christ and thus that Christ is the cause of both actions: our election before the constitution of the world and our benediction in time.¹⁷²

Opposing primarily the Lutheran view on the cause of election, Polanus first pronounces that the cause of election to eternal life is only the good pleasure of God and neither our faith nor Christ's merit could be the cause of election. He presents a number of patristic testimonies about this in a persuasive manner. He acknowledges that Augustine's early thought that "faith is the cause of election" is quite supportive of the Lutheran stance.¹⁷³ As seen in his small works written before his episcopate, Augustine had held that the idea that God has mercy on whom He wants to have mercy must be credited "to the preceding merit of faith (*praecedenti merito fidei*)," while the idea that God hardens whom he wants to harden must be attributed "to the preceding impiety (*praecedenti*

¹⁷² Johann Gerhard, *Loci theologici*, vol. 2 (Berolini: Schlawitz, 1864), 82: "nec electionis, nec reprobationis causa in absoluta Dei voluntate quaerenda vel statuenda est...Sed Polan. De praedest, pag.45. excipit, in Christo eligi non esse idem quod propter meritum Christi eligi.... Aliter igitur excipit Piscator Herborn.in anal.pag.80. Deum elegisse nos in Christo, id est, ut nos servaret per Christum. Nimirum hoc vult, quod Christus cum suo merito sit saltem medium, per quod suum electionis decretum in tempore Deus exequatur, non autem intuitum meriti Christi ipsum electionis decretum ingredi.... Distinguit manifeste benedictione illam, qua in Spiritualibus DEUS in tempore nobis benedicit, & actum electionis, quo DEUS ante constitutionem mundi nos elegit ad vitam aeternam, utrique actui includit Christum, tanquam causam...merito Christi esse causam προκαταρκτικὴν nostrae electionis." For the views of more Lutherans on the merit of Christ, see Heinrich Schmid, *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche* (Gütersloh, 1893), 193-210.

¹⁷³ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 146.

impietati).¹⁷⁴ Later he realized that he had been in serious error, by looking at the patristic testimony of the pious and humble bishop of Carthage, Cyprian: “We must boast in nothing, as nothing is our own (*in nullo gloriandum est, quando nostrum nihil est*),” a testimony that was grounded in the apostolic witness: “what do you have that you have not received? And if you have received it, why do you boast as if you have not received it?”¹⁷⁵ From this, Augustine concluded that faith and even the most persistent obedience (*obedientia perseverantissima*), from beginning to end, are the gifts of God which are given to some but not to others, and no one can doubt this, unless he is willing to withstand the most manifest testimonies of Scripture.¹⁷⁶ Polanus’s conclusion on the patristic testimony of Augustine and Cyprian has two parts: 1) some Lutherans’ misconceived conception of predestination is not strange but probable, as shown in early Augustine, and 2) the church fathers may not be always right in their views on the predestination of God and would correct them on the basis of the apostolic and patristic witnesses.

What is more, Polanus calls again Luther as the final advocate of the Reformed stance on the cause of election and is most persuasive to Lutheran thinkers. In the German preface to his commentary on Romans, Luther provided a concise *argumentum* of the chapters 9, 10, and 11 where it is written that the eternal predestination of God is the

¹⁷⁴ Augustine, *Retractionum*, in *PL* 32, col. 622.

¹⁷⁵ Augustine, *De praedestinatione sanctorum*, in *PL* 44, col. 964: “Non sic pius atque humilis doctor ille sapiebat: Cyprianum beatissimum loquor, qui dixit, «In nullo gloriandum, quando nostrum nihil sit» (Ad Quirinum, lib. 3, cap. 4). Quod ut ostenderet, adhibuit Apostolum testem dicentem, *Quid autem habes quod non accepisti? Si autem et accepisti, quid gloriaris quasi non acceperis* (1 Cor. IV, 7)? Quo praecipue testimonio etiam ipse convictus sum, cum similiter errarem.”; Cyprian, *Testimoniorum adversus Iudaeos ad Quirinum* in *D. Caecilii Cypriani opera*, tom. 2 (Geneva, 1593), 420.

¹⁷⁶ Augustine, *De praedestinatione sanctorum*, col. 963. Also see John Calvin, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione* in *CO* 8, col. 266: “Quid habes quod non acceperis? (1 Cor. 4, 7.) A quo autem, nisi ab illo qui te discernit ab alio, cui non donavit quod donavit tibi? Deinde: Fides igitur, et inchoata, et perfecta, donum Dei est: et hoc donum quibusdam dari, quibusdam non dari, omnino non dubitet, qui non vult manifestissimis scripturae testimoniis repugnare.”

original source that determines who would believe and who would not.¹⁷⁷ In agreement with Luther's thought, Polanus further comments that "if whoever would believe flows originally from eternal predestination, then, it surely follows that faith is not the efficient cause of election or predestination to eternal life."¹⁷⁸ To check the view of Christ's merit as the cause of election, Augustine's attestation is sufficient that "the Father loved us also before, not only before the Son died for us, but before He created the world."¹⁷⁹ It is notable that this quotation was not originally intended by Augustine to discuss the cause of election, but was written in the context of mooted the simultaneity of the Trinity in all divine external works. When using a patristic thought, Polanus quotes a relevant text not always squaring his thesis with the contextual scopus of the text.

The eleventh thesis was definitely intended to oppose the old and new Pelagians. The view of the foreknown sin as the cause of reprobation was not finalized but preceded as an unending controversy in the day of Polanus, even more harshly within the Protestant circle. Polanus takes the champion of grace against the ancient Pelagianism, Augustine, as the foremost undefeatable witness to underpin the debate on the issue for the Reformed stance. The main idea of this father is that there is in all things no other cause which precedes the

¹⁷⁷ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 146; Martin Luther, "Vorrede auff die Epistel S. Paul an die Römer," in *Biblia, das ist, Die gantze heilige Schrift Deudsch* (Wittenberg, 1562), 263r: "Am neunnden/ zehenden vnd eilffften Capitel/ leret er von der ewigen vernehmung Gottes/ daher es vrsprünglich fleusset/ wer gleuben odder nicht gleuben sol/ von sunden los odder nicht los werden kan/ damit es je gar aus vnsern henden genomen/ vnd allein jnn Gottes hand gestellet sey/ das wir frum werden. Vnd das ist auff aller höhest not/ denn wir sind so schwach vnd vngewis/ das/ wenn es bey vns stünde/ würde freilich nicht ein mensch selig/ der teuffel würde sie gewislich alle vberweldigen."

¹⁷⁸ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 146-147.

¹⁷⁹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 147; Augustine, *De trinitate*, in *PL* 42, XIII.xi, col. 1025: "video quod et antea Pater dilexit nos, non solum antequam pro nobis Filius moreretur, sed antequam conderet mundum, ipso teste Apostolo qui dicit: *Sicut elegit nos in ipso ante mundi constitutionem. Nec Filius Patre sibi non parente pro nobis velut invitatus est traditus, quia et de ipso dictum est: Qui me dilexit, et tradidit semetipsum pro me.*"

voluntas of God.¹⁸⁰ Attributing to Augustine the authorship of *De praedestinatione et gratia* included in the Basel edition of the *Opera omnia* (1528-1529), Polanus continues to insist that the election of Jacob and the reprobation of Esau were neither caused by the merits (*ex meritis*) of their parents or even of Christ, nor by any works (*ex operibus*) either in the past or in the future.¹⁸¹ Luther's testimonial from his exposition of Genesis 25 is that the temporal servitude of Esau for Jacob was not caused by the merit of either but by the divine profession given to Rebecca that the older would serve the younger.¹⁸² It is undeniable that the notions of double predestination and the cause of election were more systematically formalized in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries than in the patristic period. It, however, is untenable that those notions were not acknowledged in the ancient church and were newly invented and unduly amplified in dogmatic systems by the Reformed thinkers of early modern time. Thus, Polanus's discussion demonstrates that the position of the Reformed church on predestination was rooted in the apostolic and patristic thought and did not even diverge from Luther's understanding of the doctrine.

5.2.6. The Doctrine of the Church

Ecclesiology or the doctrine of the church has a considerable space devoted to it in the *Symphonia*. It is for this issue that Polanus discusses the greatest number of theses

¹⁸⁰ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 155; Augustine, *De genesi contra Manichaeos*, in *PL* 34, I.i, col. 175: "Causas enim voluntatis Dei scire quaerunt, cum voluntas Dei omnium quae sunt, ipsa sit causa. Si enim habet causam voluntas Dei, est aliquid quod antecedit voluntatem Dei, quod nefas est credere."

¹⁸¹ Augustine, *De praedestinatione et gratia*, in *Opera omnia*, tom. 7 (Basel, 1528-1529), 827.

¹⁸² Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 156; Martin Luther, *De servo arbitrio*, WA 18:723: "Ut enim maxime hic locus Gene. 25 de servitute temporali sola intelligeretur (quod non est verum), tamen a Paulo recte et efficaciter adducitur, dum per ipsum probat, non [Röm. 9, 12] per merita Iacob aut Esau, Sed PER VOCANTEM dictum esse ad Saram: Maior serviet minori." Polanus indicates "ad Saram" in the original text as a *typographicum erratum*.

(eighty-one) among theological *loci*, making a great portion of his annotations. His ardent concern about the catholic church should be cultivated by the invincible zealousness of his academic father, Johann J. Grynaeus, to consolidate and ground the Reformed church on the catholic and orthodox tradition that has been handed down and preserved by the ancient pious fathers, sound medieval doctors, and the Reformers, all of whom were most adherent to the truth of Holy Scripture. With appeal to the patristic, medieval, and Reformation testimonies, Polanus defines the true catholic church in the chapter of ecclesiology and scrutinizes its marks and properties, in polemic confrontation to the Roman Church's views of the catholic church. In this section, I will not deal with all the theses of ecclesiology which Polanus discussed in the *Symphonia*, but I will select some of them that provide more characteristics of Polanus's patristic theology.

The first thesis involves the definition of the church, called catholic in an absolute sense, as "the assembly of the blessed angels and human beings elected to eternal life" who become the partakers of heavenly calling to be justified and glorified, but entirely excluding the reprobate. In fifty-second thesis, moreover, Polanus would identify a particular church as truly pure, catholic, and orthodox, if it hands down and retains the salvific doctrine and the right norm of worshiping God integrally, incorruptly, sincerely, and truly as comprehended in the whole Scripture, and in unanimous consensus with the universal church dispersed throughout the whole earth.¹⁸³ Polanus's first appeal for his thesis is made to Augustine, the most eminent catholic father, who described the church, utterly subordinate to the Trinity, as consisting in the part that is dispersed on the whole

¹⁸³ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 614-615: "Ecclesia illa particularis est vere Catholica ut Patres loquuntur, hoc est, Orthodoxa atque pura, quae doctrinam salvificam & rectam rationem colendi Deum in Sacra Scriptura comprehensam tradit ac retinet integre, incorrupte & sincere, atque unanimi consensu cum Ecclesia vere Christiana per universum orbem dispersa."

earth and the part that is in heaven, composed of the holy angels and the elect in the state of blessedness: both parts are combined into one body in the bond of love – the whole universal church in heaven and on earth instituted as the temple of the supreme Trinity for the proper worship of one God.¹⁸⁴ Polanus also cites Ignatius as focusing on the unity of the church in which every nation and every language become one on the confession of faith in one Christ; similarly Gregory the Great identified the vineyard described in Isaiah 5 with the universal church ranging from the just Abel to all the elect even including those who will be born at the end of the world; and Bernard, also in the line of the fathers, connects the notion of the church with the elect and the righteous.¹⁸⁵ These patristic testimonies lack regard for the angels as a part of catholic church and then do not fully support Polanus's concept of the church. Augustine is the exception whose definition of the church is almost tantamount to that of Polanus.

The second point about ecclesiology made by Polanus in dialogue with ecclesiastical writers is that the marks, through which the pure and orthodox church of God is known, must be found in Scripture alone. Polanus cites both Chrysostom and Augustine on the point. From Chrysostom he has two brief statements indicating that the true church is known only through the Scriptures.¹⁸⁶ Augustine taught that the divinely inspired Scripture

¹⁸⁴ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 436; Augustine, *Enchiridion*, lvi (cols. 258-259): “Quae tota hic accipienda est, non solum ex parte qua peregrinatur in terris, a solis ortu usque ad occasum laudans nomen Domini, et post captivitatem vetustatis cantans canticum novum; verum etiam ex illa quae in coelis semper, ex quo condita est, cohaesit Deo, nec ullum malum sui casus experta est. Haec in sanctis Angelis beata persistit, et suae parti peregrinanti sicut oportet opitulatur; quia utraque una erit consortio aeternitatis, et nunc una est vinculo charitatis, quae tota instituta est ad colendum unum Deum.”

¹⁸⁵ Ignatius, *Epistola ad Magnesios*, in *PG* 5, cols. 671-672; Gregorius Magnus, *Homiliarum in evangelia*, in *PL* 76, col. 1154; idem, *Expositio super cantica canticorum*, in *PL* 79, col. 539; Tertullian, *De carne Christi*, in *PL* 2, col. 768; Bernard, *Sermones in cantica canticorum*, in *PL* 183, col. 1109: “Ita plane. Ipsa est enim Ecclesia electorum, de quibus Apostolus: *Omnia*, inquit, *propter electos*. Et cui dubium, quod gratia et misericordia Dei sit in sanctos ejus, et respectus in electos illius?”

¹⁸⁶ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 441, citing Chrysostom, *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, sermon 49.

throws the whole literature of all nations under its unsurpassable authority, not by a casual movement of the mind but by the disposition of God's predominant providence over all kinds of human capacity.¹⁸⁷ None of the human documents could refuse the existence of the church designated by the most divine and certain verification of the canonical scriptures in all the Gentiles.¹⁸⁸ "The most certain and infallible mark of the pure catholic and orthodox church," Polanus identifies on such ground as depicted above, "is the true doctrine or truth, or persistence in doctrine and true faith together with the prophets and apostles inspired by the Holy Spirit."¹⁸⁹

A further thesis argues that the "most certain and infallible" mark of the catholic church is true doctrine, understood as a maintenance or perseverance in the doctrine and true faith of the prophets and apostles, as inspired by the Holy Spirit. Polanus cites several fathers in support of his argument, notably Ignatius, Tertullian, and Chrysostom. As Ignatius said, if all nations and all languages, by means of one confession and one faith in one Christ, are united as one church, the true faith and doctrinal confession must be seen as the mark of the church.¹⁹⁰ With the view of the gospel and the spirit of life as the pillar and the ground of the church, Irenaeus claims that we ought to follow the one and only true God the Teacher, have the same norm of truth, always declare the same work from the same source, and perceive one God.¹⁹¹ With Tertullian, Polanus professes that there is no

¹⁸⁷ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 442; Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, XI.i, in *PL* 41, col. 316.

¹⁸⁸ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 443; Augustine, *De unitate ecclesiae*, col. 395.

¹⁸⁹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 443: "Vere Catholicae, purae & orthodoxae Ecclesiae nota certissima atque infallibilis est doctrina vera seu veritas seu perduratio in doctrina & fide vera, Prophetis & Apostolis a Spiritu Sancto inspirata."

¹⁹⁰ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 444; Ignatius, Ignatius, *Epistola ad Magnesios*, cols.667-668.

¹⁹¹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 444; Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, in *PG* 7, col.885: "στόλος δὲ καὶ στήριγμα ἐκκλησίας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ πνεῦμα ζωῆς."; idem, *Adversus haereses* (Basel, 1526), IV.lxix, 277:

criterion whereby to discern if a person is Christian or not, except the foremost mark of the pure and orthodox church, the faith in scriptural truth. All the apostles in their circle confess “the same doctrine of the same faith (*eandem doctrinam ejusdem fidei*)” and proclaim it to the nations.¹⁹² From this, Polanus argues that the church of his day, following this apostolic example, should be regarded as pure and orthodox only by the distinguishing mark of the church, the true doctrine of faith, beyond which there is no other doctrine or testimony of truth. It is on this ground that Chrysostom’s *dictum* is true that, “where there is no faith, there is no church.”¹⁹³

Along with the patristic testimonies, Polanus cites an eirenic Catholic theologian of the sixteenth century, Georg Cassander,¹⁹⁴ who pursued a rapprochement between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant positions. Still, Cassander retained many of the dogmas critiqued by Protestants and accepted the authority of the Roman Church, for which he was censured by Calvin and Beza. Cassander held what amounts to the medieval form of Boerman’s Tradition I, that “the only way to know the truth and reject the error is to know the true meaning of canonical scriptures, a meaning that depends on “the common consent and the public testimony of all churches,” on his exegetical assumption that “Scripture is a

“Nos outem unum & solum uerum deum doctoerm sequentes, & regulam ueritatis habentes eius sermones, de iisdem semper easdem dicimus, omnes unum deum scientes.”

¹⁹² Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 447; Tertullian, *Adversus haereticos*, in *PL* 2, col.32.

¹⁹³ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 449. See the original text of Chrysostom, *Opus imperfectum in Matthaei Euangelium*, 24v: “Secundum hoc & de haereticis dicimus: quia ubi est fides, illic est ecclesia: ubi ecclesia, ibi sacerdos: ubi sacerdos, ibi baptismum: ubi baptismum, ibi Christianus. Vbi autem fides non est, ibi nec ecclesia est: ubi ecclesia non est, nec sacerdos: ubi sacerdos non est, nec baptismum: ubi baptismum non est, nec Christianus.”

¹⁹⁴ For Cassander’s reception of the fathers, see Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation*, 183-195. For the eirenic disposition of Cassander’s theology, see Paula Bröder, *Georg Cassanders Vermittlungsversuche zwischen Protestanten und Katholiken* (Ph.D. diss., Marburg: Düsseldorf, 1931); Maria E. Nolte, *Georgius Cassander en zijn oecumenisch streven* (Nijmegen, 1951).

kind of implicated and sealed tradition, and tradition is truly an explained and unfolded Scripture.”¹⁹⁵

The contrast with Cassander is significant for an understanding of Polanus’s use of the fathers, particularly given the way in which Polanus’s sense of the limits of patristic authority illustrate the Protestant alteration of the Tradition I model, as also the Protestant refusal of medieval “reverent exposition”: the fathers are taken selectively and not viewed as a tradition that consistently unfolded Scripture with utter accuracy. Unlike Cassander, Polanus is a staunch advocate for the sufficiency of Scripture and also the *scriptura sui ipsius interpres*, as shown in chapter three. Quite attractive and agreeable to Polanus, however, is Cassander’s triple formula of the *notae ecclesiae*, namely, the evangelical doctrine, the administration of the sacraments, and the obedience due to the office of the church.¹⁹⁶ Well aware of the controversy between Cassander and Reformed thinkers, especially Calvin and Beza, Polanus acknowledges that Cassander correctly identified evangelical doctrine and administration of the sacraments as marks of the church; but he adds, as necessary to the identification of the true church, a third mark, the obedience owed to ministers of the church, namely, discipline, as understood among the Reformed. Here Polanus reflects the developing Reformed ecclesiology, with the formal addition (usually

¹⁹⁵ Georgius Cassander, *De officio pii viri in hoc dissidio religionis* (Paris, 1564), 1r-v: “Quare non verbis, quae illis cum orthodoxis communia erant, sed vera intelligentia & scientia diuinarum literarum cocsutandi erant: quae intelligentia petenda erat a communi consensu & publico testimonio omnium Ecclesiarum Scripturam esse implicatam quandam & obsignatam traditionem: traditionem vero esse Scripturam explicata & resignatam.”

¹⁹⁶ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 451; Georgius Cassander, *De Articulis religionis inter catholicos et protestantes Consultatio* (Colonia, 1577), 44: “Quod autem subijcitur, ad veram Ecclesiae vnitatem satis esse consentire de Doctrina Euangelij, & administratione Sacramentorum: non satis est, ad schismaticos ab Ecclesiae societate segregandos.... Hanc tertiam notam necessario requiri, etiam huius Confessinois auctor postea agnuit, qui multis in locis vbi de signis Ecclesiae agit, tertio loco addit Obedientiam eebitam ministerio Euangelij, seu Catholicae Ecclesiae.”

attributed to Beza) of the third mark of the church.¹⁹⁷ Given that Polanus also adds confession of the true faith or true doctrine, and true worship of the true God to his list of marks, he brings the number of marks of the church to a total of five.¹⁹⁸ Polanus's addition of true doctrine and true worship to his list of marks of the church draws attention to the connection of the marks to standard definitions of true religion as consisting the right knowledge of and worship of God and it also serves to clarify his use of the fathers. As already noted, the "fathers" are not so much persons set into ancient contexts as texts, specifically ecclesiastical texts written by trustworthy persons cited for their antiquity and relative authority. In this sense, some of the texts and writers identified as fathers, notably Augustine, stand out as more authoritative than others given the congruence of so much of what Augustine wrote with the main lines of Western Christian orthodoxy. But it was also possible for Polanus to mine texts that corresponded with his sense of a line of truth in matters of doctrine and worship to the exclusion of other texts by the same author. Those texts corresponding to the marks of the church could be gathered into a *consensus patrum*, regardless of the perceived deviations of other texts. The *consensus patrum*, in short, is the consensus of selected authoritative texts as interpreted in relation to a set of doctrinal norms understood as marks of the church.

The third issue that Polanus raises is that the rock (*petra*) upon which the whole catholic church is established is not the apostle Peter, much less one of his successors, but Jesus Christ alone, the living stone. This rock, properly speaking, does not refer to the

¹⁹⁷ See Tadataka Maruyama, *The Ecclesiology of Theodore Beza: The Reform of the True Church* (Geneva: Droz, 1978).

¹⁹⁸ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 451-454.

person Peter but only in a figurative manner of speaking (*figurato loquendi modo*).¹⁹⁹ The name of Peter, according to Polanus's comment on Cyprian, is just metonymically specified in that it means not a person but the doctrine, faith, and confession of Peter about Christ: "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God."²⁰⁰ This is also confirmed in many synodical testimonies, for instance, the Acta of the sixth Constantinopolitan synod, as approved by the Roman pontiff (*Pontifice Romano approbato*), where it is confessed that the unique ground and foundation with the heavenly appointment proves to be the most inflexible and unshakable faith of all things in Jesus Christ, a faith through which Christ our God constructs the universal church as his own house from all nations.²⁰¹ In attestation to his point, Polanus quotes the greatest number of testimonies from twenty-four witnesses of the ancient fathers and medieval authors who use the same expression in understanding the firmness of the true faith in Christ as the firm foundation of the church. It is no surprise that a special emphasis is given by Polanus to the nine Roman pontiffs, cardinals, scholastics, and several Jesuits who confirmed the claim of the Reformed about the establishment of the church on Christ and faith in Christ.²⁰² Reformed teaching, to Polanus's eyes, is not limited to the Reformed church but embraced by those pious theologians who belong to other confessions, even the Roman Catholic Church.

¹⁹⁹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 455.

²⁰⁰ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 455; Cyprian, *De unitate ecclesiae catholicae*, 296-297.

²⁰¹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 456; Laurentius Surius, *Tomus primus conciliorum omnium, tum generalium, tum provincialium atque particularium*, 1025: "Firmamentum ac fundamentum superno nutu creditae nobis Christianissimae existit Reipublicae fides in Deo inflexibilis & inconcussibilis, in qua Christus Deus noster tanquam propriam domum suam construxit Ecclesiam." Also See the decree of the Concilium Treverensis in *Tomus quartus*, 882: "Quando vera in Iesum Christum fides fundamentum est, & petra illa de qua Saluator noster dixit, super eam aedificandam esse ecclesia suam, aduersus quam inferorum portae nunque praeualiturae essent (praeualerent autem, si Ecclesia errare perniciose posset, aut docere noxia) fateri oportet, Ecclesiam in fide & veritate radicatam & fundatam, errare non posse."

²⁰² Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 457-462.

Related to the preceding is the issue of church polity, monarchism (*monarchismus*) is the polity of the universal or invisible church spread in the whole earth that Polanus advocates. This monarchical polity is one in which Christ alone is the monarch to rule over all churches. What followed from this was not an order in which a human being might be an earthly monarch in the church, subordinate to Christ, but an aristocracy in which all the apostles, as leaders of the church, were equal (*aequales*) in power. Even so, following the apostles, pastors are in charge of individual churches, having equal duty (*aequo jure*). A patristic vestige of the apostolic aristocracy in the church is found in Cyprian who advocated such polity by claiming that, as endorsed by the common agreement of all the bishops, “it may be both impartial and just that every person’s cause may be heard where his crime was committed, ... [insofar as] there they may have both accusers and witnesses in the cause.” From this claim, all Christian bishops seem to have equality on the ground of power or authority.²⁰³ The notion of the equivalence in power among the bishops, Polanus remarks, needs to be complemented by Chrysostom’s golden *dictum*: “God set down heavenly primacy as the fruit of earthly humility and heavenly confusion as the fruit of earthly primacy.”²⁰⁴ With this in view, Polanus points out how foolish any struggle over primacy is among the Roman Church’s bishops and even among the Reformed pastors, repeating the noted aphorism of this eminent archbishop of Constantinople that the true

²⁰³ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 463; Cyprian, *Epistola LV ad Cornelium*, in *D. Caecilii Cypriani opera*, tom. 1, 142: “Nam cum statutum sit ab omnibus nobis, et aequum sit pariter ac justum, ut uniuscujusque causa illic audiatur, ubi est crimen admissum: et singulis pastoribus portio gregis sit adscripta, quam regat unusquisque et gubernet, rationem sui actus Domino redditurus; oportet utique eos, quibus praesumus, non circumcursare, nec episcoporum concordiam cohaerentem sua subdola et fallaci temeritate collidere; sed agere illic causam suam, ubi et accusatores habere et testes sui criminis possint.”

²⁰⁴ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 467; Chrysostomus, *Opus imperfectum in Matthaei Euangelium*, 81v: “Fructum humilitatis terrestris, posuit primatum coelestem: & primatus terrestris, fructum posuit confusionem coelestem. Quicumq; ergo desyderat primatum coelestem, sequatur humilitatem terrestrem: quicumq; autem desyderat primatum in terra, inueniet confusionem in coelo.”

primacy is greater to those who are more righteous than to those who are greater in earthly honor.

It is worthy of observation that Polanus shows the means of his engagement in the issue of literary authenticity in the quotation of Cyprian. Two thoughts with a fundamental difference are found in the same paragraph, raising the issue of interpolation: 1) we must understand that “the other apostles were, just as Peter was, endowed with an equal participation in both authority and honor; after his resurrection he gave equal power to all the apostles but the commencement proceeds from one”; and 2) “the primacy is given to Peter, which was taught by one church and one cathedral of Christ.”²⁰⁵ This text of Cyprian’s *De unitate ecclesiae catholicae* with which Polanus is consulting comes from the edition of Jacobus Pamelius published in 1593. Using this edition, Polanus does not deny that the origin of churchly power began with Peter in much the same manner as the Roman consuls had their origin from Brutus and monarchical emperors from Julius, because the power was truly established in those two men, but not restricted to them. Even so, Christ’s declaration of building his church upon the *petra* that was made to Peter was afterwards renewed to all the other apostles. But the phrase “*Primatus Petro datur,*” Polanus suspects, must not be from Cyprian but afterward inserted by Cardinal Hosius, not only because the phrase is repugnant in its context and *scopus* but more explicitly because the words were not present in the earlier codices of Cyprian’s *De unitate ecclesiae catholicae* in the time of Gratian who collected the canonical law: “*Primatus Petro datur,*” otherwise, would not have been omitted from the verification of Peter’s and the later

²⁰⁵ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 465-466; Cyprian, *De unitate ecclesiae catholicae*, 297: “Hoc erant utique et caeteri Apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, et primatus Petro datur, ut una Christi Ecclesia et cathedra una monstretur.”

pope's primacy in *Gratian*, where it is written that "Hoc erant vtiq; & caeteri Apostoli, quod fuit, & Petrus, pari consortio pediti, & honoris, & potestatis. Sed exordium ab vnitatem proficiscitur, vt ecclesia vna monstretur."²⁰⁶

Polanus's objection to the phrase "primatus Petrus datur" reflects the debates of his time. The phrase is found not only in the Pamelius edition which Polanus used but also in the edition of Paulus Manutius earlier published in Rome in 1563. Pamelius argues that he has used many ancient copies of Cyprian's *De unitate ecclesiae catholicae*, eight or nine copies before the year 1563.²⁰⁷ Pamelius argues, relying upon the Manutius edition, that the phrase "primatus Petro datur" is found in the codex Cambronensis probably written by a blind monk in an old abbey, the codex which he endorsed as representing the famous Verona manuscript, probably of the sixth century.²⁰⁸ On this point, Latinus Latinius reports that the phrase is not seen in any of the manuscripts, which he has read, but was just added in a single manuscript belonging to Vianesius of Bologna which Latinius considers as very recently written.²⁰⁹ Examining the eight ancient manuscripts of the *De unitate ecclesiae*, Polanus's contemporary James judges that "none of these have any such matter" and blames the Jesuits of his day for preferring just one, Cambron codex, to so many ancient manuscripts of their own and of his.²¹⁰ Polanus similarly concludes that the phrase "primatus Petro datur" is interpolated not just in the editions of Manutius and Pamelius,

²⁰⁶ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 466; Giovanni Paolo Lancellotti, ed., *Corpus juris canonici*, vol. 2, XXIV.i, 1303.

²⁰⁷ Cyprian, *De unitate ecclesiae catholicae*, 305-307.

²⁰⁸ Cyprian, *De unitate ecclesiae catholicae*, 305: "Hoc erant & caeteri quod Petrus, sed Primatus Petro datur, vt una Ecclesia & cathedra vna monstretur."

²⁰⁹ Latinus Latinius, *Bibliotheca sacra et profana* (Roma, 1677), 174-177.

²¹⁰ James, *A Treatise of the Corruptions of Scripture, Councils and Fathers*, part.II, 8, 17. For a more detailed discussion of the codices of Cyprian's *De ecclesiae catholicae*, see Edward Benson, *Cyprian: His Life, His Times, His Work* (London, 1897), 204-216, 549-552.

but also in the Gregorian edition of the Canon Law.²¹¹ In order to reveal the absurdity of such a depraved interpolation, Polanus takes more evidential quotations from Cyprian's other writings.²¹²

Polanus goes on to argue that neither the apostle Peter nor any Roman bishop before Boniface III has been or has asked to be called "the ecumenical or universal bishop of the church."²¹³ It is so far evident that Peter was not an ecumenical pontiff superior to other apostles on the ground of honor, dignity, and power. As Ambrose pointedly said, Peter himself was not heedless of what his primacy spoken by Christ was, that is, his primacy was not the superiority of honor or order but "the precedence of confession" (*primatum confessionis*).²¹⁴ To construct the church upon the rock was Christ's utterance in response to Peter's answer to the question, "Who do you say I am?" This does not concern the political or hierarchical primacy of a person by any means, but focuses on Peter's confession of faith in Christ as the Son of the living God.

Polanus does not entirely deny the notion of primacy but rather assumes that in the church there are diverse kinds of ecclesiastical primacy, like that of the preeminence of gift, function, order, time, age, dignity, or power.²¹⁵ The primacy with regard to the preeminence of gift connotes that one is more eminent among others in terms of the gift bestowed on him: it is in this vein that Paul acknowledged himself to be the last of the

²¹¹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 466.

²¹² Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 471.

²¹³ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 463, 471.

²¹⁴ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 472; Ambrose, *De incarnationis dominicae sacramento*, in *Opera omnia*, tom.2, 225: "Vos autem quid me dicitis statim loci non immemor sui, primatum egit: primatum confessionis utique, non honoris; primatum fidei, non ordinis."

²¹⁵ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 473: "Primatus Ecclesiasticus vel functionis est vel ordinis vel temporis vel aetatis vel praestantiae donorum vel dignitatis & potestatis."

apostles (ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων). The primacy of function is nothing but the apostleship: the apostles are superior to all other ministers of the church in *gradus*, while all the apostles have certainly retained the utter equality of primacy. The primacy of order is one by which someone is first in order among colleagues, a primacy that the fathers have attributed to Peter. The primacy of time means that one is prior to others in terms of time: Peter, thus, was called into the apostleship, prior to the other apostles, for example, to John and Paul. The primacy of age is found in the idea that one precedes others in relation to age: this primacy is also entitled to Peter. From this reasoning, Polanus concludes that Peter did not, however, have the primacy either of function, dignity, honor, or power, over the other apostles but just of time, age, and order.²¹⁶

In the same vein is the issue of “the keys of the kingdom of heaven (*claves regni caelorum*)” which is described in Matthew 16:19. On this issue, Polanus argues that the keys of the kingdom of heaven were not given by Christ exclusively to Peter alone (*unus*), but equally to all the other apostles (*unitas*) as evidenced in other biblical texts (for example, Matt. 18:18, 28:19 and John 20:23), and later entrusted to the pastors of church or ministers of the Word with regard to ecclesiastical administration. Before presenting the patristic testimonies, Polanus clarifies the character of the *claves* by defining the *claves* not as principal since such kind of keys is only applicable to Christ, but as ministerial, which is universally given to the church by Christ. The ministerial *claves* have two departments: proclamation of the gospel and ecclesiastical discipline, in short, doctrine and discipline. The power of the *claves* in the church, Polanus goes on to argue, is exercised through both the ministers of the Word and the presbyters (*per ministros verbi & presbyteros*): thus, all the

²¹⁶ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 473-474.

faithful ministers of Christ are the janitors of heaven bearing the keys of the heavenly kingdom and opening or closing its gates.²¹⁷

Notably, Christ's investing Peter with the *claves* is understood by Augustine in such a way that Peter, in receiving the *claves*, represents the personality of the church: the *claves* are actually given to the church represented or figured (*figurata*) in the name of "Peter."²¹⁸ The figurative sense of "Peter" leads Augustine to say further that Christ signifies the rock, while Peter figures the whole catholic church.²¹⁹ In addition to the patristic attestation of the great authority, Polanus appeals to the *Decretum Gratiani*, a collection of Canon laws written in the twelfth century, having retained legal force in the Roman Catholic Church until Pentecost 1918, in which Gratian makes the marginal remark that "we have accepted" among others "that, when the Lord would give the equal power of binding and loosing to all the disciples, he promised Peter the *claves regni caelorum* to be given to him for all and before all."²²⁰

It is notable that Polanus's manner of rejecting the Roman Church's understanding of the *claves regni caelorum* as given to Peter alone by appeal to the dual authority, primarily of Scripture and secondarily of the church fathers, evidences a feature of continuity between the Reformers and the Reformed orthodox. Luther, for example, argued against

²¹⁷ See Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 474-475.

²¹⁸ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 476; Augustine, *Tractatus in Joannis evangelium*, in *PL* 35, col. 1762. In this regard, Augustine insists further that "in Peter's person were represented the good in the church," while "in Judas' person were figured the bad in the church" and that, though both partook in the one bread, "Peter's partaking was unto life but that of Judas unto death." See Augustine, *Tractatus in Joannis evangelium*, cols.1763: "si hoc ergo in Ecclesia fit, Petrus quando claves accepit, Ecclesiam sanctam significavit. Si in Petri persona significati sunt in Ecclesia boni, in Judae persona significati sunt in Ecclesia mali."

²¹⁹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 477; Augustine, *Tractatus in Joannis evangelium*, col. 1444.

²²⁰ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 477; Giovanni Paolo Lancellotti, *Corpus juris canonici*, vol. 2, XXIV.i (1297): "Audivimus: Cum omnibus discipluis parem ligandi atque solvendi potestatem Dominus daret, Petro pro omnibus & prae omnibus claves regni caelorum se daturum promisit."

the understanding of Peter as the unique person holding the *claves* by his biblical interpretation of Matthew 18:16-19 and also by the use of the church fathers, especially, Jerome, Chrysostom, and Augustine.²²¹ In the same way, Calvin declared that the power of *claves* was not given to an individual but the church or the consistory of elders (*consessum seniorum*), by expositing Matthew 16:19, 18:18 and taking as the *testes veritatis* the church fathers like Cyprian and Ambrose.²²²

The power of remitting sins, according to Firmilianus of the same antiquity as Cyprian, was given to the apostles and the churches which they, sent by Christ, would constitute, and also to the episcopals who have succeeded them in vicarious ordination.²²³ Ruling out a presumable misunderstanding of this view as if such power might be given even to heretics, Polanus advises us to observe the previous text of Firmilianus where he wrote that the actual endowment of the *claves* to Peter alone means nothing but that sense in which the power of the *claves* was granted only to the pure and orthodox church which was figured in Peter.²²⁴ Thereby Firmilianus wants, on the one hand, to refuse the errors of those who determined that the remission of sins could be given even to a heretic congregation and, on the other hand, to approve that the remission of sins must be imparted to the orthodox churches alone (*solis ecclesiis orthodoxis*).²²⁵ After consulting with the patristic literature, Polanus underlines the importance of a contextual understanding that

²²¹ Martin Luther, *Resolutio Lutheriana super propositione sua decima tertia de potestate papae*, WA 2:187-192.

²²² John Calvin, *Institutio*, IV.i.22, IV.x.6-7.

²²³ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 478; Firmilianus, *Epistola LXXV*, in *D. Caecilii Cypriani opera*, tom. 1, 241.

²²⁴ Firmilianus, *Epistola LXXV*, 240.

²²⁵ Firmilianus, *Epistola LXXV*, 240.

may be obtained by the collation of biblical places, in hermeneutic conviction that “the context apparently overcomes the same matter (*contextus aprte evincit idem*).”²²⁶

Finally, the sixteenth thesis on ecclesiology is notable: all the churches in Christ receive, from Christ through the apostles, freedom and honor because of which a bishop or pastor cannot be given to the churches against their will; rather, they have the right to elect their own pastor or bishop and are responsible for ordination to be made in accordance with their observation.²²⁷ Before delving into the *consensus patrum*, Polanus would first provide us with an organizational and operational picture of the ancient apostolic church in which we may discover an apostolic practice or principle of choosing or electing a minister to serve the church. The principal point Polanus would make relates to the election of Matthias for the apostolic ministry of Judas Iscariot to preserve a structure of twelve apostles that Jesus arranged. First, no one could voluntarily set himself into the apostolic place of Judas Iscariot either by using force or taking a judicial action. Second, Peter did not employ the power, either religious or political, with which he was invested, to place any person in substitutive charge of Judas’s apostolic office. Third, all the faithful who were assembled took part in proposing two men by their suffrage (*suis suffragiis*). Fourth, two nominators had to wait in prayer for the election by Jesus Christ through the casting of lots (*sortis*), to the effect that Matthias was chosen to take over the apostolic ministry of Judas. The election of Matthias, thus, is a product of the association between the

²²⁶ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 478.

²²⁷ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 489: “Omnes Ecclesiae quae sunt in Christo, hanc libertatem, hunc honorem a Christo per Apostolos acceperunt, ut invitis illis Episcopus aut pastor dari non possit: sed illae jus electionum habeant & in illarum conspectu ordinationes fieri debeant.”

calculation of the congregation or common sentence and the remaining eleven apostles (*communibus calculis seu communi sententia cum undecim Apostolis*).²²⁸

The principle of this public election is also advocated by the pious fathers, Chrysostom and Cyprian in particular.²²⁹ The clearer testimony that the eminent bishop of Carthage provides is this: the common election of bishops has originated “from the divine tradition and apostolic practice (*de traditione divina et apostolica observatione*),” and its universal preservation should be maintained.²³⁰ In high regard for the independence of the clergy and common people (*clerus et plebs*) in church government, Cyprian also insists on their ordained authority in episcopal election, while denying the election and ordination of bishops and priests by the apostles alone. The same view of ecclesiastical liberty is observed in the third council of Paris, held in 557, where it is determined in its eighth canon that any bishop should not be ordained against the will of the citizens without the most satisfied will of the congregation and the clergy but with the consent of the provincial bishops, in opposition to the ordination of the bishops by the command of the king.²³¹

²²⁸ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 489.

²²⁹ Chrysostomus, *Commentarium in Acta apostolorum*, in *Omnia opera septimus tomus*, 100-101; Cyprian, *Epistola LXVIII, Ad clerum & plebem Hispaniarum, de Basilide & Martiali*, in *D. Caecilii Cypriani opera*, tom. 1, 201.

²³⁰ Cyprian, *Ad clerum & plebem Hispaniarum, de Basilide & Martiali*, 201: “Quod & ipsum videmus de divina auctoritate descendere, ut sacerdos plebe praesente, sub omnium oculis deligatur, & dignus atque idoneus publico iudicio ac testimonio comprobetur, sicut in Numeris dominus Moysi praecipit...Quod postea secundum divina magisteria observatur in Actis Apostolorum... Nec hoc in Episcoporum tantum et Sacerdotum sed et in Diaconorum ordinationibus observasse Apostolos animadvertimus... Propter quod diligenter, de traditione divina et Apostolica, servandum est et tenendum quod apud nos quoque et fere per provincias universas tenetur, ut ad ordinationes rite celebrandas, ad eam plebem, cui Praepositus ordinatur, Episcopi ejusdem provinciae proximi quique convenient, et Episcopus deligatur plebe praesente, quae singulorum vitam plenissime novit.”

²³¹ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 491: “Nullus civibus invitis ordinetur episcopus, nisi quem populi et clericorum electio plenissima quaesierit voluntate; non principis imperio neque per quamlibet conditionem contra metropolis voluntatem vel episcoporum comprovincialium ingeratur.”

From the so-call Apostolic Canons (*canones apostolici*, about 380 A.D.), in addition, Polanus brings forward a strong testimony of more explicit and declared opposition to the intervention of Christian emperors in the episcopal election: “if a bishop enjoying the friendship of secular powers has occupied one church by means of them, all who share with him may be resigned and removed *from the church (ab ecclesia)*”²³² There was, however, debate over the authenticity of the Apostolic Canons during the sixteenth century.²³³ Thus, Jean Daillé regarded the Apostolic Canons as not proceeding from the apostles but later composed by a fabricator who might have lived in the fifth and the sixth centuries, charging Turrianus with open forgery and the intentional corruption of some canons and biblical texts.²³⁴ On the other hand, the legitimacy of the content in the Apostolic Canons was accepted by both Protestants and Roman Catholics. The quotation had been reckoned as genuine by the two most renowned canonists in the twelfth century, Yves and Gratian, who included it in their collections of the canon law.²³⁵ Polanus took a mediating view. Considering the canons as not entirely authentic, Polanus also points out that there are many errors in the Canons that would make it unlikely that the Canons were written by the apostles and that they indeed did not proceed from any of the later fathers

²³² Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 491. It is notable that Polanus does not make this quotation from the original Greek text of *Constitutiones apostolorum* or its Latin translation by Dionysius Exiguus but from the *Decretum Gratiani*, where the phrase ‘ab ecclesia’ is added to the original text of the Dionysian version. Giovanni Paolo Lancellotti, *Corpus juris canonici*, vol. 1, 299: “Si quis episcopus saecularibus potestatibus vsus ecclesiam per ipsos obtinuerit, deponatur; segregentur ab ecclesia omnes, qui illi communicant”; Ibid., 572: “Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος κοσμικοῖς ἄρχουσι χρησάμενος δι’ αὐτῶν ἐγκρατῆς γένηται ἐκκλησίας καθαιρεῖσθω καὶ οἰκωινωῶντες αὐτῷ πάντες”; Yves de Chartres, *Decretum beati luonis* (Lovanii, 1561), 166: “Si quis episcopus secularibus potestatibus vsus ecclesias per ipsos obtineat, deponatur, et segregentur omnes qui illi communicant.”

²³³ Charles J. Hefele, *A History of the Councils of the Church*, vol. 1 (Edinburgh, 1872), 452.

²³⁴ Johannes Dallaeus, *De pseudepigraphis apostolicis* (Hardervici, 1652), 432, 571, 577-578, 692-694.

²³⁵ Giovanni Paolo Lancellotti, ed., *Corpus juris canonici*, vol. 1, 299; Yves de Chartres, *Decretum beati luonis*, 166

but were determined in the sixth ecumenical synod (*sexta Synodus oecumenica*), later included in the *Decretum Gratiani*.²³⁶

With regard to public election, it is remarkable that Polanus's quotation made above on account of its Reformed feature in content is constructive for nurturing the Reformed doctrine of the episcopal election, and also polemical in opposition to the imperial intervention or control in the composition of the episcopate. But this sixteenth thesis of the church should not be taken to argue the utter independance of the church from the civil society or government. Polanus admits that the ecclesiastics should be subjected to emperors, kings, political magistrates, and senior senators, even if they might be heretical, and even more if they are orthodox and faithful of them, as long as the civil or external government is attributed to them to solve, and unless those magistrates might throw back their attributed secular privilege. Also in criminal and civil causes, the ecclesiastics and the Roman pontiffs can and ought to be judged by a secular magistrate.²³⁷

5.3. Conclusion

It is undeniable that the flourishing rise of concern and zeal for patristic theology in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was prompted primarily by the pressing necessity to defend the orthodox validity and catholic antiquity of the Protestant teaching in opposition to the Roman Catholic Church. In the same breath, many Reformed orthodox, such as Tossanus, Scultetus, and Laurent, devoted themselves to the recovery and study of patristic sources and to the reception of patristic thought as systematically clothed with the

²³⁶ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 491, 546.

²³⁷ See Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 492-500.

theological hue of the Reformed faith. Such a patrological enterprise, however, was not exclusively directed to the doctrinal polemic against the Roman Catholic Church and other denominational churches. It was also, perhaps primarily, intended to construct and solidify the confessional and ecumenical identity of the Reformed church.

Distinct from the biographical and literary introduction to the church fathers by Tossanus and Scultetus and complementary to Laurent's dogmatic rearrangement of the patristic thought, Polanus reformulates the apostolic doctrines disseminated in the patristic literature by examining doctrine by doctrine in thorough correspondance to the full structure of Reformed orthodox theology. Polanus's approach to patristic quotation, at least in his dealing with the doctrines of Scripture, predestination, and church, may be characterized primarily as a preference for the orthodox content of the patristic text, even to the verification of its literary authenticity, on the ground that whatever is good and right comes from God the Father of light. What matters in Polanus's dealing with authenticity is not just the authorship of a patristic work but more significantly the orthodox character of its content. He is indeed concerned about the unending debate of authorial attribution and textual accuracy in patristic literature, but still he would share with his Reformed colleagues their elaboration of the issues, seeking the authentication of the confessional orthodoxy and ecumenical catholicity of the Reformed church.

Polanus's reception of the church fathers, medieval doctors, the conciliar canons, and the Roman pontiffs as revealed in the *Symphonia* may be characterized in six ways. First, Polanus argues the catholic and orthodox harmony in doctrines between the apostolic and orthodox church and the Reformed church in a doctrinal analysis of selected texts. As noted previously, Polanus's understanding of the *consensus patrum* is by nature selective,

based on his understanding of the relative authority as well as the errors of the fathers and of the fathers primarily as evidenced through authentic texts that witness to his Reformed understanding of true doctrine and true worship. This approach to the fathers was typical of his time. Second, he uses any testimony or literature that is supportive, in his eyes, of the scriptural and Reformed doctrine, regardless of its author or source's background, often with careful textual observations. In his patristic quotations, Polanus usually attaches importance to their "orthodox" content than to their other factors. Third, although Polanus does not devote much space to issues of text criticism, interpolation, and forgery in patristic literature, he is not simply uncritical. He shows an awareness of the critical debates of the era. Fourth, he tends to make use of the traditional testimonies both constructively and polemically. Fifth, Polanus views the ancient fathers, medieval doctors, general councils and an occasional more recent authority as fallible colleagues with whom dialogues to cultivate the faith and theology of the Reformed church. To borrow a term from Oberman, Polanus enters into a theological "conversation" with the fathers. The conversation, moreover, began chronologically with and emphasized the early church, but it could include later writers like Bernard, Lombard, and even Luther among the fathers insofar as they were viewed as offering significant theological arguments and definitions. Sixth, he would establish and polish Reformed doctrines in deliberate correpondance with what in his view was the best of the ecclesiastical tradition, as well as defending the true and orthodox church with the testimonials of the pious fathers in opposition to problematic teachings of the Roman Church and other doctrines that he viewed as false.

It is interesting that the *Symphonia*, a nearly complete system of patristic dogmatics, still does not provide as detailed a discussion of Reformed orthodox theology as would be

elaborated in the *Syntagma*. To see the influence of patristic thought on the formulation of Reformed orthodoxy as represented in Polanus, we need to examine the *Syntagma* and compare it with the *Symphonia* with regard to the introduction of the fathers into his dogmatics and the modification and development of patristic doctrines. That examination will be done in the next chapter and the nature of the linkage between patristics and Polanus's dogmatics demonstrated as well.

Chapter Six: *Symphonia* in *Syntagma*

6.1. Introduction

Polanus's inquiry into the church fathers served not only to demonstrate the doctrinal consonance between the "apostolic and catholic fathers" and the Reformed churches as illustrated in the *Symphonia* by quotation from patristic texts, but also more significantly it served the constructive and polemical dogmatic enterprise developed in the *Syntagma*. In his introductory epistle to the *Syntagma*, arguably the most elaborate system of Reformed dogmatics from the beginning of the seventeenth century, Polanus professes that all acceptable words of truth flow from the mouth of the same shepherd (*pastore eodem*), Jesus Christ, without whose prior truth Polanus would "not say anything (*nihil dicam*) of bishops, ecclesiastical doctors, and other Christians."¹ By "the apostolic and catholic fathers," Polanus means those "who established a coherent theology piously and eruditely from the prophetic and apostolic scriptures and handed it down."² It is true that he has formerly (*dudum*) desired to imitate their example for the study of God's glory and propagation of truth and stir up the edification of the church. Respecting the orthodox fathers, he also admits that nothing can be now said of theology and wisdom of divine things that was not previously said. Augustine, however, inspired him to write and publish the *Syntagma*, by saying that "it is useful that many persons should write many books in diverse style but not in diverse faith, even with regard to the same questions, that the

¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, epistola, 3r.

² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, epistola, 3r: "qui Theologiam ex scriptis Prophetis & Apostolici pie eruditeque contextam explicarunt & tradiderunt: quorum in numero sunt Justinus Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Irenaeus Martyr, Tertullianus, Cyprianus Martyr, Athanasius, Lactantius, Chrysostomus, Ambrosius, Jerome, Augustinus & alii plurimi."

matter itself may reach the greatest number.”³ In this vein, Polanus makes a concise comment of the relation between the *Symphonia* and the *Syntagma*.

There are the difficult explanations of the greatest numbers of places in Holy Scripture for which I may not be willing to trust my judgment but consult with the ancient fathers and other recent ecclesiastical writers and search everywhere for their thoughts and annotate [them]: whence not only has the *Symphonia catholica* come from my hand but also the orthodox interpretations of many places in the two Testaments are furnished. Thus, I have put every ounce of my spirit into the *Syntagma theologiae* and devoted labor and good health to it, certainly consuming the principal *materia* and the things themselves from the divinely inspired scriptures written by the prophets and the apostles, just as from the ocean of heavenly wisdom; and then upholding the *consensus* of the ancient orthodox fathers in controversial questions and *loci*, while constantly and sincerely pursuing the internal *forma*, that is, bustling to exhibit the divine truth to be conspicuous, of which I profess to be the most beautiful lover and desire it to be admired.⁴

The *Syntagma*, thus, remains in the same realm of theology or “wisdom of divine things” as the *Symphonia*, but operates on different style and scale. No less than in the *Symphonia*, Polanus makes an extensive use of the ancient sources in the *Syntagma* even to construct the framework for Reformed dogmatics, as was intimated in the previous chapter

³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, epistola, 3v; Augustine, *De trinitate*, in *PL* 42, col. 823: “Ideoque utile est, plures a pluribus fieri diverso stilo, non diversa fide, etiam de quaestionibus eisdem, ut ad plurimos res ipsa perveniat.”

⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, epistola, 3v; “plurimorum autem scripturae sacrae locorum difficiles explicatus fecerunt, ut iudicio meo fidere noluerim, sed Patres & Scriptores alios Ecclesiasticos veteres & recentes consuluerim, sententias illorum per quisiverim & annotaverim: unde non tantum SYMPHONIA CATHOLICA sub manu nata est, sed multorum etiam utriusque Testamenti locorum interpretationes orthodoxae subministratae. Ad SYNTAGMA THEOLOGIAE igitur animum adjeci & ei operam valentudinemque impendi, materiam quidem & res ipsa primum ex divinitus inspiratis literis Prophetiis & Apostolicis, tanquam ex Oceano sapientiae caelestis hauriens; deinde in quaestionibus & locis controversis consensum orthodoxorum Patrum antiquorum, & scriptorum aliorum optimorum certo consilio & dedita opera retinens: formam autem internam, id est, veritatem divinam, cujus me tanquam rei pulcherrimae amatorem profiteor, constanter & sincere consecretans & conspiciendam satagens exhibere cupientibus eam intueri.”

with regard to the distinction between the *opera Dei interna* and *externa*. For the sake of doctrinal formulation and theological polemic, each chapter of the *Syntagma* also stands in intentional dialogue with those fathers identified as catholic and orthodox. Clearly, the *Symphonia* was not designed for itself but was involved in the formulation of the *Syntagma* in a dual manner: constructive and polemic. It is also notable that in the *Syntagma* Polanus provides a brief biographical comment on each church father before quoting his testimony. This represents a didactic step beyond the *Symphonia*. This chapter is aimed to show this substantial function of the ancient writers in the structural, doctrinal, and polemic formulation of Reformed orthodoxy as drawn from the *Symphonia* into Polanus's *Syntagma*. For this, I will examine, corresponding to the analysis of the *Symphonia*, some selected doctrines on Scripture, predestination, and church, following a brief comment on Polanus's use of patristic thought as conducive to the framework of his theological system.

6.2. *Symphonia* in *Syntagma*

6.2.1. Structure of *Syntagma*

The material structure of the *Syntagma* consists of four parts: synopsis, contents, body, and four indices. The synopsis presents a summary of the *Syntagma* in an articulation of its organizational and architectonic structure, following the bifurcatory, Ramist model of the earlier *Partitioes theologiae*. This synopsis also corresponds to the index of doctrinal theses shown in the *Symphonia*. And the four indices cover a list of scriptural texts, the bibliographical index of the fathers and ecclesiastical writers, and the alphabetical indices of theological questions and subjects. Notably, the bibliographical index in the *Syntagma* is exactly the same as that of the *Symphonia*. Similar to the

Symphonia, the patristic sources that Polanus consults in the *Syntagma* are not restricted to but go beyond the bibliographical index.

The brief comment on the structure of Polanus's *Syntagma* previously made in chapter three did not deal with the patristic impact on it. This section is devoted to that issue in more detail. The structure of the *Syntagma* is constituted in several layers of architectonic bifurcation, for example, *principium & partitiones theologiae, de fide & de bonis operibus, de Deo & de ecclesia*, and *de essentia Dei & de operibus Dei*. Each structural distinction was not made in a vacuum but generally in intimate connection with biblical authority and patristic testimony. The first structural distinction of *principium* and *partitiones theologiae* was already treated in chapter three, with heavy attention to the philosophical and historical conceptualization of the term *principium*. It is yet notable that any significant function of the fathers on the first *structural* distinction itself is hardly proved in the *Syntagma*, though the concept of *principia* was clearly germinated in their thought. Polanus grounds the distinction of *de essentia Dei* and *de operibus Dei* in the praise of Psalm 136 to God for His nature and what He has done.⁵

Polanus makes the distinction of *de fide & de bonis operibus* as the two largest parts of the Christian theology: *de fide* relates to what ought to be believed (*de rebus credendis*) and *de bonis operibus* links with what ought to be done (*de rebus faciendis*), faith preceding the good works. He grounds this distinction first in Scripture as the theological principle, especially in Acts 24:14-16, Romans 10:9-10, Galatians 5:6, Mark 1:15,

⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 865. This grounding of the distinction between *De Deo* and *De operibus Dei* in Scripture defeats Deal's criticism of Polanus for separating God in His being from God in His action and Barth's identification of Polanus as a semi-nominalist. Max Eugene Deal, "The Meaning and Method of Systematic Theology in Amandus Polanus," 81, 90; Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics* II/1:334-335.

Ephesians 1:15-16, Jeremiah 2:3, and so forth.⁶ From the scriptural ground of the distinction comes the first argument: the written Word of God itself consists in the two essential parts, faith and good works, so that Christian theology, surely corresponding to Scripture, must lie in *fide* and *bonis operibus* as essential and necessary.⁷ What the whole Scripture does is both to inform (*ad informandam*) the knowledge of truth (γνώσιν ἀληθείας) belonging to faith for true doctrine to be expounded and false teaching to be refuted, and to direct (*ad dirigendam*) the practice of piety (πρωξις ἐυσεθείας) for bad morals to be corrected and for good morals to be established.⁸ With an understanding of Christian theology as consisting in the doctrine of faith and the institution of good works, Polanus defines theology as a practical discipline whose *finis* must not be bare and idle speculation or contemplation but both cognition and operation toward the glorification of God and the eternal beatitude of human beings.⁹ The distinction of *de fide* and *de bonis operibus* is not a new invention of human reason but originally inherent in Scripture. Thus, this structural partition does not evidence the influence of rationalism on the Reformed theology but that of an orthodoxy well versed in the tradition.

Polanus shows the catholicity of this distinction from patristic and conciliar testimonies: Gregory the Great teaches in his commentary on the book of Ezechiel that we reach communion with God as our beatitude only in faith, and that our good works are a

⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 833-835; idem, *Partitiones theologiae* (Basel, 1590), 1.

⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 835.

⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 836.

⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 836: “Theologia est disciplina practica. Omnium autem practicarum disciplinarum finis est non sola cognitio, sed operatio: itae etiam Theologiae finis non est nuda & ociosa speculatio seu contemplatio, sed praxis, sed operatio ad quam homo est a Deo conditus, ad quam a Christo redemptus, ad quam a Spiritu Sancto sanctificatur, nempe glorificatio Dei & beatitudo hominis sempiterna.”

witness to having communion with God.¹⁰ With indication of ignorance as the mother of all errors, the Concilium Toletanum IV also mentioned that the meaning of Paul's admonition to Timothy on the usefulness of Scripture to teaching, rebuking, correcting, and training the faithful in righteousness is for the pastors to know Scripture and canonical laws so that their whole work may remain in preaching and in doctrine, and to edify all people with the knowledge of faith as well as the discipline of works.¹¹ In the same vein, Polanus appeals to Ignatius who identified the *principium* of Christian life with the faith and its end, charity, and insisted that these two, when they fit together in one, complete the people of God.¹² With the distinction of the wisdom of knowing God and the religion of honoring Him, Lactantius presents the proper priority of the two: "wisdom precedes, religion follows: for the knowledge of God comes first, the worship of God is the result of knowledge."¹³ Augustine in his commentary on Matthew also defined "the good catholics (*boni catholici*)" as those who strive both for integral faith and good morals.¹⁴ Thus, the partition of Christian theology into *de fide* and *de bonis operibus* represents the two essential parts of the whole Scripture that complete the people of God, enable us to have

¹⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 837; Gregory the Great, *Homillae XL in Ezechielem*, in *PL* 76, cols. 870-886.

¹¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 839; Laurentius Surius, *Tomus secundus conciliorum omnium, tum generalium, tum provincialium atque particularium* (Coloniae Agrippinae, 1567), 732: "Sacerdotes enim legere sanctas scripturas frequenter admonet Paulus apostolus dicens ad Timotheum: Intende lectioni, exhortationi. Doctores semper manere in his se sciunt. Igitur sacerdotes scripturas sanctas et canones meditentur, ut omne opus eorum in praedicatione et doctrina consistat atque aedificent cunctos tam fidei scientia quam operum disciplina."

¹² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 840; Ignatius, *Epistola ad Ephesios*, in *PG* 5, cols. 747-748: "Ἀρχὴ ζωῆς πίστις τέλος δὲ ἀγάπη τὰ δὲ δύο ἐν ἐνότητι γενόμενα θεοῦ ἀνθρώπων ἀποτελεῖ."

¹³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 840; Lactantius, *De sapientia itidem et religione*, in *PL* 6, cols. 456-457.

¹⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 841; Augustine, *Quaestiones XVII in Matthaem*, in *PL* 35, col. 1396.

and evidence our communion with God, and make us good catholics. This is also testified by the fathers.

The catholicity of the distinction between faith and good works was not only, in Polanus' view, received from the fathers, but was also developed and modified by the Reformed. The Second Helvetic Confession teaches that the universal church of Christ has in Scripture the most complete exposition of everything pertaining to a saving faith and also to the well framing of a life pleasing to God.¹⁵ Polanus reinforced the confessional point by reference to several of his predecessors: Daneau offers a slightly modified version of the distinction by saying that Christian piety relates to the doctrine of faith and the reformation and sanctity of morals; Ursinus present an interesting identity of the Apostles' Creed as containing the whole gospel and the Decalogue that include in it all the laws as the doctrines of faith and good works both of which comprise the whole doctrine in the Bible; and Zanchi considers the Apostles' Creed, the Decalogue, the Lord's prayer, and the doctrine of sacraments to be the so-called quadruple fundamental *compendium* of the whole Christian religion that entirely consists in faith and obedience.¹⁶ Thus, Polanus validates his framing distinction of *de fide* and *de bonis operibus* as orthodox and catholic by appealing to the authority of biblical, patristic, and Reformed testimonies.

The next structural partition of *de fide* into *de Deo* and *de ecclesia* was also not newly invented by the Reformed orthodox but had been already assumed by the fathers and councils. Before getting to the point, Polanus presents several reasons that the

¹⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 841; Heinrich Bullinger, *Confessio & expositio simplex orthodoxae fidei* (Tiguri, 1608), 1r.

¹⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 842; Lambert Daneau, *De haeresibus ad quodvultdeum* (Eustache Vignon, 1576), 4v; Zacharias Ursinus, *Doctrinae christianae compendium* (Cambridge, 1585), 6-7; Jerome Zanchius, *De religione christiana fides* (Neustadt, 1601), 13-14.

distinction of *de Deo* and *de actionibus Dei* is not legitimate. First, the second part coincides with the first and is comprehended in it just as anyone who talks about the action of God talks about God. Second, the two parts constitute the identical subject or equal object of theology, namely, God, but the identical subject of discipline is unable to be one *part* of discipline. Third, theology is a practical discipline whose *finis* is operation and, for that reason, we have to proceed from end to *media* which lead to the end, but this process is not made in the distinction of *de Deo* and *de actionibus Dei*.¹⁷

The partition of *doctrina fidei* into *de Deo* and *de ecclesia* was most strongly legitimized or confirmed by the Apostles' Creed, "the perfect *compendium* of Christian faith." According to Polanus's analysis of this Creed, the articles of God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and also of God's works and favor, like creation, redemption, sanctification, remission of sins, resurrection of the body, the gift of eternal life, belong to the locus of God, while all others belong to the locus of God's church. This is not an idiosyncratic exposition of the Apostles' Creed by Polanus but also of other ecclesiastical creeds, like the Athanasian, Nicene, Ephesian, Chalcedon and others which Polanus regards as the publicly approved expositions of the Apostles' Creed.¹⁸ However, it should be noted that Polanus would not take the Apostles' Creed as a *principium theologiae* but as a conclusion deduced from the theological *principium*, namely, Scripture.

Polanus's partition of *doctrina fidei* into *de Deo* and *de ecclesia* is quite close to the understanding of the Reformers on theology or religion. For example, Zwingli declares that Christian "religion cannot be truly treated without first of all discerning God and

¹⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1:843.

¹⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 845.

knowing human beings,”¹⁹ and John Calvin also makes a similar distinction of our whole supreme wisdom (*tota sapientiae nostrae summa*) into the cognition of God and ourselves (*Dei cognitione & nostri*).²⁰ At this point, we can say that Polanus did not disregard the theological framework of the Reformers by distinguishing *doctrina fidei* into *de Deo* and *de ecclesia*.

Thus, we see that Polanus attempts to ground his several structural distinctions of Christian theology in biblical orthodoxy and patristic catholicity. It is notable that such a formative use of the fathers in building the structure of theology was not found in the writings of the Reformers. Such a structural feature is developed by the Reformed orthodox, and Polanus in particular, yet without departing from the confessional identity of Reformation theology.

6.2.2. Doctrine of Scripture

Polanus’s discussion of the doctrine of Scripture as the *principium* of theology consists in thirty-two chapters, dealing chiefly with the authority, divinity, necessity, authentic edition, translation into vernacular languages, reading, perspicuity, interpretation or exposition, and perfection of Scripture. This list of topics reveals a comprehensive approach to the issues that Reformed writers of the era were formulating, debating, and incorporating into their theologies. Here again Polanus can be regarded as a major

¹⁹ Huldreich Zwingli, *De vera et falsa religione* (Christophori Forschouer: 1525), 4-5: “Quandoquidem autem religio fines duos complectitur, alterum in quem tendit religio, alterum qui religione tendit in alterum.... Hoc est, cum Deus sit in quem tendit religio, homo uero qui religione tendit in eum, fieri nequit ut rite de religione tractetur nisi ante omnia Deum agnoueris, hominem uero cognoueris.”

²⁰ John Calvin, *Institutio* 1559, I.i.1.

formulator, providing a model that would be followed in much of later Reformed orthodox theology.²¹

Each chapter reveals a similar but extensive pattern of doctrinal discussion made in the *Symphonia*, starting with the Reformed statements of a given doctrine and its detailed exposition, followed by a number of scholastic disputations consisting in pairs of objections and responses where Polanus provides not a few biblical and patristic testimonies in opposition to the Roman Catholic theologians, chiefly Robert Bellarmine. Here also the impact of Polanus's earlier work is evident in the construction of the *Syntagma*, especially his earlier disputations on subjects related to the doctrine of Scripture.²²

The doctrine of Scripture as discussed in the *Symphonia* is not merely reproduced but far more amplified, specified, and systematized in the *Syntagma*. It is interesting that the *Symphonia* provides the theses of Scripture essential to show the verity of the doctrinal unity of the apostolic and the Reformed churches, while the *Syntagma*, assuming those doctrinal theses as such, provides a more detailed explanation of each thesis and enumerates some additional topics, a topic that may not be fundamental to evidence the orthodox and catholic harmony in doctrine between the apostolic and the Reformed churches, but still of no less polemic significance in the time of Polanus.

The doctrine of Scripture in the *Syntagma* starts with the lengthy discussion of its authority consisting in fifteen chapters which were treated in the *Symphonia* but not as an individual thesis or chapter but which had appeared earlier in the *Sylloge thesium*

²¹ Cf. Muller, *PRRD*, II, part 2.

²² See Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, especially *locus* 1, *De verbo Deo*; *locus* 6, *De litera & Spiritu*; and *locus* 7, *De auctoritate Scarae Scripturae*.

theologicarum. Polanus identifies the authority of Scripture as its dignity and excellence, an authority that is duplex, divine and canonical.²³ The divine authority is one in which Holy Scripture is true *in se* and indubitable to us as the divine Word of God that prophets and apostles wrote through the immediate inspiration of Holy Spirit. Canonical authority refers to the one in which Scripture includes in it the certain, stable, perfect, unique, and incontestable norm for the whole wisdom of divine things, the totality of our piety and faith, the assertion of all doctrines, the worship of God, Christian life, and also the rejection of the errors in religion and false heresies.²⁴ With a patristic witness from Augustine, Polanus professes that God alone is the original *fons* and ultimate goal from and for which the divine and canonical authority was given to divine scriptures *absolute in se* and *quo ad nos*.²⁵ This issue I already discussed in chapter three. In the *Syntagma* Polanus presents no less patristic testimonies than in the *Symphonia*, some testimonies that are not used in the *Symphonia* are newly cited in the *Syntagma*.²⁶ As for the style of quotation or citation, Polanus sometimes makes the same quotations in different places and different contexts for an emphasis on doctrinal catholicity.²⁷ In some cases, he refers to quotations, just providing their bibliographical information but not inserting the quoted text in his discussion, even for texts that were not previously quoted.²⁸ In other cases, he

²³ Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologicarum*, locus 7.3 (289).

²⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 103-104.

²⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 104-105; Augustine, *Confessiones*, in *PL* 32, col.723: “Ideoque cum essemus infirmi ad inveniendam liquida ratione veritatem, et ob hoc nobis opus esset auctoritate sanctarum Litterarum, jam credere coeperam nullo modo te fuisse tributurum tam excellentem illi Scripturae per omnes jam terras auctoritatem, nisi et per ipsam tibi credi, et per ipsam te quaeri voluisses.”

²⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 119-120, 152, 190-191, 202, 273-274.

²⁷ For example, see Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 105, 193-194, 358-359.

²⁸ For example, see Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 153, 166.

summarizes what he wants to quote for a given topic, without any information about the sources except the names of their authors.²⁹ In those cases, Polanus would guide the readers to see the exact quotations made in the discussion of the same topic in the *Symphonia*.

In the *Symphonia*, as also in the *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, Polanus pointed out that “any book in the Old Testament that is outside the Hebrew Canon is not canonical but apocryphal,” with reference to the six chapters added to the book of Esther, the book of Baruch, additions to Daniel, the book of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus of Jesus Sirach, and the books of Maccabees. This thesis is the same in the *Syntagma* but with reference to more patristic sources and an expansion of the discussion. In the *Syntagma*, Polanus discusses the list of canonical scriptures on the ground of Athanasius’ own epistle to Marcellinus about the interpretation of Psalms and his synopsis of Holy Scripture, which sources were not consulted for the *Symphonia*.³⁰ When the testimonies of the fathers and legitimate Christian councils relevant to the canonical list need to be quoted, he refers the readers again to the *Symphonia* where the patristic and conciliar witnesses to the issue were already quoted.³¹

Unlike in the *Symphonia*, Polanus provides a lengthy discussion of each of some canonical books and apocryphal writings that were controversial between the Protestants and the Roman Catholics in relation to their canonicity. For instance, as Jerome mentioned in his commentary on Isaiah, the epistle to Hebrews was once rejected to be divine and

²⁹ For example, see Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 170, 172, 330.

³⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 282-283; Athanasius, *Epistola ad Marcellinum in interpretationem psalmorum*, in *PG* 27, cols. 11-12; idem, *Synopsis scripturae sacrae*, in *PG* 28, cols. 283-294.

³¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 284; idem, *Symphonia catholica*, 1-22; cf. also, *Sylloge thesium theologiarum*, locus 7.22 (274).

canonical by both the Latin and Greek churches, mainly on the ground that its author was not publicly known.³² Having this in mind, Polanus quotes a testimony from Jerome who, aware of the debate concerning its authorship, identified Paul as the human author of the epistle, and indicates the Reformed church, with catholic tradition, also holds the epistle to be truly divine, apostolic, and canonical.³³ In accord with Jerome but without clarifying his own opinion of the authorship, Polanus professes the epistle to the Hebrews as divine and canonical, on account of its literary splendiddness in doctrinal discussion, its prophetic and apostolic doctrine of Christ's person and office, and its right interpretation of the Old Testament.³⁴ Notably, Polanus' view of Hebrews as divine and canonical was not founded on patristic testimonies but fundamentally in the epistle itself.

The divinity and canonicity of the epistle to the Hebrews, Polanus acknowledges, does not rely upon the judgment of human beings (*judicio hominum*), either the universal councils or the fathers, but the doctrinal concord of its content with the other canonical scriptures. Still, he wants to verify this with the aid of the conciliar and patristic authority. As to the anonymity of the epistle, Polanus points out that there are many canonical writings in Scripture whose author's name is uncertain, such as Judges, Ruth, and Job. The anonymity of canonical books, he believes, may be resolved in general by the principle stated by Gregory the Great that "whoever wrote this book, the Holy Spirit was firmly

³² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1:308; Jerome, *Commentariorum in Isaiam prophetam*, in *PL* 24, col. 94: "Unde et Paulus Apostolus in Epistolas ad Hebraeos, quam Latina consuetudo non recipit: *Nonne omnes*, inquit, *ministri sunt spiritus, in ministerium missi propter eos qui haereditatem accepturi sunt salutis.*"

³³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 308; Jerome, *Epistola CXXIX ad Dardanum, De terra promissionis*, in *PL* 22, col. 1103: "hanc epistolam quae inscribitur ad Hebraeos, non solum ab ecclesiis Orientis, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Graeci sermonis scriptoribus, quasi Pauli apostoli suscipi, licet plerique eam vel Barnabae, vel Clementis arbitrentur."

³⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 308-309.

trusted as its author.”³⁵ Identification of Paul as the author of Hebrews, Polanus indicates, was advocated by the most ancient fathers. He cites Clement of Rome on the basis of Eusebius. Still resting on Eusebius, Polanus adds that Clement of Alexandria thought that the epistle was a homily written by Paul the apostle who did not write his name as the apostle of the Hebrews not just out of humility but more sincerely for the honor of the Lord who sent Paul as the apostle of the gentiles.³⁶ Athanasius also assumed that Paul is the author of the epistle who “has written (γράφας) to all the gentiles” and “now writes (λοιπὸν γράφει) this epistle to all the Hebrews.”³⁷ With a series of references to the diverse patristic thought on the canonicity and anonymity of the epistle to the Hebrews, Polanus, implying Paul as its author,³⁸ finally formulates his view that the epistle is truly divine and canonical, even though its author is uncertain (*incertus*).

Polanus’s basic position of the apocryphal books is eclectic, as in the *Symphonia*, in such a way that those books are not included in the canonical list, but some of them must not be rejected as if they were entirely spurious or useless. First, opposing the Roman Church’s acceptance of apocryphal writings as “univocally and properly divine and canonical,” Polanus reminds the readers of the sole fountain of the divine and canonical

³⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 310; Gregorius Magnus, *Expositio in librum Job*, in *PL* 75, col. 517.

³⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 310-311. Polanus cites Eusebius’ *Avtores historiae ecclesiasticae* (Basel, 1544), 69, 138-139 and in Greek; “Εβραίοις γὰρ διὰ τῆς πατρίου γλώττης ἐγγράφως ὠμιληκότος τοῦ Παύλου, οἱ μὲν τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν Λουκᾶν.” Polanus’s comment indicates that he had probably not examined 1 Clement, which does not actually argue Pauline authorship Epistle to the Hebrews, but rather borrows language from the Epistle.

³⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 311-312; Athanasius, *Synopsis scripturae sacrae*, cols. 423-424: “Ἐπειδὴ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐνίσταντο ἐν τῷ νόμῳ καὶ ταῖς σκιαῖς, διὰ τοῦτο ὁ ἀπόστολος Παῦλος, διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν γενόμενος, καὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἀποσταλεῖς κηρύττειν τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, γράψας τε πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι, γράφει λοιπὸν καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστεύσασιν Ἑβραίοις ἀποδεικνύει τὴν ταύτην Ἐπιστολὴν περὶ τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίας, καὶ τοῦ πεπαῦσθαι τὴν σκιάν τοῦ νόμου.”

³⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 314-315.

authority which belongs only to the prophetic and apostolic councils directed and affirmed by God.³⁹ Moreover, he insists on the apostolic basis of the divine canon by quoting from the testimony of Augustine that “the canon of the Old and the New Testaments was not established by any other councils of the Roman pontiffs, ancient fathers, and bishops but was confirmed and accepted by the apostles” and handed down up to now by succession.⁴⁰

Augustine, however, attended and subscribed the third Council of Carthage of which in the forty-seventh canon the book of Tobit, Judith, the two books of Maccabees, Wisdom of Solomon, and Ecclesiasticus are enumerated among the canonical scriptures. Well aware of this fact, Polanus regards the inclusion of those apocryphal books into the canonical lists as not original but as forged or manipulated, on the ground that the decree of the council was promulgated when Boniface I was bishop of Rome, as indicated in the canon itself, but this council was only published when Siricius was the pope to whom the next canon refers. Between Boniface I and Siricius, there was a gap of at least 150 years.⁴¹ Dealing with the authenticity issue of other councils that endorsed the apocryphal books as canonical, Polanus refers his readers to the discussion in his *Symphonia*.⁴²

After his lengthy discussion of the apocryphal books, Polanus presents a series of reasons why those books are not canonical.⁴³ First, the apocryphal books are not divinely

³⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 356-357.

⁴⁰ Augustine, *Contra Faustum manichaeum*, in *PL* 42, cols. 248-249: “distincta est a posteriorum libris excellentia canonicae auctoritatis Veteris et Novi Testamenti, quae Apostolorum confirmata temporibus per successiones episcoporum et propagationes Ecclesiarum, tanquam in sede quadam sublimiter constituta est, cui serviat omnis fidelis et pius intellectus”; Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 357: “Ex hoc testimonio Augustini liquet, Canonem Veteris & Novi Testamenti, non a conciliis, Pontificibus Romanis & Patribus ac Episcopis factum, sed ab Apostolis confirmatum & acceptum.”

⁴¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 358-359; Laurentius Surius, *Tomus primus conciliorum omnium, tum generalium, tum provincialium atque particularium* (Coloniae Agrippinae, 1567), 508.

⁴² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 366.

⁴³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 401-447.

inspired. Second, they are not dictated or written by a prophet. For that reason, Jerome and Augustine called additions to Daniel *fabulas*.⁴⁴ Third, they do not subsume the divine and universal truth from heaven as matter and form (*materia & forma*) in each of them. Fourth, the ancient catholic church read the apocryphal books, not for any affirmation of ecclesiastical dogmas but for the edifying of people in morals. Fifth, the apocryphal books are not included in the Hebrew canon. Sixth, those books are not written in Hebrew language. Seventh, those controversial books are not approved in the New Testament by Christ and the apostles. Eighth, the ancient catholic Christian church excluded them by name (*nominatim*) from the list of the truly and univocally canonical scriptures.⁴⁵

Reading of Scripture by the laity, an issue that was already discussed in the *Symphonia*, is more specified and systematized in the *Syntagma*. Identifying this issue as controversial between the Reformed orthodox and the Roman Catholics, Polanus begins by stating the Roman Catholic teaching that “Holy Scripture ought neither to be read nor known by the people or laity without the permission of bishops or inquisitors exceptionally and apparently given in a certificate.”⁴⁶ As distinct from the *Symphonia*, Polanus takes biblical texts as the first criterion for his rejection of the Roman doctrine and as the foundation on which to build the Reformed view of the issue, citing especially Matthew 22:29, “You are mistaken, not understanding the Scriptures nor the power of God.” He next presents some patristic witnesses, for example, Theodoret who most truly (*verissime*)

⁴⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 405.

⁴⁵ Cf. similarly, but mere briefly, Polanus, *Sylloge thesium theologicarum*, locus 7.22 (274).

⁴⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 581.

held that “the Word of God, obtusely understood, is not the word of God” and Hilary who stated that the origin of all heresies comes from ignorance of Scripture.⁴⁷

Polanus expands on the issue under discussion by disputing Bellarmine’s claims about Luther. Luther had once called Scripture a book of heresies, a comment used by Bellarmine to argue against lay reading. But, as Polanus counters, Luther put heavy emphasis on reading and studying Scripture as helpful to expose and refute the heretics. In support of Luther’s actual view and against Bellarmine, Polanus illustrates a number of heresies which were not created by the laity but by bishops or monks who did not properly understand Scripture and rather abused their ignorance of Scripture.⁴⁸ Polanus further disputes Bellarmine’s claim that Basil and Jerome were determined not to allow all people to study Scripture without distinction.⁴⁹ According to Bellarmine, when a prefect of the royal kitchen discovered something that he had not known in Scripture, Basil reproved him by saying that “your job is to think of the appetizer, not to ruin the divine dogmas.”⁵⁰ In Polanus’s eyes, however, these two fathers did not hold what Bellarmine ascribed to them; rather, their testimonies were distorted by Bellarmine. Basil did not rebuke the prefect either for the reading of Scripture or for his views on religion but for a reckless judgment concerning church controversies such that an unexperienced person could hardly understand except in an ignorant, wrong, and impudent way.⁵¹ These two fathers, rather,

⁴⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 583: “sicut verissime Theodoretus ait: verbum Dei stolide intellectum, non est verbum Dei. Unde Hilary in fine libri de Synodis inquit: Omnes haereses natae sunt ex Scriptura non intellecta.”

⁴⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 583-584.

⁴⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 589-590; Robert Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei*, II.xv, 90.

⁵⁰ Robert Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei*, II.xv, 90.

⁵¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 590.

recommended that the faithful read Scripture with reverence and humility. Polanus thus counters Bellarmine's distortion of the meaning of patristic testimony, a distortion that served to make the fathers supportive of the papacy. Polanus's approach to patristic literature here is somewhat more polemical than in the *Symphonia*, specifically designed as a counter to Bellarmine's appropriation of patristic texts.

After the polemical discussion with regard to popular reading of Scripture, in accordance with the fathers and in opposition to the Roman Catholics, Polanus proclaims the thought of the Reformed church (*ecclesiarum reformatarum sententia*), that is, "the reading of Holy Scripture by the laity should not be prohibited by any bishop" for several reasons.⁵² First, whatever God commands to the laity is neither able nor ought to be prohibited by any means. Second, what the Holy Spirit pleases for the laity to do should not be forbidden. Third, whatever the apostles themselves allow and commend to the laity is not to be inhibited. Fourth, whatever conveys God's eternal beatitude and glory or teaches true wisdom and prudence ought not to be vetoed in any respect. Fifth, whatever is written also for the laity ought not to be confined at all by the bishop's reading of it. Sixth, whatever in Scripture reveals the way of eternal life and testifies of Christ should not be blocked by the bishops' reading of it. Seventh, the laity's reading of whatever is written about the offices of all the laity in Scripture should not be prohibited. Eighth, the laity should not be prohibited from reading those things whose ignorance becomes the cause of errors and heresy. Ninth, the laity should not be forbidden to read God's testaments that must be known to all his children and heretics. Tenth, the laity should be allowed to read whatever is translated into sundry languages to become necessarily known to all. Eleventh,

⁵² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 591.

whatever the orthodox fathers enacted for the laity to read should not be interdicted by the episcopal reading of it. The twelfth reason is that whoever forbids Scripture to be read by people would destroy the friendly relationship and communion between God and his people, since God speaks to those who truly read Scripture. The thirteenth is that, right after the apostolic time, the laity such as Constantinus Magnus, Theodosius Magnus, and Theodosius Junior read Scripture as the book of laws and *principium* of all magistrates who ought to read the laws.⁵³ In the *Syntagma*, thus, Polanus's exposition of the laity's reading of Scripture becomes more detailed, more augmented, and more systematized than in the *Symphonia*, but without any change in his essential thesis.

It is notable that the authenticity of the Septuagint and the Latin Vulgate was not listed as an essential thesis in the *Symphonia* but was treated in the *Syntagma*. The editions of the Old and the New Testaments are also newly discussed in the *Syntagma*. Polanus, in discussing those issues, does not present detailed patristic argumentation, but only references of Jerome and Justin Martyr.⁵⁴ Nonetheless, Polanus indicates his intention to remain in accord with the thought of the fathers, even in the case of not using a specific quotation from them.⁵⁵ To defend his argument concerning biblical translation, for example, Polanus repeats this phrase that “the fathers bear witness here and there, whose testimonies are in the *Symphonia* (*id passim testantur Patres, quorum testimonia sunt in*

⁵³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 591-599.

⁵⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 475-525.

⁵⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 522.

Symphonia).”⁵⁶ The relationship between the *Symphonia* and the *Syntagma* is most typically seen in this way.

6.2.3. Doctrine of Predestination

The development of Polanus’s theology through various stages from the *Partitiones* to the *syntagma* is well illustrated by his doctrine of predestination. Looking at the first discussion of decree and predestination in *Partitiones theologiae*,⁵⁷ we find no patristic citations, but rather a consistent appeal to biblical texts. The general approach of Polanus in this early work was to elicit a doctrinal thesis directly from biblical texts, in other words, to depend primarily on the scriptural authority, with very little appeal to any patristic or ecclesiastical authority. The *Partitiones*, like other short manuals of the era, could be viewed as an exercise in proof-texting from Scripture. The method of theology, however, as illustrated by these manuals, was, arguable, to cite texts that belonged to a tradition of exegesis. In other words, the brief citations of texts should be understood as indicators of a background of biblical interpretation for a doctrinal point, a background, of course, that would need to be found in the works of Reformed commentators.⁵⁸

In the *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, the biblical orthodoxy of doctrine as founded on Scripture was complemented by an argument for ecclesiastical catholicity acquired from extensive dialogue with the fathers, medieval thinkers, and the Reformers as well as with Polanus’s contemporaries. The role of logic is also more apparent. Further in

⁵⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 556. For similar patterns of appealing the *Symphonia*, especially see *ibid.*, 825, 1581, 1588, 2:2387, 2788, 2940, 3587.

⁵⁷ Polanus, *Partitiones theologiae*, 14-17, 41-42.

⁵⁸ Cf. Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, pp. 142-145; and *idem*, *PRRD*, II, pp. 509-520.

the *Symphonia*, Polanus argued the doctrinal harmony in understanding of decree and predestination between the “apostolic” and the Reformed churches, by an appeal to the *consensus patrum* and to other ecclesiastical writers who in his view adhered to the scriptural truth. Finally, in the *Syntagma*, Polanus amplified and completed his doctrine of predestination by means of a more systematized formulation, additional patristic quotations, and copious polemic discourses, questions and responses, for the sake both of doctrinal consolidation and the polemic need of his time, still drawing on his *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione* and *Symphonia*. This section deals with these issues as illustrated by Polanus’s discussion of decree and predestination in the *Syntagma*.

As implied in the *Symphonia*, Polanus makes a nuanced division of God’s works into the internal and the external with previous consideration to the ultimate goal and the efficient cause of all divine works, namely, God’s glory and God himself without exception.⁵⁹ In the *Syntagma*, however, he introduces another distinction between the essential and the personal works of God (*opera Dei personalia et essentialia*), to which the distinction of the *opera Dei interna et externa* is secondary.⁶⁰ This distinction, according to Polanus, depends on the efficient cause, since “the singular principle of some divine works is a singular term, clearly, *persona*, while the common principle of some divine works is a common term, evidently, *essentia*.”⁶¹ Thus, the personal works of God are the works which are proper to the divinity of the individual persons in the Trinity, one person acting in one’s own personality or for the reason of one’s own person just as a formal principle,

⁵⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1513-1514.

⁶⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1517.

⁶¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1517: “Distributio haec sumta est ex causis efficientibus: Nam aliorum operum Dei singulare est principium, singularis terminus, nempe persona: aliorum autem commune principium, communis terminus, videlicet essentia.”

while the essential works of God are those works which proceed from the divine essence common to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit and take place by the three persons in conformity with the unity of essence.⁶²

Although these distinctions, like others, that Polanus would use in his doctrine of predestination more directly reflect medieval scholastic than patristic backgrounds, Polanus indicates a connection with the thought of the church fathers. The personal works of God were already conceptualized by the orthodox fathers (*a patribus orthodoxis*), in different wording, as “the economic works of God or economic actions (*opera Dei oeconomica seu actiones oeconomicae*).”⁶³ In Polanus’s analysis, the church fathers are, in fact, different in theological terminology but not in theological meaning. The essential works of God, Polanus continues, are indivisible in the Trinity and common to the whole essence, the whole Trinity, that is, the three persons, as both the *terminum a quo* and *terminum ad quem*. Here again, Polanus did not provide any patristic quotations supporting his argument concerning the *opera Dei essentialia* and its indivisibility. Such clear distinction of the *opera Dei essentialia et personalia* is not found as such in the patristic literature or even in the writings of the Reformers. Rather, it belongs once again to Polanus’s scholastic background.⁶⁴

⁶² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1517, 1521: “Personalia opera Dei, sunt quae propria sunt singularum personarum Deitatis, una persona agente personalitate sua, seu pro ratione personae suae tanquam formali principio...Essentialia opera Dei, sunt quae proficiscuntur ab essentia divina communi Patri, Filio & Spiritui Sancto, & desinunt in creatura, quae & ipsa commune est opus Patris, Filii & Spiritus sancti: ita ut secundum unitatem essentiae fiant communiter a Patre, Filio & Spiritu Sancto & communiter in creaturam dirigantur.”

⁶³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1517.

⁶⁴ Note that Deal, *The Meaning and Method of Systematic Theology in Amandus Polanus*, p. 90, following Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, II-1, pp. 334-335, critiques Polanus’s references to the divine essence and essential attributes on the assumption that Polanus’s doctrine of simplicity a “Platonic-Aristotelian” doctrine unrelated to Scripture and that it creates an improper separation between God’s being and God’s act. Full response to the critique would require a lengthy essay. Suffice it to say here that divine simplicity was a standard doctrine from the fathers onward, that Polanus’s language and distinctions reflect his scholastic

The eternal council and decree of God is classified by Polanus as the internal, essential works of God (*interna essentialia opera Dei*), the act of internal wisdom and most free divine will common to the whole Trinity of God.⁶⁵ This is not discussed in the *Symphonia*. Polanus sees that such classification is not immediately drawn from a specific father but might be implied in many patristic works, as he examined the biblical and patristic appellations of the divine council and decree, like ὠρισμένη βουλή, τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ ἣν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ, ἢ βουλή προώρισεν γενέσθαι (biblical) and *mysterium consilii divini* (patristic).⁶⁶ In another categorization of decree in the internal providence of God, Polanus introduces the Latin sense of *providentia* (πρόνοια) as including the precognition of things, the will and care of things foreseen, and the action itself by which things are wisely undertaken and ruled. The ancient gentile sense of πρόνοια, Polanus continues, is found in Theodoretus who pointed out that gentile philosophers like Chrysippus had conceptualized πρόνοια as “the perfect and completed government of things (*perfectam transactamque rerum gubernationem*)” but had generally interpreted it as φύσις, ἀνάγκη, τύχη, εἰμαρμένη, μοίρα, and χρόνος.⁶⁷ For the ancient Christian sense of πρόνοια, Marcus Minucius Felix is taken as a witness who theologized such a gentile notion of providence as fate or chance by saying that “For what else is fate

backgrounds and are not taken directly from purely Platonic and Aristotelian sources, that the scholastic backgrounds represent a considerable Christian modification of the Platonic and Aristotelian views on the subject, and that in any case the specific issue addressed by Deal, the being-act distinction is more a matter of common sense than of Aristotelian philosophy. Polanus does not separate God’s being and act, he distinguishes them, and does so on the ground that being or existence logically (and necessarily so) precedes the actions of any being and that what (or who) a being is determines the nature of its acts. On divine simplicity in the Christian tradition, see Muller, *PRRD*, III, pp. 70-76, 275-298.

⁶⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1528.

⁶⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1531.

⁶⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1532; Theodoretus, *Graecarum affectionum curatio*, in *PG* 83, cols. 959-960.

but what God speaks of every one of us? [God is the one] who, since he can foreknow matter, even determines the fates in accord with the merits and qualities of every one.”⁶⁸

Another patristic witness taken by Polanus is Augustine who described the fate for the gentiles as, in its Christian meaning, God’s “knowing all things before they come to pass and leaving nothing unordained.”⁶⁹ These arguments of Polanus serve to illustrate his broadly catholic approach. Like most Reformed writers of the era, Polanus acknowledged that the term *providentia* and its Greek equivalent, *pronoia*, were not well attested in Scripture even though the concept was clearly present. [for fn: Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae christianae*, 1531, 1532, 2158] For his analysis of the term, therefore, he turned to ancient philosophical and patristic sources and he fitted their basic definitions into the framework of his scholastic distinctions.

Unlike the *Symphonia*, the *Syntagma* shows far more polemic engagement consisting in the number of objections and responses, yet it leaves a pattern of the Reformed theses and the patristic attestations almost unchanged. The tenth thesis of divine decree, for example, is that the decree is firm, stable, constant, and immovable. A series of biblical testimonials are taken from Psalm 33:11, Numbers 23:23, Isaiah 46:10, and James 1:17, while the patristic and ecclesiastical witnesses for this include Theodoretus, Augustine, and Gregory the Great. A possible objection to the thesis is this: if God repents (*poenitet*) of any thing, it is mutable, but God did regret his decree and therefore God’s decree is

⁶⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1533; Marcus Minucius Felix, *Octavius* (Heidelberg, 1560), 88: “Quid enim aliud est fatum, quam quod de unoquoque Deus fatus est? Qui cum possit praescire materiam, pro meritis et qualitatibus singulorum etiam fata determinat.”

⁶⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1533-1534; Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, in *PL* 41, cols. 148-149.

mutable.⁷⁰ This objection is, indeed, supported by some scriptural texts like Genesis 6:6, 1 Samuel 15:10, and John 3:11. In reply, following a standard traditional explanation, Polanus points out that “the divine regret” (μεταμέλεια Θεοῦ) found in some places was written “in a figurative manner of speaking” (*figurato loquendi modo*), as already witnessed in Theodoretus and Augustine who elucidated the *divinam poenitentiam* as signifying nothing else but “the mutation of dispensation” (οἰκονομίας μεταβολή) or “mutation of things” (*mutatio rerum*).⁷¹ Since God, who himself is not mutable, moves what he wills to move, Gregory the Great here reasons that the divine regret means that, although he moves things, the council does not mutate.⁷² Notably, these patristic texts used here are not found in the *Symphonia* but are added in the *Syntagma*, indicating the development and elaboration of Polanus’s thought and argumentation.

With the distinction of divine decree as the general and the special, Polanus links the latter with predestination, or the decree of rational creatures, as a part of divine providence and general decree. As shown in the *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione* and the *Symphonia*, Polanus started his exposition of predestination with the question of whether we must publicly propound and teach this doctrine to the people in the church of God or not.⁷³ In the *Syntagma*, however, he begins to discuss the doctrine with the question of whether any predestination in God pertains specifically to rational creatures.⁷⁴ With this in mind,

⁷⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1547-1548.

⁷¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1549; Theodoretus, *Quaestiones in Genesim*, in *PG* 80, cols. 155-156; Augustine, *Enarrationes in psalmos*, in *PL* 37, col. 1459.

⁷² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1550; Gregorius Magnus, *Moralium in librum B. Job*, in *PL* 76, col. 175: “quia ipse immutabilis id quod voluerit mutat, poenitere dicitur quamvis rem mutet, consilium non mutet.”

⁷³ Polanus, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione* (Basel, 1598), 1; idem, *Symphonia catholica*, 139. This order is followed by Turretin in his *Institutio theologiae elencticae*, vol. 1 (Geneva, 1679), 350.

⁷⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1560.

Polanus refers the readers to some biblical testimonies which demonstrate that predestination was frequently and splendidly taught by Christ and the apostles.⁷⁵ As whatever doctrine was inculcated by Christ and written in Scripture should not be concealed in the church of God, so should predestination not be omitted but taught.⁷⁶ Some may argue that predestination, on the claim that it could dissuade the believers from learning the obedience to God, should not be taught in the church. This objection, of course, had been lodged against Reformed theology and, specifically, against Calvin's thought, virtually from its beginnings. Polanus does not reference the earlier controversy but rather appeals to Augustine, who argued the compatibility of predestination and obedience to God and moreover the necessity of teaching predestination for the proper understanding of obedience to God by saying that "just as other things are to be preached so that one who preaches them may be heard with obedience, thus, predestination must be preached so that one who hears these things with obedience may glory not in the human being, and through this not in himself, but in the Lord."⁷⁷ This quotation, notably, was not used in the *Symphonia*. Using it here again illustrates that the patristic referencing of Polanus is augmented in the *Syntagma*. The necessity of teaching predestination is discussed, moreover, in connection with other doctrines like obedience. In fact, the discussion of predestination in the *Syntagma* is in close connection with several other

⁷⁵ Polanus, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 1: "Prima est, quia est d Deo per Prophetas, Christum ipsum atque Apostolos Ecclesiae tradita atque commendata; ut ex deinceps allegandis testimoniis liquet."

⁷⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1562-1563.

⁷⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1565; Augustine, *De dono perverantiae*, in *PL* 45, col. 1033: "Sicut ergo caetera praedicanda sunt, ut qui ea praedicat, obedienter audiatur; ita praedestinatio praedicanda est, ut qui obedienter haec audit, non in homine, ac per hoc nec in se ipso, sed in Domino gloriatur."

doctrines, like divine attributes, eternal council, Christ's meritorious work, salvation, and so forth.

Predestination is "the decree of God by which all rational creatures are destined from eternity to certain ends, beyond this temporal and natural life, being lead up to them by certain means that are also preordained from eternity."⁷⁸ Polanus thus maintains the predestination not only of the end, the glory of God and the salvation of the elect, but also of the means (*de mediis*) by which the elect shall be drawn to those ends. However, the notion of the *praedestinatio de mediis* was neither formulated in the *Symphonia* nor even in the *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*; it was added in the *Syntagma*, without any patristic but only biblical appeal.⁷⁹ Ursinus, Grynaeus, and Zanchi, on whom Polanus is heavily dependent with regard to predestination, had clearly mentioned the dual predestination of *finis* and *media* through which the elect are lead into the *finis*, still without any quotation from the church fathers except Augustine in an indirect manner.⁸⁰ Since this issue was not directly handled by the fathers Polanus could not have included discussion of the *decretum de mediis* in the *Symphonia*; he adds it in the *Syntagma* as an aspect of the more scholastic development among the Reformed.

⁷⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1566.

⁷⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1566.

⁸⁰ Johann Jacob Grynaeus, *Theoremata duo, alterum quidem de fidei actione propria, alterum vero de praedestinatione sanctorum* (Basel, 1592), 6; Jerome Zanchius, *De natura Dei*, in *Omnium operum theologicorum*, vol.1 (Geneva, 1619), col.476: "dicimus, quicumque ad illum finem sunt electi: ad haec etiam media esse praedestinos. Est enim praedestinatio non solum finis, verum etiam mediorum ad finem"; Theodore Beza, *De Praedestinationis Doctrina* (Geneva: Eustathius Vignon, 1582), 403: "Praedestinatio verò nihil aliud sit quàm eius voluntatis ad certum finem sive salutis sive exitii destinatio, negari iusta ratione non potest, Praedestinationem & ad ultimum illum duplicem finem & ad utrinque subordinata media pertinere." The dual predestination *ad finem et media* was retained by the Reformed thinkers after Polanus, for example, Twisse, Daillé, and Samuel Andreae. Cf. William Twisse, *Vindiciae, gratiae, potestatis ac providentiae Dei* (Amsterdam, 1648), 702; Johannes Daillé, *Apologia pro duabus ecclesiarum in Gallia protestantium Synodis*, vol. 2 (Amsterdam, 1655), 1216; Samuel Andreae, *Disquisitio theologica de decreto absoluto* (Marburg, 1689), 57.

The question of whether Polanus's formulation of predestination is supralapsarian or infralapsarian also serves to illustrate his use of sources. The answer may be both, or, more precisely, evidencing elements of both the later infralapsarian and the later supralapsarian positions. First, Polanus's view of predestination may be considered as infralapsarian but with the condition that he, even if he would be seen as infralapsarian, firmly holds the free and absolute will of God as the unique efficient cause of predestination. The crucial, though indirect, evidence for this is found in his early work, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione* (1598), where Polanus describes in regard to the cause of predestination that "God, when he had foreseen (*praevидisset*) that all human beings would be sinners alike in Adam and by nature the children of wrath, decreed (*constituerit*) to declare his mercy in the one and to abandon the other in their sins and condemn them for their sins."⁸¹ This description comes originally from Zanchi who more clearly presents an infralapsarian pattern in his formulation of predestination: God established the firm decree from eternity, first to create all human beings, then to permit them to fall into sin and to be fitted to the eternal death on account of their sin, and finally to liberate some thence, whom he has created in regard, and give them eternal life, but to hold back the rest of them from this grace and abandon them in their sins, leaving them in deserving eternal punishment because of their sin.⁸² The same doctrine, Polanus says, is also taught by "Luther, Calvin,

⁸¹ Polanus, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 148: "Deus cum praevидisset omnes homines futuros ex aequo in Adamo peccatores & natura filios irae, constituerit in unis misericordiam suam declarare, alios vero in peccatis ipsorum relinquere, & propter ea damnare."

⁸² Zanchius, *De natura Dei*, cols. 485-486: "Deum ab aeterno, firmo decreto constituisse, primum quidem creare omnes homines: deinde eos in peccatum labi & propter peccatum morti aeternae obnoxios fieri permittere: postremo aliquos inde per Christum, ea qua fecit ratione, liberare, & aeterna vita donare: reliquos vero ab hac gratia retinere, & in suis peccatis relictos, eandem aeterno supplicio propter peccata afficere."

Vermigli, Beza, Bucanus and other outstanding theologians.”⁸³ Here it is worthy of observation that Polanus categorizes the supralapsarian Beza and the infralapsarian Zanchi in the Reformed circle with the same perspective on predestination. From this, it seems that Polanus’s description, seemingly infralapsarian, was not intended to pointedly demonstrate his position to be infralapsarian but to argue that God’s free and absolute will, not sin, is the unique efficient cause of predestination.

Polanus’s doctrine of predestination may be considered more tenably as supralapsarian. This pattern of his doctrinal formulation is insinuated in his understanding of Jacob and Esau as respectively elected and reprobated without any consideration to their good or evil acts (*nulla benefactorum vel malefactorum ratione habita elegit vel reprobavit*).⁸⁴ Such a pattern is more typified in that, in execution, the creation of rational creatures precedes the permission to sin and that the effects of reprobation are orderly 1) *excitatio seu creatio reprobatorum*, 2) *permissio lapsus seu peccati*, 3) *desertio divina*, and 4) *reverentia & amor Dei in electis*.⁸⁵ From this, it is sure that the *creatio reprobatorum* precedes the *permissio peccati* in execution, while the phrase “*creatio reprobatorum*” indicates that reprobation or the decree of some into eternal death has a logical priority to the ordination of creation, as well as of permission to sin. Following Zanchi, Polanus assumes that God ordained first (*primum*) the rational creatures unto certain ends (*finem*), either eternal life or death, and then (*deinde*) the means (*media*) by which the divine council is executed.⁸⁶ He also holds the formula of “*scholastici doctores*”: the end is the

⁸³ Polanus, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 150.

⁸⁴ Polanus, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 142.

⁸⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1566, 1619-1620.

⁸⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1612.

first in intention and the last in execution, while the means is the last in intention and the first in execution.⁸⁷ It is clear in this regard that permission to sin is not included in the end of predestination, either of election or reprobation, and hence the end of predestination, namely, the decree of some into eternal life and others into eternal death, must be prior to that of permission to sin.

Unlike the inverse order of the end and the means, the order among the means is not inverse but identical in intention and execution. Given the identical order of means and the clear sense of permission to sin as not included in the end either of election or of reprobation, it seems more plausible that Polanus regards the creation of the reprobate to be first ordained in the divine mind (*in mente divina*) and then permission to sin. Generally, Polanus tends to speak, in his early work *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, of predestination in an infralapsarian pattern, while in his final work, *Syntagma*, he describes it in a more supralapsarian pattern. It should be noted that he does not deal with this issue as an independent locus and that he does not use the terms ‘supralapsarian’ or ‘infralapsarian.’ Whereas Polanus had been able to cite Augustine as support for his doctrine of double predestination and also for the infralapsarian definitions found in the *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, there was no clear Augustinian basis for arguing the issues raised by supralapsarian arguments. Polanus thus depicts the doctrine of predestination as infralapsarian in his early writing and supralapsarian in his final work, not in dependence on the patristic literature but in the light of his doctrinal exegesis of Scripture and in dialogue with his contemporaries, notably, Beza. It is likely that this issue, at least for Polanus, may not be fundamental to establish a precise harmony in doctrine between the

⁸⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1613.

patristic and the Reformed churches. Indeed, he has not engaged in any debate over supra- and infra-lapsarianism.

Polanus calls for our special attention to the free and absolute will of God as the ultimate cause of predestination. The main point of identifying the absolute and most free will of God alone (*sola absoluta liberrimaque voluntas Dei*) as the cause of predestination in the *Syntagma* is exactly same as in the *Symphonia* but with further elaboration and formalization of that thesis. The efficient cause of predestination is God himself, by and in whom the *actus* of predestination is, by whose supreme mind all things are ordained toward their goal, and by whom all means are prepared for the designated goal. The reason for the attribution of the cause to God alone, Polanus states, is that predestination is eternal in God before anything else comes into being. As God is eternal, so is predestination eternal and definitely done before the foundation of the world, the creation of all things in it, and their proximate causes, but not after human beings have been created and sinned.⁸⁸ The cause whereby God is moved to us or on account of which election is made, thus, is not human will, faith foreseen, human merits foreknown, nobility of birth, other prerogatives, the merit of Christ, or even the end of election itself, but only God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, God's good pleasure and free love.⁸⁹ Polanus adds that election is truly made no less by the Son and Holy Spirit than by the Father, but it is

⁸⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1567.

⁸⁹ Cf. Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1575-1576; idem, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 11-12: "Κύριον αἴτιον seu causa efficiens principalis est solus Deus Pater, Filius & Spiritus sanctus.... Causa qua Deus ad eligendum impulsus fuit, seu propter quam election est facta, non est voluntas hominis: nec praevisa fides: nec praescita hominum merita: nec dignitas generis, vel ullius alterius praerogativae: nec meritum Christi; nec denique ipse electionis finis; sed solum beneplacitum Dei in gratuita ejus dilectione fundatum." This trinitarian causality of election is also found in terms of reprobation. See Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1636.

chiefly attributed to the Father, just as he is the fountain of the Godhead and thus the beginning of every divine work.⁹⁰

In this regard, it is notable that Polanus's predestination, as Muller argues, may be characterized by its "trinitarian ground and christological focus," a character that is clearest in his distinction of eternal election into that of Christ and of those united with Christ (*tum Christi, tum unitorum Christo*).⁹¹ Polanus actually identifies eternal predestination with "the foundation and fountain (*fundamentum & fons*) of God's all saving benefits" and "the foundation and principal part of the gospel (*fundamentum & praecipua pars euangelij*)."⁹² He, however, did not regard the doctrine of predestination as "a metaphysical foundation" or "an inner principle" for building Reformed dogmatics, but rather represented the soteriological interrelationship of predestination and Christ. According to the distinction of *opera Dei essentialia et personalia*, predestination is classified as an essential work commonly attributed to the three persons of the Trinity. Christ is, thus, the efficient cause of election as God the Son but, moreover, as the God-man he is the object of election. And he was elected as the head of angels and human beings and also as their mediator through and in whom they are united with God and have eternal life. In this vein, the election of Christ, Polanus argues, is "the foundation and firmness of the election of angels and human beings."⁹³ He distinguishes the election of those united with Christ into two parts: the

⁹⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1574; idem, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 12: "Non minus igitur a Filio & Spiritu sancto electio est facta, quam a Patre. Sed Patri praecipue ascribitur: quia is est, sicut Deitatis fons, sic omnis divinae actionis principium."

⁹¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1568; Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, 156-157.

⁹² Polanus, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 1, 59.

⁹³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1570: "Electio Christi est fundamentum et firmamentum electionis angelorum & hominum" In this regard, Muller rightly points out that "Polanus refrains from calling Christ himself the *fundamentum electionis*" as the God-man, a *fundamentum* that is rather the *electio Christi*. See Richard A. Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, 156.

destination of human beings to eternal salvation and the preparation of means leading them into salvation, namely, the fruition of God or communion with God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.⁹⁴ The mediation of Christ, as the first effect of eternal election, relates to the whole *ordo salutis* of the elect or all other effects of our election, such as union with Christ, adoption in Christ, effectual vocation in Christ, salvific faith in Christ, justification in Christ, and finally glorification in Christ. All these effects, thus, occur only in and through Christ.⁹⁵ This is what election in Christ means. The fact that Christ is both the efficient cause of election as God the Son and the object of election as the God-man for the salvation of the elect demonstrates the soteriological interconnection of predestination with Christology. Thus, it may be said that Polanus's doctrine of predestination has the trinitarian ground and christological focus as its character. It is notable that this character is also found in his attribution of the *caput* of angels and human beings, commonly to God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, but singularly to Christ alone as the formal and analogical head (*caput formale & analogicum*).⁹⁶

Polanus's discussion of the election of angels deserves our special attention, a discussion that was not found in the *Symphonia* but added in the *Syntagma* as part of Polanus's systematic elaboration of doctrine. In the *Syntagma*, Polanus offers one biblical quotation without any patristic attestations. He defines the election of the blessed angels on the basis of the first Timothy 5:21: it is a predestination by which God from eternity ordained to confirm some angels by grace in the good in which they were created for the

⁹⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1573, 1595: "Salus ipsa sempiterna, est fruitio Dei seu communio cum Deo Patre, Filio & Spiritu Sancto."

⁹⁵ See Polanus, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 59; idem, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1573.

⁹⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1570: "Caput Angelorum & hominum communiter est Deus Pater, Filius & Spiritus Sanctus; singulariter Caput formale & analogicum est solus Christus."

fruition of eternal beatitude.⁹⁷ Patristic attestation had been already made in *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*. There he had pointed out the theological absurdity of some medieval scholastic discussions of angels' merits, based on the misconstrual of Augustine's *Enchiridion*, as well as of Anselm's argument in *Dialogus de casu diaboli*.⁹⁸ The main themes of Augustine's explanation in *Enchiridion* are two. First, the elected angels remain in piety and obedience to their Lord, enjoying certain knowledge that makes possible their everlasting safety and freedom from the possibility of falling. Second, the angels were elected before their creation by God but not for any foreknown merit on their part.⁹⁹ Anselm's *Dialogus* is a curious treatise which deals with the cause of the devil's first sin in terms of the dual structure of angels' will and intellect.¹⁰⁰ Once again, Polanus's concern can best be characterized as engaging in conversation with major figures in the catholic tradition, here, both Augustine and Anselm, not for the sake of a historical examination of their thought but for the sake of drawing aspects of their formulations into dialogue with his own.

Polanus next underlines Christ's primacy among the angels as their head, for which reason he is called "the Angel" (Mal.3:1).¹⁰¹ Then he draws our attention to the view of Christ as the *redeemer* of the angels made by Bernard, whom he considers to be the last church father. Bernard's main thesis in the quotation made by Polanus is that Christ was the redeemer of the elected angels by bestowing on them the power of not falling, thus

⁹⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1570.

⁹⁸ Polanus, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 9-10.

⁹⁹ Augustine, *Enchiridion de fide, spe et charitate*, in *PL* 40, col. 246.

¹⁰⁰ Anselm, *Dialogus de casu diaboli*, in *PL* 158, cols. 325-360.

¹⁰¹ Polanus, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 10.

rescuing and defending them from captivity.¹⁰² But Polanus would refrain from calling Christ the redeemer of the elect angels because they have not sin (*non peccaverunt*), following “the most faithful servant of Christ, Theodore Beza” who provided “the more genuine sense of those *loci* [theses of predestination].”¹⁰³ Christ, still, can be correctly called the head (*caput*) of the angels by whose tie with them the angels may adhere solidly and inseparably to their God and the preserver (*conservator*) of the angels in good, the God without whom they might not be stable in their innocence.¹⁰⁴ The angels, thus, have the foundation of their consistency, good condition, and perseverance on their eternal election made only in Christ.¹⁰⁵ It is interesting in this issue to note that Polanus reassesses Bernard, once calling him one of the church fathers,¹⁰⁶ now as one of the problematic scholastics. Again, we observe here Polanus’s focus on “orthodox” content rather than on the church fathers as persons writing in particular historical contexts.

This approach to reception and use illustrates a methodological continuity with the Reformers. Luther, for instance, said that the fathers who piously read Scripture would have always demonstrated nothing except Christ, but he pointed out that, however, some fathers like Jerome, Cyprian, and Origen did not preach Christ in some biblical expositions,

¹⁰² Polanus, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 10. Bernard, *Sermones in cantica conticorum*, in *PL* 183, col.880: “Qui crexit hominem lapsum, dedit stanti [*alias* statum] angelo ne laberetur, sic illum de captivitate eruens, sicut hunc a captivitate defendens. Et hac ratione fuit aequae utrique redemptio, solvens illum, et servans istum. Liquet ergo sanctis angelis Dominum Christum fuisse redemptionem, sicut justitiam, sicut sapientiam, sicut sanctificationem.”

¹⁰³ Polanus, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 10: “Sed locorum illorum sensum veriore fidissimus Christi servus Theodosius Beza attulit.” Cf. Theodore Beza, *De praedestinationis doctrina* (Geneva: Eustachius Vignon, 1582).

¹⁰⁴ Polanus, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 10: “Atqui Angeli non peccaverunt: ergo ipsis non fuit opus Redemptore. Huic concedo Redemptore ipsis opus non fuisse, at capite opus habuerunt, per cujus nexum solide & indistracte Deo suo cohaererent. Instauratore non eguerunt, sed conservatore in bono, sine quo stabiles in sua integritate non permansissent.”

¹⁰⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1572.

¹⁰⁶ Polanus, *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachiae*, 56.

even in the places where their reasoning was glittering, though in other places they taught Christ rightly.¹⁰⁷ Calvin also showed a preference for orthodoxy in the content of patristic sources.¹⁰⁸

Polanus's discussion of foreseen faith in the *Syntagma* also illustrates well the interrelationship of his doctrinal works, his progress in formulation, and his way of incorporating patristic texts into his theology. To verify the catholicity of his Reformed understanding that special election was not caused by faith foreseen, Polanus explicitly references the fourth thesis in the fourth chapter of the *Symphonia catholica* where he provided a great number of testimonies from antiquity that argue that faith is "neither the meritorious nor the instrumental cause" of our eternal election. He also adds a lengthier quotation from Augustine than found in the *Symphonia*: Augustine had argued, on the ground of John 15:16, "you have not chosen me but I have chosen you," that election precedes faith, since God "chose us not because we believed but that we might believe, lest we should be said first to have chosen him, and thus his word be false."¹⁰⁹ Since Polanus recognizes that this patristic verification is not sufficient to settle the debate with his opponents,¹¹⁰ he also provides a great number of biblical texts and logical axioms in the *Syntagma* to argue his position. The *Syntagma*, again, was constructed to meet the

¹⁰⁷ Martin Luther, *Predigten 1530; Reihenpredigten über Matthäus 5–7*, WA 32: 241-242; idem, *Wider das Papsttum zu Rom vom Teufel gestiftet 1545*, WA 54:246. Cf. Manfred Schulze, "Martin Luther and the Church Fathers," in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, ed. Irena D. Backus, vol 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 573-626.

¹⁰⁸ John Calvin, *Institutio christianae religionis*, praefatio, vr.

¹⁰⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1581; idem, *Symphonia catholica*, 145; Augustine, *De praedestinatione sanctorum*, col.988: "Non vos me elegistis, sed ego vos elegi; nec fides ipsa praecedit. Non enim quia credidimus, sed ut credamus elegit nos: ne priores eum elegisse dicamur, falsumque sit

¹¹⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1581.

doctrinal and polemical need of the time, conjoining biblical, patristic, and rational argumentation with the more elaborate late sixteenth century.

Similarly, Polanus's doctrinal adversaries argued that the first chapter of Ephesians identifies our election as made in Christ and that we could not be in Christ except through faith (*per fidem*). Their "logical" reasoning is this: the first sentence is a true apostolic testimony, and the second is true, and thus it follows that we cannot be elect in Christ without faith in him – making election dependent on faith. And the adversaries verify this argument by taking a testimony from Theophylact who commented on Ephesians 1:4 that God "has blessed us through Christ, just as he elects us through him, that is, through faith in him."¹¹¹ In his response, Polanus makes three points. First, the adversaries commit the fallacy of *ignoratio elenchi*, namely, failing to deal with the actual point at issue, *An fides causa sit instrumentalis aeternae electionis*. Second, their proposition that Christ would be idle (*ociosus*) with regard to our salvation apart from our faith, evidences *kainophobia*, i.e., a fear of novelty. (Presumably the novelty of the right formulation of doctrine, of which they had not previously been aware.) Third, is it ambiguous to state that we were not elected into salvation in Christ without faith in him. In order to verify that we could not have believed in Christ unless we had not been ordained to eternal life, Polanus employs other biblical texts like John 6:37 and Acts 13:48. And with regard to the passage in Theophylact cited by the opponent, he points out the problem of citing one father in opposition to the consensus of many orthodox fathers who rightly deny that faith could be the cause of election.¹¹² And then he corrects Theophylact's misunderstanding of

¹¹¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1585-1586; Theophylactus, *Expositio ad Ephesios*, in PG 124, cols. 1035-1036.

¹¹² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1586.

Ephesians 1:4 as teaching that Paul would mean that “God elected us not through him (*per ipsum*) but in him (*in ipso*),” on the ground of another patristic witness from Athanasius who interpreted Ephesians 1:4 like this: “we are elected in Christ (*in Christo*), for Christ is the foundation on which our election and whole instauration is founded.”¹¹³ Given his Protestant assumption that the fathers can err, Polanus (perhaps unlike his Roman opponents) can refuse to harmonize the patristic texts and pose one father against another. Once again, he argues the catholicity of Reformed doctrine on the basis of a selective *consensus patrum*.

For the sake of both positive teaching and polemical defense, Polanus seeks a complete and integral system of the doctrine of predestination by making a series of further distinctions: the goal of predestination into supremely the glory of God and subordinately the salvation of the elect, predestination into election and reprobation, election into the election of Christ and of union with him, the election of human beings into the communal or general and the individual or special, special election into *prior* destination of some to eternal life and *posterior* preparation of means for their salvation, and so forth. Here, Polanus’s appeal to the fathers, especially Augustine and Athanasius, is drawn into a set of distinctions that he has actually drawn from Junius, dividing doctrine into *causa, materia, forma, finis, effecta, beneficia, and testimonia*,¹¹⁴ with further distinctions of the first into *remota* and *proximata*, the second into *concilium* and *decretum*, the third into *summus* and *subalternus*, the fourth into *gloria* and *salus electorum*, the fifth into *media* and *salus ipsa*, the sixth into *vocatio efficax ad communionem, donum fidei salvifica, justificatio gratuita*

¹¹³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1587; Athanasius, *Orationes adversus Arianos*, in *PG* 26, cols. 451-452.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Junius, *Theses theologicae*, in *Opera theologica*, vol. 1 (Geneva, 1613), 2006-2007.

coram Deo, and *glorificatio*, namely, *regeneratio* or *santificatio*, and the seventh into *evangelium externa* and *interna Spiritus sancti*.¹¹⁵ This pattern of scholastic distinction is characteristic of Polanus's full formulation of the decrees, where he has created a scholastic framework for the citation of Scripture and the fathers.

With regard to the doctrine of eternal reprobation, Polanus deals with three issues that were not discussed in the *Symphonia*: 1) whether there is reprobation, 2) whether reprobation must be taught in the church, and 3) what should be taught of reprobation, especially its definition and the indication of its parts, species, causes, effects, subjects, and essential features. On the first issue, Polanus takes a series of biblical testimonies from the Old and the New Testaments to present a positive answer, with some ratiocination of those testimonies. If all are not the elect to eternal life, he reasons, the rest of them must be the reprobate (Matt. 20:16). In other words, those who would be driven away from Christ in the final judgment are definitely reprobated by God from eternity (John 6:37). Moreover, if not all are sheep but many die to eternal punishment, they must be reprobated by God (John 10:26). If there are some for whom Christ has not prayed and others for whom he died efficaciously, the former must be reprobated by God (John 17).¹¹⁶

Polanus also takes up the second issue with a positive answer on the ground of his reasoning that whatever is instructed by God in divine scriptures or serves to assert the glory of God and carry the salvation of the elect, it must not be neglected but taught in the church. As for the third issue, he presents a definition of reprobation as the divine predestination whereby God has pleased to disregard the fixed number of rational creatures

¹¹⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1566-1599; Athanasius, *Orationes adversus Arianos*, in *PG* 26, cols. 451-452.

¹¹⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1609-1610.

in election for eternal life but destined them for eternal death, abandoned them in sins, and for this reason condemned them by the justest judgment, ultimately for the sake of God's glory. Reprobation consists in two parts: *prior* destination of the reprobate to eternal death and *posterior* destination of means to execute the decree of reprobation. And then Polanus argues that this is the biblical and patristic view, which had been inverted by the medieval doctors. The end of reprobation must precede the firm destination in the divine counsel, on the ground of the inverse order of things in intention and execution (what is the end in execution is the first in intention).¹¹⁷ Polanus observes, without specifying theologians, that the "scholastics" identified the utter ruin or eternal death of the reprobate with the final end of reprobation. Polanus disagrees with them, arguing that reprobation finally serves the glory of God and salvation of the elect, as verified by biblical testimonies from Romans 9:21-22, 2 Corinthians 11:15, Philippians 3:19, 1Peter 2:7-8, and Jude 1:4.¹¹⁸ For patristic testimonies on this issue, Polanus points to the second and tenth theses of the fourth chapter of the *Symphonia catholica*.¹¹⁹ In effect, Polanus has set biblical testimony and a selection of patristic texts against various medieval scholastics, in the service of his own scholastic formulation.

Polanus devotes the largest space of the *locus* to the discussion of the cause of reprobation. First of all, he distinguishes the cause of reprobation into *efficiens principalis*

¹¹⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1613. Using this inverse order, Polanus would follow Zanchi. Cf. Polanus, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 130; Girolamo Zanchi, *De natura Dei*, in *Omnium operum theologicorum*, vol. 1 (Geneva, 1619), 568: "Sunt haec manifesta ex euentu & ordine, quo res eueniunt, ad regulam illam certissimam examinatae, quod primum est in intentione, id est, in consilio & cogitatione: illud est vltimum in executione."

¹¹⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1613.

¹¹⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1614.

and *efficiens impellens*¹²⁰: the former refers to God himself, while the latter refers to the eternal pleasure or free will of God.¹²¹ On the view of any other things like sin *extra* God himself as the only efficient cause of reprobation, Polanus rejects the view based on a series of biblical, patristic, and logical reasons. Since the decree of reprobation is made before sin, he demonstrates, its cause should not be sin (Rom. 9:11). When sin is seen as the efficient cause of reprobation, most absurdly, the eternal decree of God would depend on human beings and, as the pious bishop of Hippo pointedly said, it follows that good works might be the cause of election.¹²² In addition, if sin is the cause of reprobation, the cause must be sin, either original or real. In the case of regarding original sin as the cause, all people must be born as reprobate, while the understanding of real sin as the cause leads to the conclusion that any baby born dead, either of the brutal or blasphemous nations, must not be reprobated by God. And also the sin foreseen is not the cause of reprobation, for all people must be reprobated by God on the ground that there is no one who does not sin and God must foresee it.¹²³

Special attention is given in the *Syntagma* to the hotly debated issue of the cause or author of sin in relation to reprobation, an issue which was not discussed in the *Symphonia*. Polanus's main argument on the issue is that sin is not the result of eternal reprobation, that

¹²⁰ For the meaning of *causa efficiens et impellens*, see Polanus, *Logicae*, 5: "Causa efficiens, est a qua aliquid est"; *ibid.*, 16: "causa impellens, est quae incitat & movet ad agendum aliquid."

¹²¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1614-1617: "Causa ejus efficiens principalis est Deus: is enim est qui reprobavit eos, quotquot non sunt electi ad vitam aeternam; & qui destinavit ad sempiternum interitum omnes quotquot damnabuntur propter peccata...Vera atque unica causa impellens propter quam decretum reprobationis factum, est aeternum beneplacitum seu voluntas Dei libera."

¹²² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1616; Augustine, *De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum*, in *PL* 40, cols.115-116.

¹²³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1614-1617.

is, eternal reprobation is not the cause of sin.¹²⁴ If reprobation were the cause of sin, he reasons, God could have been the cause or author of sin “for what is the cause of a cause is also a cause of what has been caused (*quod enim est causa causae, est etiam causa causati*).”¹²⁵ The reason for Polanus not to identify reprobation as the cause of sin is that God is not the cause of sin. In the same vein, he indicates that the effect of reprobation is neither the condemnation to eternal death nor eternal death itself, which is the reward of sin (*quae peccati est stipendium*).¹²⁶ It is surely undeniable that every cause is something preceding and reprobation precedes damnation, but Polanus points out that everything preceding is not always a cause (*non omne antecedens est causa*). To put it in reverse, it is definitely true that an effect is something subsequent and that damnation follows reprobation, but Polanus also remarks that not everything consequent is an effect (*non omne consequens est effectus*).¹²⁷

The *Syntagma*, oddly, does not provide any fathers or medieval thinkers as a basis for this argument. But in *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, Polanus does deploy his recourses. Echoing Aquinas, he presents three reasons that reprobation is not the cause of sin: 1) reprobation is the most sacred work of God; 2) the devil is the principal cause of sin; and 3) sin is neither the effect of God nor thus of reprobation.¹²⁸ Against a similar objection that the reprobate cannot but sin on account of divine reprobation, Polanus quotes, with primary appeal to several biblical texts of Matthew 7:18 and 1 John 3:9,

¹²⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1618.

¹²⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1619.

¹²⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1619.

¹²⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1619.

¹²⁸ Polanus, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 215.

Augustine and Justin Martyr to witness that the corrupt nature of the reprobate can do nothing other than sin.¹²⁹ Sin is not one of the effects or results that are caused by reprobation, which include the creation and animation of the reprobate, the permission of fall or sin, divine desertion, and the production of the reverence in the elect about God's power and judgment toward the reprobate.¹³⁰ That sin neither precedes predestination nor is the effect of reprobation, Polanus concludes, is a biblical and patristic doctrine to be taught and defended in the church.

When he comes to his full discussion of reprobation in the *Syntagma*, Polanus cites only Ambrose who identified the elect with the *membra* of Christ and the reprobate with the *membra* of the devil.¹³¹ The names of Augustine and Aquinas are mentioned but their texts are not quoted. The reason for his intentional lack of patristic testimony for the thesis of reprobation in the *Syntagma*, Polanus himself explains, is that patristic literature was already quoted at length in the *Symphonia*.¹³² Polanus did not want to repeat the same quotations already made in the previous work. Dealing with reprobation in the *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, he also used a great number of witnesses, ranging from the church fathers, sound medieval doctors, and even to the Reformers and his Reformed and

¹²⁹ Polanus, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 216; Augustine, *De genesi ad litteram*, in *PL* 34, col. 434: "Sed posset, inquit, etiam ipsorum voluntatem in bonum convertere, quoniam omnipotens est. Posset plane. Cur ergo non fecit? Quia noluit. Cur noluerit, penes ipsum est. Debemus enim non plus sapere quam oportet sapere"; Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone Iudaeo*, in *PG* 6, cols. 797-798: "ὅτι οὐκ αἰτία τοῦ θεοῦ οἱ προγινωσκόμενοι καὶ γενησόμενοι ἄδικοι, εἴτε ἄγγελοι εἴτε ἄνθρωποι, γίνονται φαῦλοι, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἑαυτῶν ἑκαστος αἰτία τοιοῦτοι εἰσιν ὅποῖος ἑκαστος φανήσεται, ἀπέδειξα καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν."

¹³⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1620; idem, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 216.

¹³¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1614; Ambrosius, *Enarrationes in XII psalmos*, in *PL* 14, col. 1025.

¹³² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 1614: "Doctrina haec Scripturae Sacrae est, ut testimonia tum ante adducta, tum deinceps adducenda confirmant. Nec aliud docuerunt veteres orthodoxi Patres, quorum testimonia videantur in *Symphonia Catholica*, capite quarto, Thesi secunda & decima."

Lutheran contemporaries.¹³³ Here again, Polanus was content with the fuller statements in his earlier writings.

6.2.4. Doctrine of Church

Polanus's discussion of ecclesiology began in the *Partitiones theologiae* with a simple definition of *ecclesia vera* as a gathered company (*coetus*) of human beings who profess a true religion, and *ecclesia catholica* as the invisible *coetus* of the elect predestined to eternal life.¹³⁴ This doctrinal nexus of *ecclesia* with election, stated without controversy by Calvin, Ursinus, and others, is also undoubtedly assumed by Polanus. By the term *catholica* Polanus means the *universitas* of the elect who constitute one universal and mysterious body (*universi unum corpus mysticum*) whose head is Jesus Christ alone. In the *Syntagma*, this conceptualization of the *ecclesia catholica* is grounded in scriptural testimonies without appeal to the fathers. In the *Symphonia*, the definition of *ecclesia catholica* was, similarly, the *coetus* of the blessed angels and human beings elected to eternal life who become the partakers of heavenly calling to be justified and glorified, but here, by contrast, the definition was supported by the church fathers like Augustine, Ignatius, Gregory the Great, Tertullian, and Bernard.¹³⁵

¹³³ Polanus calls as witnesses for his view of predestination, especially the reprobation issue, for example, Augustinus, Jerome, Prosper, Fulgentius, Bernardus (orthodoxi patres), Petrus Lombardus, Anselmus, Thomas Aquinas, Gregorius Ariminensis, Durandus (scholastici), Luther, Calvin, Vermigli, Beza, Bucer and Zanchi. The number of witnesses also undermines "the claim of Paulenbach that Polanus took over Beza's predestinarian theology." See Polanus, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, 130, 150, 170; Heiner Faulenbach, *Die Struktur der Theologie des Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf* (Zürich: EVZ-Verlag, 1967), 315-319; Robert Letham, "Amandus Polanus: A Neglected Theologian?" *Sixteenth Century Journal* 21/3 (Autumn, 1990), 468.

¹³⁴ Polanus, *Partitiones theologiae*, 135-136.

¹³⁵ Polanus, *Symphonia Catholica*, 436.

In the *Syntagma*, Polanus takes account of the standard usage (*usitatissima*) of the Latin theologians, *ecclesia*, as originating from the Hebrew and Greek words, קהל and ἐκκλησία. Some basic distinctions of the church are made for better organization, analysis, and clarification or disambiguity: distinctions of *ecclesia* into *vera* and *falsa*, *ecclesia vera* into *catholica* and *particularis*, *ecclesia catholica* into the *absolute dicta* and the *secundum quid dicta*, and *ecclesia catholica secundum quid dicta* into *essentiales* and *integrales*, or *omnium temporum* and *unius temporis*. The definition of *ecclesia vera*, slightly modified, is “the *coetus* of the elect to eternal life whom God calls among countless multitude of all rational creatures, from their natural status to the supernatural status of grace and the communion of glory in Christ,” a definition based on biblical texts.¹³⁶ The catholic church is “the whole universality of all angels and human beings efficaciously called to eternal life and beatific communion with God”; the church should be considered with respect both to its *caput* and *corpus*.¹³⁷

The *caput* of *ecclesia catholica*, commonly (*communiter*) understood, is God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the unity of essence from whom, in whom, through and for whom all exist, but the formal and analogical *caput* of *ecclesia*, singularly (*singulariter*) seen, is Christ alone. Found here is a trinitarian and christological focus of ecclesiology. The patristic basis for this definition of *caput ecclesiae* is Chrysostom, who was not cited on this issue in the *Symphonia*. Polanus poses Chrysostom’s language of Christ alone as one head (*unum caput*) of angels and human beings against the Roman Church’s view of

¹³⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3348: “Ecclesia vera, est coetus electorum ad vitam aeternam, quos Deus ex innumerabili illa multitudine omnium creaturarum rationalium e naturali statu ipsarum vocavit ad supernaturalem statum & gratiae gloriaeque communionem in Christo.”

¹³⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3350.

Peter as the head of *ecclesia catholica*.¹³⁸ For the mystical character of the body of *ecclesia catholica*, Polanus quotes a long text from Augustine which was also not cited in the *Symphonia*. Here, in contrast to the pattern of relationship between his works evidenced in the doctrine of reprobation, the *Syntagma* represents a considerable elaboration, particularly in its citation of patristic texts. Polanus apparently felt the need to argue the catholicity of Reformed ecclesiology even more fully than that of his doctrine of reprobation and he also recognized that he could do so more easily given the absence of anything like a doctrine of Roman primacy among the church fathers, particularly among Greek fathers like Chrysostom.

Polanus's conceptualization of the word *catholica* in the *Syntagma* merits careful regard, since he was not satisfied with the general meaning of *ecclesia catholica* as universally seen in respect of human beings gathered from all the ages. The *catholic* character of the church, in his eyes, must be said also in respect of human beings, places, times, and dogmas for some reasons. First, the *ecclesia catholica* is the universality of the elect who constitute the mystical *corpus*. Second, all of those who were, are, and will be created and saved in God must be in this *coetus*. Third, *ecclesia catholica* embraces the catholic doctrines which God has ordained to be observed always and everywhere by all (*omnibus & semper ubique*). Fourth, *ecclesia catholica* is those who are dispersed through the whole realm of the earth.¹³⁹ This *ecclesia catholica*, however, is not separable but in

¹³⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3351; Chrysostom, *Homiliae XXIV in epistolam ad Ephesios*, in *PG* 62, cols. 25-28.

¹³⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3358-3359: "Ea autem Catholica dicitur respectu hominum, locorum, temporum, dogmatum. 1. Quia est universitas electorum, qui universum corpus mysticum constituunt. 2. Quia universo in DEUM credentes & salvandos, oportet in hoc esse coetu. Nam extra Ecclesiam non est salus. 3. Quia amplectitur doctrinam Catholicam, quam DEUS omnibus & semper ubique praescrispsit observandam. 4. Quia dispersa est per totum orbem terrarum."

the divine unity having trinitarian and christological focus. Polanus identifies *ecclesia catholica* as one mystical body whose head is Christ alone, also maintaining that all the faithful are “one in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; I say, they are one in affection, one in consensus of piety, one in communion of the sacred body of Christ, one in participation of one Holy Spirit, and one in worship to the same Father in Christ.”¹⁴⁰

In opposition to this understanding of *ecclesia catholica*, the Roman Catholics claim that the Roman Church must be called *catholica*. Opposing to the Roman Church’s claim, with appeal to Augustine but less than clear textual basis, Polanus illustrates a number of reasons for his opposition: 1) *ecclesia catholica* does not begin with Rome but before the Roman Church; 2) *ecclesia catholica* does not receive the gospel or word of God from Rome; 3) the promise of salvation is not made to the Roman Church; 4) the universal people (*universi populi*), not the Romans, are promised to Christ; 5) the Roman Church is cut off from the olive tree to which it was once attached, by elevating the pope as its head “who for that reason becomes an antichrist”; 6) the Roman Church departs from the true faith and doctrine of Christ which the ancient Roman Church preserved; 7) the *ecclesia catholica* has indeed never been taken by God’s command into confinement in Rome; 8) the Roman Church has not been considered as *ecclesia catholica* in the Apostle’s Creed, the Nicene Creed, or in other ancient creeds of councils; 9) the light of the gospel was formerly illuminated not just in the Roman church but also in other churches; 10) even the canonical law clearly states that *ecclesia catholica* scattered through the whole world is set

¹⁴⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3359: “Et tantum una est, Ephes. 2. V 14, 15, 16, 17. tum quia unum est tantum corpus mysticum, cuius caput est Christus; non plura corpora specie distincta: tum quia omnes vere fideles sunt unum in Patre, Filio & Spiritu Sancto, unum, inquam, sunt affectu, unum pietatis consensu, unum sanctae carnis Christi communionem, unum unius Sancti Spiritus participatione, unum ejusdem Patris in Christo adoratione.”

before the Roman church; and 11) a part is not the whole: the Roman Church, only when it is pure and orthodox, is just a part of *ecclesia catholica*.¹⁴¹ Here, in particular, Polanus has rationalized his patristic attestations.

On the members of *ecclesia catholica*, Polanus holds the thesis, evinced in the *Symphonia*, that the reprobate should not be seen as its members, but in the *Syntagma* goes further to defend it against his chief opponent, Bellarmine. This eminent Jesuit argues with scriptural and patristic testimonies in opposition to Wycliff, Hus, and Calvin that not only the predestinated or elected but also the reprobate or the infidels, if receiving the sacraments and making profession of faith and submission, are to be regarded as members of the church.¹⁴² According to Polanus's diagnosis, Bellarmine's argument must be caused by his antagonism to the distinction of *ecclesia catholica et singularis* or *corpus verum et permixtum*. As Chrysostom and Augustine emphasized, Polanus acknowledges that there is chaff among the wheat, there are bad fish among the good, and there are many sheep outside a visible church and many wolves inside.¹⁴³ In this sense, Bellarmine's appeal to the testimony of John the Baptist in Matthew 3:12 to verify his argument is untenable, because the testimony refers "not to *ecclesiam catholicam* but to *particularem ecclesiam Israeliticam*."¹⁴⁴

¹⁴¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3359-3360.

¹⁴² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3361; Bellarmine, *De controversiis christianae fidei*, in *Opera* 2:75, 81: "Deinde pertinere ad Ecclesiam non praedestinos, non perfectos, peccatores etiam manifestos, infideles occultos, si habeant sacramenta, professionem fidei et subjectionem etc.... Jam vero quod non soli praedestinati, sed etiam reprobi ad Ecclesiam pertinere possint, contra Wiclesum, et Huss, et Calvinum, probatur primo ex parabolis evengelice apertissimis."

¹⁴³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3362; Chrysostom, *Homiliae LXXXVIII in Joannem*, in *PG* 59, cols. 251-258; Augustine, *Contra litteras Petilianus*, in *PL* 43, col. 349.

¹⁴⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3362.

On the ground of 2 Timothy 2:20, Bellarmine alleges that vessels in glory refer to the elect, while vessels in indignity to the reprobate, even though they are all “in the same house (*in eadem domo*),” namely, in the same *ecclesia*, defending his view with Cyprian, Ambrose, and Augustine, as well as by other scriptural texts.¹⁴⁵ In response, Polanus posits that, provided that the universal consent of the fathers handed down to us is the true interpretation of Scripture, Bellarmine quite deviates from the true interpretation. With primary appeal to the Greek fathers, like Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact, as well as the Latin father, Jerome, Polanus interprets in a different way the phrase *domus magna* in 2 Timothy 2:20 as “the whole world (*totum mundum*).”¹⁴⁶ It is true and acknowledged surely by Polanus that the Latin fathers whom Bellarmine cites did not understand the *domus magna* as *mundus* but *ecclesia*, where “there are diverse people.”¹⁴⁷ But Polanus contends that, even if *domus magna* were considered *ecclesia*, what Paul would mean by *domus magna* is “not concerning the *ecclesia invisibili catholica* but concerning the *visibili*.”¹⁴⁸ This view, in his eyes, may not be out of alignment with Ambrose who, in the same place as the text that was quoted by Bellarmine, refers to the Corinthian church that includes those who denied the resurrection of body, as a definite

¹⁴⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3371; Bellarmine, *De controversiis christianae fidei*, in *Opera* 2: 81.

¹⁴⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3371; Chrysostom, *Homiliae X in epistolam secundam ad Timotheum*, PG 62, col. 629; Oecumenius, *Commentaria in epistolas Pauli*, in PG 119, cols. 217-218; Theophylact, *Expositio in epistolam II ad Timotheum*, in PG 125, cols. 111-112: “Μεγάλην δὲ οἰκίαν τὸν κόσμον φησὶν οὐ γὰρ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν”; Jerome, *Commentarii in epistolas Pauli*, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 9, fo. 188: “Magnam domum, non Ecclesiam dicit, ut quidam putant, quae non habet maculam neque rugam, sed mundum.” It is notable that Polanus undoubtedly attributes the authorship of *Commentarii in epistolas Pauli* to Hironymus.

¹⁴⁷ Ambrosius, *Commentarii in epistolam beati Pauli ad Timotheum II*, in *Opera omnia* 5:405: “Non ergo domum magnam mundum dixit, sed ecclesiam in qua omnes sub unius domini sunt nomine”; Cyprianus, *Epistola LI ad Confessores de reditu ex schismate congratulatoria*, in *D. Caecilii Cypriani opera*, tom. 1 (Geneva, 1593), 111-112; Augustine, *De baptismo contra Donatistas*, in PL 43, col. 241.

¹⁴⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 2:3372.

evidence of his view of *domus magna* as *ecclesia*.¹⁴⁹ Given that the reprobate, like those who deny resurrection, are not in *ecclesia catholica*, Polanus specifies that by *ecclesia* Ambrose did not mean *ecclesia catholicam seu internam* but *externam coetuum particularium*.¹⁵⁰ Augustine, he continues, would disavow Bellarmine's conclusion that the reprobate are also the members of God's house or *ecclesia*, because Augustine considered the faithful and pious servants of God to be the very house of God (*eadem domus Dei*).¹⁵¹ Thus, according to Polanus, what Cyprian would mean by *ecclesia*, properly understood in its context, is not the church universal or invisible but the church particular or visible. In this vein, Augustine's text that many of the reprobate are inside the church, while there are many of the elect outside the church, should not be uncritically reckoned as an attestation of Bellarmine's argument, but as describing the external church.¹⁵² Bellarmine's argument that the reprobate are members of *ecclesia*, even upon his appeal to the great number of scriptural and patristic testimonies, thus, turns out to be untenable. The patristic consensus, as Polanus's use of the church fathers showed here, must be respected by its broader contextual understanding in comparison with the thoughts of other orthodox fathers.

With regard to *notae purae et orthodoxae ecclesiae*, previously presented in the *Symphonia* as the quintuple marks of the true and orthodox church, the true confession and faith in the truth of the gospel, the two sacraments of the Lord's Supper and baptism, the obedience to God's commands, the true worship of the true God alone, and church

¹⁴⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3373; Ambrosius, *Commentarii in epistolam beati Pauli ad Timotheum II*, 5:405.

¹⁵⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3373.

¹⁵¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3374; Augustine, *De baptismo contra Donatistas*, col. 241.

¹⁵² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3376; Augustine, *Tractatus CXXIV in Joannis evangelium*, in *PL* 35, col. 1725.

discipline, the *Syntagma* assumes these marks offer a more detailed explanation and clarifying distinctions. The marks of the church are characteristics by which a particular church can be infallibly recognized as a part of *ecclesia catholica* or not. Such marks may have a diversity in their verbal expression among the pious thinkers but they nonetheless agree in the thing itself, namely, the truth of doctrine and conformity with the divine word or divine scriptures, by whose rule the orthodoxy and catholicity of a particular visible church can be examined and the true and orthodox can be distinguished from the false and heretical. Chrysostom seems to subscribe to Polanus's thesis, when he says that "there can be no other test of the true Christianity than Holy Scripture."¹⁵³ In this sense, Polanus demonstrates that the Reformed church alone is in great doctrinal harmony with the apostolic orthodox church.

Assuming the Scripture as the supreme and final norm for the church, Polanus deals with the fact that every and each visible church has, to some extent, an external profession and a visible practice of religion or piety. A person or particular church can be called *catholica* who professes a catholic faith (*fidem catholicam*) that all the prophets and the apostles handed down in Scripture, and that all the faithful have truly and always represented; for that reason it was called catholic by the fathers.¹⁵⁴ But Polanus, with an appeal to Augustine, makes a careful distinction that, among the ancient fathers or churches, some are good catholics (*bonos catholicos*) who sincerely profess *fidem catholicam*, while others are bad catholics (*malos catholicos*) who are certainly proud of themselves as

¹⁵³ Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 441; Chrysostom, *Opus imperfectum in Matthaei Euangelium*, in *Omnia opera septimus tomus* (Basel, 1525), 110v.

¹⁵⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3434: "Ea licet loci respectu universalis & Catholica dici proprie non possit: tamen quia Catholicam profitetur fidem, id est, quam universi Prophetae & Apostoli tradiderunt & omnes vere fideles semper tenuerunt: id circo apud Patres vocatur Catholica."

catholic but in reality (*revera*) are heretical.¹⁵⁵ Moreover, every pure church of God is indeed true but may not continue to be pure, just as all truly pure gold may not continuously be pure. With this in mind, Polanus defines more simply the essential marks (*notae essentialies*) of the true and orthodox churches: 1) the divine doctrine, sound and incorrupt, and 2) the divine discipline both in the legitimate administration of sacraments and of divine commands with respect to the genuine worship of God alone and to the sanctity of life and obedience.¹⁵⁶ Quoting 2 John 9 and Irenaeus, of whom several lengthy quotations were made in the *Symphonia*, Polanus affirms that the most certain mark of the true and orthodox church is the conservation of truth or the doctrine of Christ, “the true orthodox and catholic faith (*veram orthodoxam & catholicam fidem*),” which was initially proclaimed by the prophets and the apostles, thereafter according to the will of God delivered to us in Scripture, and without which the church cannot be as it should be.¹⁵⁷

Polanus presents two divine doctrines which every church must always hold: 1) there is one God in one essence and three ὁμοούσιος persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit; 2) Jesus Christ is true God and true man with two distinct natures in one person.¹⁵⁸ This highest and essential mark of the catholic church is verified by a great number of biblical testimonies and the church fathers, such as Jerome, Chrysostom, Gregory, Isidorus, Lactantius, Athanasius, and Basil.¹⁵⁹ The texts of the first four fathers and Johannes Driedo,

¹⁵⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3434; Augustine, *De baptismo contra Donatistas*, cols. 198-199.

¹⁵⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3435.

¹⁵⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3437; Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, in *PG* 7, col. 844.

¹⁵⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3438: “Orthodoxa Ecclesia credit in unum Deum essentia, trinum personis ὁμοούσιος, Patrem, Filium & Spiritum Sanctum, & Jesum Christum credit esse verum Deum & verum hominem in una persona & duabus distinctis naturis.”

¹⁵⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3438-3439; Lactantius, *Synthesis doctrinae Lactantii*, in *PL* 6, col. 84; Athanasius, *Orationes adversus Arianos*, in *PG* 26, cols. 19-20; Basilius, *Expositio in sexdecim priora*

a Roman Catholic, cited in the *Syntagma*, were already used in the *Symphonia*, while those of the last three fathers are newly added in the *Syntagma*. Here we observe that the *Syntagma* is not merely a reproduction of the *Symphonia* but a significant elaboration.

Special attention should be given to Polanus's discussion of the second essential mark of the true and orthodox church, the divine discipline, of which the discussion consists in doctrinal thesis, biblical testimonies, and patristic consensus.¹⁶⁰ The patristic testimonies on the issue in the *Symphonia* were taken from Augustine, Optatus, and Lactantius, and they are, without any change, quoted again in the *Syntagma* but with ample annotation and also with one additional conciliar testimony from the Synod of Aede which was cited in the Canon law.¹⁶¹ The doctrinal thesis Polanus presents is that divine discipline in the legitimate use of divinely instituted sacraments, in the pious worship of God alone, and in the sanctity of life conformed to the gospel of Christ is the second essential mark of the pure and orthodox church.

With regard to the sacraments, Polanus elicits several doctrinal subtheses from some biblical testimonies, such as Matthew 28:19, 16:6, Acts 2:38, 17:47, Luke 22:19, and Acts 2:42. For example, whatever Christ has instructed to be preserved in his church up to the end of the world, the right use (*rectus usus*) of it must be a *signum* of the pure church. And whatever Christ has testified pertains to his people and family, the right use of it is a *signum* of the true church. As in the Old Testament the symbols of God's church were circumcision and Passover by which the Israelites were made distinct from other nations,

prophetae Esaiiae, in *Divi Basilii Magni Caesareae Cappadociae quondam archiepiscopi omnia quae in hunc diem latino sermone donata sunt opera* (Antverpiae, 1570), 661.

¹⁶⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3442.

¹⁶¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3441.

so in the New Testament baptism and the Lord's Supper are the symbols whereby Christians are recognized as distinct from others. Polanus verifies the theses by quoting a conciliar testimony of Agde.¹⁶² As for the devout worship of God alone, the biblical testimonies cited by Polanus are John 4:23, Matthew 18:19-20, Acts 2:42, 9:14, and Ezechiel 20:18-19. Based on these testimonies, he produces subtheses supportive of the thesis by the use of ratiocination. Then the patristic testimonies from Lactantius and Augustine are provided as already cited in the *Symphonia*.¹⁶³

The view of obedience in the integrity of life and moral behavior declared by the will and word of God as an indubitable sign of the orthodox church is also evidenced by Polanus in biblical testimonies, Matthew 5:3-10, 7:24-25, Luke 14:26-27, John 13:35, 14:21, 15:8, Galatians 5:24, and 1 John 1:6-7, 2:3-5, 3:18-19. From these testimonies, some subtheses are made: those who appear in humility, gentleness, justice, mercy, elegance of heart, and other virtues, and who are regenerated by Holy Spirit and perform the will of our heavenly Father and who are founded on the rock of Christ, are a true and pure church of Christ; those who are true disciples and friends of Christ, who do good works in diligence to glorify our heavenly Father, and who have communion with Christ, are undoubtedly a true and pure church of God; and things through which it is known that we know God and through which we recognize that we are from truth must be a manifest sign of the true and pure church. The observation of God's commands, thus, is a true sign of the Christian church. This thesis is followed by the patristic witness of Marcus Minucius

¹⁶² Laurentius Surius, *Concilium Agathense*, in *Tomus primus conciliorum omnium, tum generalium, tum provincialium atque particularium* (Coloniae Agrippinae, 1567), 712.

¹⁶³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3441-3442; Lactantius, *De vera sapientia et religione*, in *PL* 6, col. 542; Augustine, *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et moribus manichaeorum*, in *PL* 32, col. 1336.

Felix who was not cited in the *Symphonia*. Our discernment of people as ecclesiastics, according to Felix, should not be made by the ornaments of the body but by the exemplar of innocence and modesty. With a mutual love we, the true ecclesiastics, must love one another and call each other brethren who are born of one God and Parent, and companions in faith and hope.¹⁶⁴ Polanus says that, just as John the apostle wrote that “every person will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another,” to love is the integral observation of God’s whole law, signifying that there is a true and orthodox church.

It is worth noting on the issue of divine discipline that Polanus makes a lengthier quotation in the *Syntagma* than in the *Symphonia* from Augustine’s *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum* which contrasts the moral doctrines and practices between Christianity and Manichaeism.

Rightly, then, Catholic Church, most true mother of Christians, dost thou not only teach that God alone, to find whom is the happiest life, must be worshiped in perfect purity and chastity, bringing in no creature as an object of adoration whom we should be required to serve; and from that incorrupt and inviolable eternity to which alone man should be made subject, in cleaving to which alone the rational soul escapes misery, excluding everything made, everything liable to change, everything under the power of time; without confounding what eternity, and truth, and peace itself keeps separate, or separating what a common majesty unites: but thou dost also contain love and charity to our neighbor in such a way, that for all kinds of diseases with which souls are for their sins afflicted, there is found with thee a medicine of prevailing efficacy.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3442-3445; Marcus Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, 77: “Sic nos denique, non notaculo corporis, ut putatis, sed innocentiae ac modestiae signo facile dignoscimus: sic mutuo, quod doletis, amore diligimus, quoniam odisse non novimus: sic nos, quod invidetis, fratres vocamus, ut unius Dei parentis homines, ut consortes fidei, ut spei cohaeredes.”

¹⁶⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3442; Augustine, *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et moribus manichaeorum*, cap. 30, in *PL* 32, col. 1336: “Merito, Ecclesia catholica mater Christianorum verissima, non solum ipsum Deum, cujus adeptio vita est beatissima, purissime atque castissime coendum praedicat; nullam

As to Augustine's other phrase, "no one can find a paternal welcome from God if he scorns his mother, the church,"¹⁶⁶ the former part of this quotation has been usually taken by the Roman Catholics to emphasize the motherhood and importance of the visible church not just to teach the believers but also endow them with salvation by means of sacramental administration. Polanus, however, takes the quotation in another sense, namely, the morals of a true catholic and orthodox church, rightly understood, will take the true worship of true God as their essence. Even the broader context of the quotation does not evidence any intention in Augustine to verify the Roman Church's view of the institutional church as a key holder of salvation.

After discussing the marks of the true and orthodox church, Polanus makes a distinction of the particular or visible church into the pure and the impure, the latter defined as a *coetus* where religion is corrupt, either in doctrine or in good works.¹⁶⁷ Polanus notes that "Paul does not divest the Corinthians and the Galatians of the name of God's church (*ecclesiae Dei nomen*), even though false dogmas began to be scattered by them." In accord with this Pauline example, Polanus indicates that the neglect or cessation of ecclesiastical discipline is not a reason that a visible and particular church should be denied the name of a church: such denial is legitimate only on the basis a lack of

nobis aderandam creaturam inducens, cui servire jubeamur; et ab illa incorrupta et inviolabili aeternitate, cui soli homo subjiciendus est, cui soli rationalis anima cohaerendo non misera est, excludens omne quod factum est, quod obnoxium commutationi, quod subditum tempori; neque confundens quod aeternitas, quod veritas, quod denique pax ipsa distinguit, nec rursus separans quod majestas una conjungit: sed etiam proximi dilectionem atque charitatem ita complecteris, ut variorum morborum, quibus pro peccatis suis animae aegrotant, omnis apud te medicina praepolleat." The English quotation is from *NPNF*, 1st ser., v.4.

¹⁶⁶ Augustine, *De symbolo sermo ad catechumenos*, in *PL* 40, col. 668: "Sanctam Ecclesiam. Propterea hujus conclusio sacramenti per sanctam Ecclesiam terminatur, quoniam si quis absque ea inventus fuerit, alienus erit a numero filiorum: nec habebit Deum Patrem, qui Ecclesiam noluerit habere matrem."

¹⁶⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 2:3446.

foundation on Jesus Christ.¹⁶⁸ The mark of the pure church, moreover, is not an assessment of each member of the church as elect. Rather, it concerns the whole church (*toto ecclesia*), whose health is not appraised by the action of its single member but by the *habitus* and *valetudo* of its greater parts. Polanus reminds the readers that the true and orthodox church is always mixed (*semper admixta*) with tares and husk.¹⁶⁹ As the Jewish church, where no one dared to publicly speak in the presence of Jesus that he was Christ, is still called a church for a few believing in Jesus as Christ (John 7), so is the Roman church also called *ecclesia Christi*, although it drives souls into the most impure and most corrupt things. Even in the Roman church are some whom God calls and who constitute a church. In addition, the Roman church maintains some doctrines of Christ, however confused with many errors. The Roman church, in the eyes of Polanus, is corrupt in all things, but not utterly corrupt (*corrupta omnia, sed non omnino*).¹⁷⁰

Polanus's discussion of the ecclesiastical government deserves special attention because it clearly reveals that his use of the church fathers is made both for the edification of Reformed doctrine and for defense against his theological adversaries. For this dual end, the *Symphonia catholica*, once called the *Symphonia theologica*, is repeatedly appealed to in the *Syntagma*.¹⁷¹ With a series of distinctions of *gubernatio ecclesiae* into *invisibilis* and

¹⁶⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3447.

¹⁶⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3447.

¹⁷⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3448: "Hodierna Ecclesia Romana est adhuc Ecclesia Christi, sed omnium impurissima, sed omnium corruptissima, ac prope animam agens, quia est in ea adhuc Deus vacans, sunt in ea vocati & vocatio, quae Ecclesiam constituunt: quia aliquid adhuc doctrinae Christi retinet, quamvis multis erroribus permistum: & quia Christianismi tesseram Baptismum, quantumvis multis naevis ac maculis foedatum, in sua substantiali forma retinet; tum qua adhuc retinet invocationem Christi Mediatoris aliquam: alioquin ii qui in Papatu sunt baptizati, extra Ecclesiam Christi, ac proinde nec baptismo Christi fuissent baptizati: Summa, Romana hodierna Ecclesia habet corrupta omnia, sed non omnino."

¹⁷¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3448.

visibilis, gubernatio visibilis into *publica* and *privata*, *publica gubernatio* into *ecclesiastica* and *politica*, *ecclesiastica gubernatio* into *propria* and *communis*, Polanus defines *gubernatio ecclesiastica* as the spiritual government of the church in a divinely instituted order in the assembly of the church observed by all the believers and *propria ecclesiastica gubernatio* as a church government which pertains to the office of singular persons who consist of ministers and ecclesiastical *plebs* in the church.¹⁷²

On the ground of the vocation and functions of the prophets and the apostles in the Old and the New Testaments, Polanus understands the church ministers as persons who are legitimately called by God and of whom God makes use for the church to be gathered and governed in their ministration, directed to the dual end: the glory of God and the salvation of the elect.¹⁷³ It is significant for confirmation of Polanus's method that the apostles were called to preach and teach the gospel by both confirming the truth and refuting errors (*tum veritatem confirmando, tum errores refutando*).¹⁷⁴ Polanus links this apostolic calling to one of the basic characteristics of his theological discussion, namely, the construction of doctrinal theses and polemics against doctrinal errors of his adversaries. He also asserts that all the apostles of Christ were the *vicarii Christi* and the *regimen* of the church was given to every single apostle of Christ equally in dignity, authority, right, and power. All the bishops of the churches in the world, called *pastores* and *presbyteri* (Acts 20:17) who are to feed the congregation of the church with divine words and sacraments and protect

¹⁷² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3453-3454.

¹⁷³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3455.

¹⁷⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3461.

them from spiritual wolves, are the successors of the apostles.¹⁷⁵ And Polanus reaffirms that there is no universal *vicarius* of Christ among the bishops, and definitely not among the Roman pontiffs, because there is no universal *caput* of the church among them, except Christ himself alone. For this, Polanus appeal to the patristic authority of Anacletus, Jerome, Augustine, and Ambrose whose cited texts were not found in the *Symphonia* but are newly used in the *Syntagma*.¹⁷⁶

Polanus's exposition of the office of *doctores theologiae* also deserves consideration. As the ministers of the church along with the pastors, the doctors of theology are those who defend thos doctrines that are to be retained among the faithful. They do not teach "different things" (*alia*) from what pastors teach, but teach them "in a different way" (*aliter*).¹⁷⁷ As they engage in theological *scientia*, the doctors of theology must be qualified by their sanctity of life and faculty of theological teaching. Their ministerial duty for the church is not only the analytic interpretation of Scripture and the synthetic comprehension of universal doctrine, but also its defense against the heretics, a defense that is chiefly

¹⁷⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3466-3467. In the *Symphonia*, Polanus argued that bishops and presbyteries in the apostolic church are *non solum pares sed iidem*. As for *presbyteri*, Polanus distinguishes them into two: some who are in charge of discipline and sermon or teaching, and others who are in charge of discipline and church government. The collegium of these presbyteries is called *ecclesia repraesentativa particularis* in that it represents public institution and order in the communion of the church. See Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 573; idem, *Syntagma theologiae*, 2:3477-3478.

¹⁷⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3467; Anacletus, *De ordinatione archiepiscoporum et reliquorum episcoporum, atque sacerdotum*, in *PL* 130, col. 71: "Caeteri vero apostoli cum eodem pari consortio honorem et potestatem acceperunt, ipsumque principem eorum esse voluerunt. Qui etiam, iubente Domino, in toto orbe dispersi Evangelium praedicaverunt, ipsis quoque decedentibus in locum eorum successerunt episcopi"; Jerome, *Commentariorum in Michaeam prophetam*, in *PL* 25, col. 1172: "Si in Apostolorum loco sumus, non solum sermonem eorum imitemur, sed conversationem quoque et abstinentiam amplectamur"; Augustine, *Enarrationes in psalmos*, in *PL* 36, col. 513: "Patres missi sunt Apostoli, pro Apostolis filii nati sunt tibi, constituti sunt episcopi. Hodie enim episcopi, qui sunt per totum mundum, unde nati sunt? Ipsa Ecclesia patres illos appellat, ipsa illos genuit, et ipsa illos constituit in sedibus patrum"; Ambrosius, *Commentarii in epistolam beati Pavli ad Corinth*, in *Opera omnia*, tom. 5 (Basel, 1538), 246: "Hoc ad apostolorum personam pertinet, quos constat dei esse adiutores, dum uicarij sunt Christi."

¹⁷⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3471.

made in the schools.¹⁷⁸ Their synthetic presentation of the doctrine of the church is either the catechetical institution or the treatment of theological *loci communes*, the former referring to education for the religious novice to be well versed in the foundation and rudiments of Christian faith and life, and the latter being designed to serve the mature to understand the treasure of Holy Scripture accurately, entirely, and perspicuously.¹⁷⁹ Notably, Polanus identifies his office with that of *doctor theologiae*, that is, the edification of catholic church and the defense of it against the heretics. This dual duty of a theological doctor is also reflected in his patristic and dogmatic enterprise. The office of theological doctors is performed by means of arts, sciences, languages (especially Latin, Greek, Chaldaic, and Syriac), and both ecclesiastical and profane histories. According to Polanus, ecclesiastical history covers not just the planting and increase of the church, persecution, heresies, and diverse councils, but also the treatment of theology by patristic, medieval, Latin, Greek, and Judaic or rabbinic writers and even the ecclesiastical doctors, both ancient and recent, and finally the treatment of ecclesiastical controversies. Pastors and doctors, Polanus warns, ought not to become political and secular dignitaries, at the same time (*simul*) serving as the ministers of God's word. Notably, Polanus's discussion of *doctores theologiae* is not found in the *Symphonia* but only in the *Syntagma*, but it is documented not only by biblical testimonies but also with patristic references to Eusebius, Augustine, Ambrose, and Jerome.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3472: "Munus Doctorum Theologiae est tum Scripturam Sacram interpretari analyticè: tum universam doctrinam Ecclesiae synthetice complecti: tum eandem ab haeresibus vindicare, maxime in schola."

¹⁷⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3473.

¹⁸⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3475-3476; Eusebius, *Avtores historiae ecclesiasticae* (Basel, 1544), V.xxiv (p. 384); Augustine, *De baptismo contra Donatistas*, in *PL* 43, col. 192; Ambrosius, *Commentarii in*

Special attention must be given to Polanus's teaching on the liberty or power of Christian religion, a doctrine added in the *Syntagma* but discussed in close association with the *Symphonia*. The whole liberty of Christian religion concerns all activities that pertain to the true and sincere worship of God. This is a right and a command given to the whole universal church by Christ who has "the legitimate *potestas* and irrefragable *authoritas* in heaven and on earth." The foundation of this liberty or right of the church, as well as of all doctrines and ecclesiastical actions, is God's word alone that is now comprehended in the prophetic and apostolic Scripture.¹⁸¹ Polanus leads the readers, for example, to see "the first Christian church since the outpouring of Holy Spirit from heaven," a church that freely exercised the liberty of Christian religion, by proclaiming and hearing the gospel of Christ, conferring and receiving the divine sacraments, and administrating and exercising all other things that pertained to Christian religion. Even under the political and religious threat of the Roman authorities and Jewish hierarchies, the apostles admonished Christians to endure the persecution on account of the gospel of Christ and said, "Let us not give up meeting together, as some are in the habit of doing, but let us encourage one another--and all the more as you see the Day approaching" (Heb. 10:25).¹⁸² The liberty or *potestas* of Christian religion, thus, is also that of ecclesiastical convention, of election and vocation, ecclesiastical mission, adjudication of religious controversies, ecclesiastical order, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

epistolam beati Pavli ad Timotheum II, in *Opera omnia*, tom. 5 (Basel, 1538), 404; Jerome, *Commentarii in epistolas sancti Pauli*, in *PL* 30, col.890.

¹⁸¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3473.

¹⁸² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3482-3484.

On the liberty or *potestas* of ecclesiastical convention, Polanus organizes his discussion in a highly systematized form, as usual in the *Syntagma* but different from the *Symphonia*, by using a series of distinctions of ecclesiastical convention into *ordinarii* and *extraordinarii*, *ordinarii conventus* into *conciones sacra* and *scholae bonarum literarum*, *extraordinarii conventus* into *consistoria*, *colloquia*, and *concilia ecclesiastica*, *concilia* into *particulare* and *universale*, and *particulare concilium* into *dioecesanum*, *provinciale*, and *nationale*.¹⁸³ As that *concilium* which is assembled in the name of universal church, the universal *concilium* may be illustrated by the assembly of the Israelites on Mount Carmel (1 King 18:19), the councils of Nicaea against Arius, Constantinople against Macedonians, Ephesus against Nestorius, Chalcedon against Eutyches, and so forth. From a methodological perspective, Polanus has produced yet another arguments based on ancient and contemporary materials: his terms represent a developed classification of synods and councils, reflecting medieval and early modern understandings of the past; their organization, as evidenced by the bifurcations, is Ramist; and the examples given are biblical and patristic – all gathered into a Protestant message concerning the relative authority of church gatherings.

The universal or general council is not always (*non semper*) legitimate or approved but only when being consentaneous with the laws of God's word. The laws and also conditions of legitimate council are diverse. First, it should be convened either by political magistrates, emperors or kings (1 Kings 18:20, 1 Chr. 23:28-29, 1 Chr. 29:4), or by bishops or pastors (Acts 15:2). As Eusebius wrote, for example, the first Nicene Council

¹⁸³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3485-3486.

was summoned by Constantine the Great.¹⁸⁴ With short reference to the Council of Constantinople that was also convened by Theodosius, Polanus points his readers to the *Symphonia* for detailed discussion and more patristic illustrations of the issue. The second condition of legitimate councils is that they have a deliberate, consultative, or decisive voice on any issue; the councils should have the delegates chosen by churches not just from one side but definitely from the other side of those who have disagreement with the other. The detailed exposition of the issue is also found in the *Symphonia*.¹⁸⁵ The third law of legitimate councils is that the place of councils may be suitable and secure for all to approach without danger. The fourth condition of legitimate councils is that the supreme president of the councils is Christ in whose name they are assembled and who is the supreme judge in all religious controversies. As for these, Polanus refers the readers again to the previous complete discussion of them in the *Symphonia*.

In his view of the ecclesiastical leader as not appointed by the Roman pope but as elected and approved (*electus & probatus*) by the whole council among bishops or pastors, whether the council may be general or special, Polanus also depends on the doctrinal theses of the same issue drawn from the patristic thought he used in the *Symphonia*.¹⁸⁶ Nevertheless, he goes further in the *Syntagma* to talk about the concept of the political chief who is the emperor, king, or prince, and the highest faithful magistrate, or his ambassador, and about his office as providing the good order and peace of the council,

¹⁸⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3488; Eusebius, *De vita Constantini Magni*, in *Opera* tom. 2, ed. Johann Jacob Grynaeus (Basel, 1570), 879.

¹⁸⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3489; idem, *Symphonia catholica*, 517-526.

¹⁸⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3489-3490; idem, *Symphonia catholica*, 526-538.

protecting them from all external effects and internal confusion, confining those bishops who quarrel violently, and sustaining the council in unity.¹⁸⁷

The fifth condition of legitimate councils is that the council should be free (*liberum*) to such an extent as it may be permitted even for the laity and the infidels to oppose in the council. The sixth is that the *colloquium*, with regard to provoking controversies dissociated by bishops or pastors and the other presbyters, is possibly made without prejudgment and the different opinion of each side should be given equal attention. Polanus finds the biblical example of the *colloquium* in Jeremiah 28 and grounds his notion of a legitimate and constructive form and mode of such *colloquium* in the patristic thought described by Augustine in his epistle sent to the people of the Donatist faction when a controversy occurred in the gathering of Carthage where their bishops were convicted. Augustine publicly suggested a *colloquium* in the epistle to persuade the people back to the communion of *ecclesia catholica*.¹⁸⁸ The seventh is that the conclusion of the council must be legitimate: 1) the conclusion should preserve the pure doctrine handed down in Scripture and approve it in its own testimony; and 2) it may establish or confirm the decree of ecclesiastical polity to be constituted according to the diverse reasons of time, place, and persons. The final condition of legitimate councils is this: nothing is defined and

¹⁸⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3490.

¹⁸⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3492; Augustine, *Ad populum factionis donatiana*, in *PL* 33, col. 578: “Carthaginem venimus et nos et episcopi vestri, et quod prius nolebant et indignum esse dicebant, in unum convenimus. Electi sunt ex nobis et ex ipsis septem hinc, et septem inde, qui pro causa omnium loquerentur. Electi sunt alii septem hinc, et septem inde, cum quibus, ubi opus erat, consilium pertractarent. Electi sunt quatuor hinc, et quatuor inde, qui Gestis conscribendis custodes essent, ne infalsatum aliquid ab aliquo diceretur. Dati sunt etiam a nobis et ab ipsis notarii quatuor hinc, et quatuor inde, ut bini cum exceptoribus iudicis alternarent, ne aliquis nostrum se dixisse aliquid causaretur, quod non fuisset exceptum. Huic tantae diligentiae etiam illud est additum, ut et nos et ipsi, quemadmodum ipse iudex, verbis nostris subscriberemus, ne quisquam diceret in illis Gestis aliquid vel postea fuisse corruptum. Cum enim adhuc viventibus eis qui subscripserunt, innotuerint eadem Gesta omnibus locis, in quibus oportet ut innotescant; sic etiam ad posteros confirmata veritas perdurabit.”

decided except by the judgment of Holy Scripture, the unique norm of truth, a judgment that is the public judgment of God himself, who is speaking in Scripture and he alone has the *potestas* to rule over the church.¹⁸⁹ Polanus does not fail to emphasize the boundary beyond which the council should not go, that is, the councils do not have the *potestas* of composing new articles of faith (*novos articulos fidei*) or bringing forward other dogmas (*alia dogmata*) than are prescribed by God in the sacred writings of the prophets and the apostles.¹⁹⁰

Following the establishment of his doctrinal theses, Polanus engages in a polemical disputation over some objections to his doctrine made chiefly by the Roman Catholics. Their first objection is that the church has the power of adding something to Scripture, just as the prophets and the apostles added many things to Moses' writings. But Polanus points out the difference in authority between the church and the scriptural writers and then argues that if the prophetic and apostolic dogmas are rightly seen, there was nothing newly added by the prophets and the apostles to what Moses declared in his writings. Just as many orthodoxical fathers witnessed, in addition, nobody would be obliged to follow the councils, when they depart from Scripture. Augustine, for example, was unwilling to call his adversaries of faith back to the universal Council of Nicaea but rather to Scripture, by saying that "neither am I detained by the authority of the one nor you by the authority of the other, but by the scriptures, which are witnesses proper to neither but common to both; things ought to be debated with things, cause with cause, and reason with reason."¹⁹¹ This

¹⁸⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3493.

¹⁹⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3493.

¹⁹¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3494; Augustine, *Contra Maximinum haereticum Arianorum episcopum*, in *PL* 42, col. 772: "nec ego Nicaenum, nec tu debes Ariminense tanquam praejudicaturus

quotation, notably, was already made in both a constructive and polemic manner in the *Symphonia* but in the *Syntagma* it is used mainly for its polemic purpose.

Polanus proceeds in his argument by declaring that if the apostles and even the angels, when teaching other things than are taught in Scripture, would be cursed, much more would be the episcopal councils. In this regard, Chrysostom is called to comment that “we must not listen to Paul himself, if he speaks anything of his own or of human reason, but we ought to believe the apostle bearing about Christ who is speaking within him.”¹⁹² What is more, Polanus argues that the codices or canons of the councils, especially of Nicaea and Milevita, have been corrupted and falsified by the Roman pontiffs, whose most impudent arrogance (*impudentissimam arrogantiam*) was sometimes refused, especially by the fathers of the African council with right reason (*justis rationibus*).¹⁹³ This argument, he remarks, was fully discussed in the *Symphonia*.¹⁹⁴ If the canons of the universal council

proferre concilium. Nec ego hujus auctoritate, nec tu illius detineris: Scripturarum auctoritatibus, non quorumque propriis, sed utrisque communibus testibus, *res cum re, causa cum causa, ratio cum ratione* concertet. Utrique legimus, Ut simus in vero Filio ejus Jesu Christo; ipse est verus Deus et vita aeterna. Utrique tanti ponderis molibus cedamus” (Italics added). Augustine borrowed the italicized part from Cicero, *Pro M. Caelo Oratio* (Paris, 1558), 6v.

¹⁹² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3496; Chrysostomus, *Commentarius in epistolam ad Galatas*, in PG 61, col. 624; idem, *Homiliae X in epistolam secundam ad Timotheum*, in PG 62, col. 610.

¹⁹³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3496. Cf. John Calvin, *Institutio*, IV.vii.9 (p. 413): “In Africa diu fuit de ea re disceptatum nam quum in Mileuitano Concilio, vbi aderat Augustinus, excommunicati essent qui prouocarent vltra mare, conatus est Romanus Pontifex efficere vt id decretum corrigeretur. Legatos misit qui id priuilegii sibi a Niceno Concilio datum esse ostenderent. Proferebant Legati acta Niceni Concilii, quae ex Ecclesiae suae armario sumpserant.”

¹⁹⁴ For Polanus’ persuasive reasons for this argument, see Polanus, *Symphonia catholica*, 515-516: “Ita Patres generalis Concilii Aphricani impudentissimam Romani Episcopi arrogantiā, qua sibi jus appellationum vindicare ausus est, justis rationibus refutarunt, quarum prima est, quia Nicenae Synodus vetat excommunicatos in sua provincia, ab aliis in communione suscipi & restitui: Ergo nec a Romano Episcopo id faciendum. Secunda, quia eadem Synodus Nicenae suam cuique metropolitano, in quibus & Romano, provinciam ac dioecesim certis ac propriis finibus circumscripsit, & jurisdictionem in suae tantum provinciae clericis attribuens, vetuisse intelligitur, ne quis sibi jus ullum in alienam provinciam arroget. Tertia ratio est, quia negotia in suis locis, ubi orta sunt, finienda. Quarta, quia Spiritus Sancti gratia & recte iudicandi praesentia in qualibet provincia Sacerdotibus Christi non est defutura. Quinta, quia unicuique concessum est, si sententia iudicum suorum inique se praegravari sentiat, ad Concilia provincialia suae provinciae vel etiam ad universale Concilium provocare. Sexta, quia absurdum est existinare, examinis iustitiam soli Romano

should not be added to the gospel of Christ taught in Scripture, it is far more the case that the conciliar canons full of corruption and falsification not be added. In his discussion to the liberty of Christian religion, thus, Polanus appeals to the patristic authority for the sake of his dual goal, namely, to verify and defend his doctrinal theses concerning the Reformed church, in short, to turn patristic testimony back against his adversaries and their appeals to the fathers. In this vein, we may say that the general role the *Symphonia* played in the *Syntagma* is both constructive and polemic to verify the orthodoxy and catholicity of the Reformed doctrine.

Polanus's teaching about the false church is also worthy of close observation. The false church is one which is considered by human opinion as the church of God but does not exist (*non sit*) in reality. Polanus distinguishes it into three: the false church in earth, in purgatory, and in limbo.¹⁹⁵ Especially with regard to the claim of an *ecclesia falsa in purgatorio*, Polanus finds much fault with Bellarmine's disposed use of the biblical and patristic testimonies and emphasizes a contextual interpretation and textual criticism of them. The thesis of Polanus on the issue is this: the *ecclesia in purgatorio* is the false church which the Roman Catholics assert to be under the earth, a church that is not in the nature of things (*in rerum natura*), and purgatory, which the Roman Catholics believe in

Episcopo inspiratam, & innumerabilibus aliis Episcopis in Concilium congregatis denegatam. Septima, quia iudicium Romanum, (id enim hoc loco intelligitur per transmarinum) non erit ratum, eo quod in illo testes necessarii adesse non possint vel sexus infirmitate vel senii imbecillitate, vel aliis multis causis impediti. Octava, quia talis potestas Romano Pontifici a nulla Synodo est tributa. Huic rationi adjecerunt Patres generalis Concilii Aphricam simul patefactioem & refutationem imposturae qua Romanus Pontifex Concilio Aphricano imponere conatus erat, quod id quod Romanus Episcopus praetendebat, in verioribus exemplaribus Niceni Concilii reperire minime potuerint. Nona ratio est, quia praecavendum, ne fumus mundi fastus in Ecclesiam Christi introducatur."

¹⁹⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3524.

and fight for defensively, is in reality entirely nothing (*revera prorsus nihil*).¹⁹⁶ The Roman Catholics attempted to prove purgatory to really be under earth by using the witnesses of Holy Scripture, reason, councils, and the ancient fathers. This attempt is most explicitly found in Bellarmine who presented, as the most decisive witness of the existence of purgatory, 2 Maccabees 12:43-46: “[Judas] sent twelve thousand drachmas of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead (*pro peccatis mortuorum sacrificium*) ... Therefore it is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins.”¹⁹⁷ Polanus’s reply is that there is nothing about purgatory treated in the canonical scriptures.¹⁹⁸ Well known to him is the argument of the early Roman Catholic polemicist, John Fisher, against Luther: since faith in purgatory has been most received (*receptissimus*) in the ancient church by the orthodox fathers according the unwritten (*scripta non*) tradition, “even if purgatory is unable to be proved from the divine scriptures, its truth is nonetheless to be believed by all the Christians.”¹⁹⁹ In reply, Polanus points out that Fisher frankly (*ingenue*) admitted the fact that purgatory cannot be proved from Scripture. Even if the books of Maccabees were truly canonical and divine, he continues, the text quoted above does not support the Roman Church’s claim of purgatory, for it is corrupt “in vicious translation (*vitiosa versione*).”²⁰⁰ The original text of the

¹⁹⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3547.

¹⁹⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3549: “duodecim millia drachmas argenti misit Jerosolymam offerri pro peccatis mortuorum sacrificium...Sancta ergo & salubris est cogitatio pro defunctis exorare, ut a peccatis solvantur”; Bellarmine, *De pugatorio*, in *Opera* 2: 355.

¹⁹⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3550.

¹⁹⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3550; Johannes Fisher, *Assertionis Lutheranae confutatio* (Antwerp, 1523), 617-618: “tametsi non possit ex scripturis probari purgatorium, veritas eius nihilominus Christianis cunctis credenda est.”

²⁰⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3551.

corrupt phrase “pro peccatis *mortuorum* sacrificium” is “προσαγαγεῖν περὶ ἁμαρτίας θυσίαν,” which, when rightly translated, is “to offer sacrifice for sin (*offerre sacrificium pro peccato*).”²⁰¹

In defense of faith in purgatory, Bellarmine had appealed to a patristic custom of giving alms to poor people at the times of funeral, by quoting Chrysostom’s texts: “why do you convoke poor friends after the death of your [friends and] why do you entreat the presbyters so that they may be willing to pray for them?”²⁰² Quoting Pope Nicolaus (a significant polemical point from Polanus’s perspective) and Augustine, however, Polanus contends that “a bad tradition is to be avoided not less than a pernicious corruption” and that “when truth is once known, let custom give place to the truth.”²⁰³ Polanus also contends that Bellarmine appears to quote Chrysostom according to a sense contrary (*contrarium sensum*) to the original intention of the father who did not approve but denounced such an untoward consuetude. The above quotation made by Bellarmine, in fact, does not exist as such in Chrysostom’s *Homiliae in Matthaem*.²⁰⁴ On this account, Polanus discredits Bellarmine and identifies him as “an ignorant prompter” (*ignorans monitor*) and “unskilled cobbler” (*imperitus consarcinator*).²⁰⁵

²⁰¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3551-3552.

²⁰² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3554-3555; Bellarmine, *De pugatorio*, in *Opera* 2: 357a: “Chrysostomus hom. 32. In Matth. *Cur, inquit, post mortem tuorum pauperes convocas? Cur presbyteros, ut pro eis velint orare obsecras?*”

²⁰³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3555; Giovanni Paolo Lancellotti, ed., *Corpus juris canonici*, vol.1 (Colonia, 1605), VIII.iii (p. 21): “Mala consuetudo, quae non minus quam perniciosa corruptela vitanda est.”; Augustine, *De baptismo contra Donatistas*, in *PL* 43, col.143: “*Itaque veritate manifestata, cedat consuetudo veritati. plane quis dubitet veritati manifestatae debere consuetudinem cedere? Sed de manifestata veritate mox videbimus: nunc tamen et iste aliam consuetudinem fuisse manifestat.*”

²⁰⁴ See Chrysostom, *Homiliae XC in Matthaem*, in *PG* 57, col. 374.

²⁰⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3555.

Bellarmino had also reinforced his unbiblical argument of purgatory on the basis that the Jabeshites fasted after the death of Saul for seven days and David also fasted for the death of Saul and Jonathan: the custom of helping the souls of the dead with prayers and pious actions was already practiced by biblical figures and is a custom which thus clearly requires faith in purgatory.²⁰⁶ Against him, Polanus responds by arguing that, since the end of fasting is falsely assigned, it is untenable that the faithful in the Old Testament fasted for the dead or the sick in order to assist or delight (*juvare*) their souls. The Jabeshites and David actually fasted in public sorrow for their loss and not for those who were in purgatory.²⁰⁷

With regard to Psalm 38:2 (*Domine ne in ira tua arguas me neque in furore tuo corripas me*), Bellarmine insists, Augustine interpreted the text in this sense that *in furore argui* and *in ira corripi* referred respectively to eternal damnation and amendable punishment in purgatory; other ecclesiastical writers like Beda, Haymo, and Denis the Carthusian expounded the text in the same manner (*eodem modo*).²⁰⁸ But this seems to Polanus nothing but a vicious distortion of what Augustine meant in his exposition of Psalm 38:2. To uncover Bellarmine's misinterpretation and discover what Augustine originally intended in his exegesis of the given text, Polanus uses a lengthy quotation covering Augustine's whole comment of Psalm 38:2 and argues that Augustine considered *ira* and *furor* as "one and the same thing (*unam & eandem rem*)" and said, "Purge me in this life and make me such that there may be no further need for the amending fire,"

²⁰⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3555-3556; Bellarmine, *De purgatorio*, in *Opera* 2: 357b.

²⁰⁷ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3556.

²⁰⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3556; Bellarmine, *De purgatorio*, in *Opera* 2: 357b.

thereby signifying the wrath of the last judgment (*iram iudicii ultimi*) but not signifying purgatory.²⁰⁹

Bellarmino had also argued his case for purgatory on the basis of Isaiah 4:4, a text which Augustine used with reference to purgatorial punishment in his *De civitate Dei*.²¹⁰ It is true that Augustine wrote, “it more evidently appears that some shall in the last judgment suffer some kind of purgatorial punishments (*quasdam quorundam purgatorias poenas*).” Polanus, however, counters that the meaning of the biblical text foreign (*alienus*) to the notion of purgatory, because it deals with the means (*de mediis*) by which Christ who assumed in flesh would confer his glory upon his church. Among the means, there are justice, sanctity, remission of sins, and ablution whereby Christ expiates his people and makes them devoted to good works. It is notable that Polanus, significantly, does not reinterpret but assume Augustine’s comment of Isaiah 4:4 in the *De civitate Dei*, but only presents his own exposition of the biblical text. He makes no negative comment about Augustine.²¹¹

Bellarmino also urged that Basil commented on Isaiah 9:18 to the effect that we “can remove sin by means of confession so that it can be consumed by the purgatorial fire *after*

²⁰⁹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3557-3558; Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, in *PL* 36, cols. 91-92, 397: “in ira tua emendas me, ut in hac vita purges me & talem me reddas cui jam emendatorio igne non opus sit,”

²¹⁰ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3559; Bellarmine, *De purgatorio*, in *Opera* 2: 357b; Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, in *PL* 41, cols. 699-700: “Dicit tale aliquid et Isaias: *Lavabit Dominus sordes filiorum et filiarum Sion, et sanguinem emundabit de medio eorum spiritu iudicii et spiritu combustionis*. Nisi forte sic eos dicendum est emundari a sordibus, et eliquari quodammodo, cum ab eis mali per poenale iudicium separantur, ut illorum segregatio atque damnatio purgatio sit istorum, quia sine talium de caetero permixtione victuri sunt.”

²¹¹ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3559.

this life (post hanc vitam).”²¹² In reply, Polanus makes two biblical and patristic points: 1) the given biblical text is uncongenial to the establishment of purgatory; and 2) the phrase *post hanc vitam* was added by Bellarmine to Basil’s exposition of the text. What Basil virtually commented is that “if, therefore, we remove sin by confession and wither it up like dried grass, whose worth would be destroyed by purifying fire (ὕπὸ τοῦ καθαρτικοῦ πυρὸς).”²¹³ The meaning of καθαρτικός πυρ originally intended by the Greek father is something about fire on earth (*de igne in terra*) but not about a counterfeit conflagration of purgatory (*de fictitio purgatorii vaporario*).²¹⁴ Polanus, thus, cites and analyzes patristic literature to argue that Bellarmine imposed his own theology on patristic materials.

Micah 7:8-9 calls for our attention on account of its connection with several fathers and the *Glossa ordinaria*. Bellarmine’s assertion concerning this text in relation to purgatory is that “Jerome teaches this biblical passage to be alleged for purgatory,” and the *Glossa ordinaria* exposit of the text that “I will bear the indignation of the Lord here or *in purgatory (hic vel in purgatorio)*.”²¹⁵ The first response by Polanus is to present his own interpretation of Micah 7:8 in its context. The contextual meaning of the text is utterly different from the Roman Church’s purgatory, as “heaven is from earth.” Rather, it has connection with the admonition of God’s church toward Babylon and other nations: do not insult the church of God for its calamities as it does not expect God as the Liberator in vain. Polanus also corrects Bellarmine’s interpretation of Jerome, who, as Polanus argues, in

²¹² Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3560; Bellarmine, *De pugatorio*, in *Opera* 2: 357b: “per confessionem peccatum arefieri ut igne purgatorio post hanc vitam absumi possit.”

²¹³ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3560; Basilii Magnus, *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam*, in *PG* 30, col. 521: “Ἐὰν οὖν γυμνώσωμεν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν διὰ τῆς ἐξομολογήσεως, ἐποιήσαμεν αὐτὴν ξηρὰν ἄγρωστιν, ἀξίαν τοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ καθαρτικοῦ πυρὸς καταβρωθῆναι....”

²¹⁴ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3560.

²¹⁵ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3560; Bellarmine, *De pugatorio*, in *Opera* 2: 357b.

reality did not teach anything about purgatory but spoke of the fire of castigation or punitive fire in this life (*in hac vita*).²¹⁶

The next point made by Polanus against Bellarmine's citation from the *Glossa* is that Bellarmine wrongly attributed to the *Glossa* a comment taken from the second part of Nicholas of Lyra's exposition which, Polanus comments, involves a problematic allegory. Lyra's marginal note on the second part of Micah 7:9 (*videbo iusticiam eius*) is "*vel in hoc seculo vel in futuro*."²¹⁷ Even in this note, Polanus argues, there is not found any clear indication of purgatory. Polanus's response to Bellarmine's use of Micah 7:9 for his proof of purgatory is finalized by the lengthy quotation of Theodoret who made no comment on purgatory from the text but understood it as a testimony to Micah's felicity and to the shame and unhappiness of his enemies in the day of divine judgment.²¹⁸ As mentioned before, Polanus tends to argue an improperly theologized use of patristic quotations by Bellarmine, presenting the original text of the cited father and using additional quotations from other fathers to justify his refutations of Bellarmine's reading.

6.3. Concluding Remarks

It is in the conviction of the Reformed church as truly catholic and orthodox that Polanus constructed his enormous system of Reformed theology, *Syntagma theologiae christianae*. He substantiated his conviction, by arguing the harmony in doctrine between

²¹⁶ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3561; Jerome, *Commentaria in Isaiam prophetam*, in *PL* 24, col. 704: "Et in alio loco sanctus loquitur: *Iram Domini sustinebo, quia peccavi ei; donec justificet causam meam, et auferat iudicium meum, et educat me in lucem.*"

²¹⁷ Nicholas of Lyra, *Glossa ordinaria cum expositione lyre litterali et morali*, vol. 4 (Basel, 1502), 384r.

²¹⁸ Polanus, *Syntagma theologiae*, 3560; Theodoretus, *Interpretatio Michaeae prophetae*, in *PG* 81, in col. 1782.

what he identifies as the apostolic tradition of the church and the Reformed church. His operating assumption was that a true catholic tradition in which the reality of scriptural truth and apostolic faith had been preserved, could be identified throughout the history of the church. To peruse almost all of the patristic literature available in his time was a requirement for his discovery of that tradition. This does not mean that Polanus was an uncritical advocate of the patristic antiquity. He would not receive, just because it was ancient, the whole patristic thought even of a revered church father. Throughout his ecclesiology, Polanus's polemical needs certainly contributed to the addition of citations and elaboration of argument. What may also be observed, however, is that Polanus also provides here a more complete rationale for his selective approach to the fathers as texts representative of catholic orthodoxy. The *consensus patrum*, for Polanus, is not the general agreement of all portions of all churchly writings from the first five centuries. Rather is it the *consensus* of the patristic and later texts identified for their orthodox testimony as theological ancestors or fathers, according to the trinitarian and christological standards of the ecumenical creeds and according to Polanus's own reading of the biblical norm through the developing tradition of Reformed biblical interpretation. Accordingly, Polanus put scriptural authority in the first place and took the church fathers as the *testes veritatis*, not just for the sake of the polemic debate against the Roman Church and heretical teachings but more rigorously for the doctrinal verification and consolidation of the Reformed church as a theological heir, not just an institutional heir like the Roman Catholic Church, of the best tradition of the church.

Chapter Seven: Conclusion

Amandus Polanus was born, studied, and lived in an age of perennial necessity to construct, develop, and defend the orthodoxy and catholicity of the Protestant church in confrontation with the Roman Catholic Church and other branches of Christianity, notably, the Lutheran. Following Grynaeus' theological helm of the Reformed ship, Polanus heaved his academic anchor toward the ocean of the Christian truth, in a continuous blood transfusion with the catholic orthodoxy of Reformed faith and doctrine by the great zeal of his father-in-law. Polanus's theological journey was not without reefs, of which the most controversial was Bellarmine who became, in reality, a positive catalyst for Polanus to formulate and develop his system of Reformation theology in a Reformed manner. Bellarmine, the famed Jesuit controversialist, constituted the most polemically elaborated system of Roman Catholicism clothed with the best armament of biblical and patristic thought to thoroughly charge Protestantism with a lack of biblical orthodoxy and ecclesiastical catholicity. Polanus was a foremost representative of the early orthodox Reformed formulators who, faced with Bellarmine's theological indictment, undertook to draw up an account of Christian truth that was continuously handed down from the prophets and the apostles, through the church fathers and the sound medieval doctors, up to the Reformers and the Protestant orthodox.

Polanus's theological project began with the composition of a biblical dogmatics, *Partitiones theologiae*, which is a *compendium* of Reformed theology heavily dependent upon biblical testimonies referenced throughout as *dicta probantia*. As a biblical scholar of the Old Testament teaching at Basel University and other places, he wrote several biblical

commentaries to polish the scriptural orthodoxy of the Reformed doctrine. His strong affection infused by Grynaeus for the Reformed church moved him to explore the best tradition of Christianity by leaping into the pages of the patristic literature and digging out the best thought of the ancient orthodox fathers, to the effect that the *Symphonia catholica* was formulated in a fully methodized form of Reformed dogmatics. Polanus, however, would not be satisfied until the completion of his own Reformed orthodoxy, *Syntagma theologiae*. This work is arguably the most synthesized system of Reformed doctrine in the era of early orthodoxy: it is well organized with the aid of scholastic and humanistic tools, notably Ramist logic; authenticated as orthodox and catholic both by the large-scale biblical exegesis and by consistent reference to the church fathers, and shown to be practical by the application of each doctrine to Christian life in the church and the world (also a Ramist characteristic).

Given Polanus's process of formulation, the *Symphonia* has material agreement with but formal difference from the *Syntagma*. The agreement between the documents resulted from Polanus's intention or demonstration that the theology and faith of the Reformed church firmly stands in the orthodox and catholic harmony with the apostolic truth held and delivered under the guidance of the ever same Holy Spirit by the scriptural writers through the fathers and the ecclesiastical writers up to the Reformers and the Reformed orthodox. The difference between the *Symphonia* and the *Syntagma* was methodological: Polanus read and interpreted Scripture in an analytic and synthetic method; he gathered the doctrinal theses elicited from biblical exegesis according to the *locus* method; and he attempted to arrange these theological *loci* in a comprehensively unified system of

dogmatics, with the aid of the rhetorical and dialectical tools of humanism and the Aristotelian-Ramist logic.

Polanus's reception of patristic thought was concerned not only with the doctrinal orthodoxy and catholicity of Reformed dogmatics but also with refinement of his theological method and biblical exegesis. The doctrinal influence of the church fathers on the theology of Polanus is best characterized as a preference for the orthodox content of patristic writings; eclecticism as its result by which he tends to take some orthodox contents of a church father even in the same writing; advocacy nevertheless for the contextual understanding of each father and patristic work; and the use of the church fathers in a manner both constructive to consolidate and validate the catholic orthodoxy of Reformed theology and polemic to criticize the doctrinal deviation of Roman Catholicism from the true catholic and orthodox tradition.

The methodological function of the church fathers as found in the theology of Polanus is also notable. First of all, Polanus's conceptualization of theology and *principia theologiae* was in dialogue with the fathers, such as Clement, Theodoretus, Basil, and John of Damascus. As shown in the third chapter, Polanus, using some philosophical terms, also consulted the orthodox fathers, like Clement, Tertullain, Eusebius, Augustine, and Theodoretus. Even Polanus's framing of dogmatic structure also evidences the methodological influence given by the Apostles' Creed and the fathers, such as Ignatius, Lactantius, Gregory the Great, and Augustine. In biblical exegesis, Polanus appealed to the church fathers like Clement, Irenaeus, Augustine, and Chrysostom, especially in establishing the fundamental exegetical method of *Scriptura sui ipsius interpres* and also for expositing some obscure or ambiguous texts of Scripture. Also notable is Polanus's

substantial concern for textual criticism, especially on the book of Daniel, which he thought to be severely corrupted, not just textually but also hermeneutically. In this Polanus maintained a substantive theological dialogue with the fathers, especially Jerome, Theodoret, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Clement, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine. The major role the church fathers played in Polanus's biblical interpretation is characterized by the appeal to the fathers as *testes veritatis* who verify that Polanus's exposition of Scripture is in catholic agreement with the apostolic fathers. It should also be noted that Polanus also keeps in close connection with the fathers in his application of biblical interpretation both to theological doctrine and Christian life.

Thus, the formative function and use of the church fathers in Polanus's theology is methodological, exegetical, dogmatical, and practical. On the one hand, however, such a fourfold function should not be understood as though Polanus's theological method, biblical exegesis, Reformed dogmatics, and practical piety were a plain reproduction of the thought of the "orthodox" fathers. As shown in the preceding chapters, Polanus met the theological need of his day, by using and modifying the academic tools developed by Grynaeus and others to interpret Scripture, elicit doctrine, construct dogmatics, defend the Reformed church against its doctrinal adversaries, and apply doctrines to Christian life. For this, Polanus did not hesitate to draw on philosophy and engage in the exercise of reason. His 'philosophical eclecticism' does not indicate a theological departure from the Reformed faith or a compromise with pagan philosophy; rather it evidences the engagement of the Reformed orthodoxy with the long-standing theological tradition in its process of institutionalization, confessionalization, and systematization.

In short, Polanus engaged in the complex work not only of appropriating and dealing with the older tradition but also of identifying, from the Reformed perspective, a tradition of consent to his form of orthodoxy. That pattern of consent extended from the authoritative biblical *principium* of his theology through the less than authoritative writings of identifiable theological ancestors, namely the “fathers.” The task of constructing or reconstructing this version of a *consensus patrum* lay at the heart of Polanus’s identification of the Reformed faith as not only orthodox but also catholic. As we have seen, Polanus’s use of terminology – “fathers,” “pious fathers,” “orthodox fathers,” and “apostolic” – reflects a rather different understanding and use of the past than such terms indicate today. Understood in Polanus’s context, “father” indicates a respected and legitimate spiritual ancestor, whether in the church’s first five centuries or later, in the Middle Ages (Bernard) or even in the sixteenth century (Luther). Such usage can even be seen to reflect Renaissance and early modern forms of address: in his correspondence Beza referred to Calvin and to Bullinger as his fathers. The terms “pious fathers” and “orthodox fathers” reference those spiritual ancestors whose writings served for the most part as respected and legitimate witnesses to the creedal and confessional orthodoxy of the Reformed churches. The term “apostolic” referenced the long tradition of the teachings of those fathers identified as orthodox, namely, the line of doctrinal statement in which the evangelical teachings of the apostles were witnessed. Polanus’s project, therefore, as indicated as well by his polemics against Bellarmine and other Roman Catholics, stood in direct opposition to the Roman attempt to marshal the witness of the church against Protestants. Their attempt, in large part, assumed the co-equal authority of Scripture and

tradition. Polanus's attempt assumed the priority of Scripture and a use of the less authoritative witness of the tradition.

The outcome of Polanus's lengthy project, namely, the *Syntagma*, marks the fruition of a concerted effort to master the form or architecture of theological system, to learn and adapt to Protestant purposes the definitions and distinctions of scholastic theology, and to integrate into this structure a broadly Reformed reading of Scripture and the fathers, all for the sake of fully codifying Reformed theology as representative of the catholic church. Polanus's efforts leading to this outcome consisted in significant work as a biblical commentator and translator, a major academic effort in the form of writing and supervising theses for disputation in the university, and a major gathering of the church fathers in support of Reformed theology, not to mention the production of a system of modified Ramist logic specifically illustrated with theological examples and arguments. There were other major constructive efforts belonging to the rise of this early orthodox form of Reformed thought. Some, like Zanchi's massive treatises, were in part more detailed even than Polanus's *Syntagma*. Others like the sets of theses gathered by Junius and his successors at Leiden or the gatherings of theorems and axioms produced by Grynaeus at Basel paralleled a portion of Polanus's work in their concerted effort to produce a body of Reformed teachings in and through the educational process of the University. And there were other major dogmatic products from Polanus's generation, like Scharpius's *cursus theologicus*. Polanus's *Syntagma*, however, stands out as the most carefully and consistently constructed of these efforts, giving to the Reformed tradition of his day what is arguably the most influential of its early orthodox systems.

THESES

A. Theses Related to Dissertation

1. Polanus's theology is best characterized in *Syntagma theologiae christianae*, the most synthesized system of Reformed doctrine in early orthodoxy, a work well organized with the highly advanced aid of scholastic and humanistic tools, authenticated to be orthodox by the thoroughness of biblical exegesis, catholicized in accord with the consensus of the church fathers, and practicalized by the application of each doctrine to Christian life in the church and the world.
2. The *Symphonia catholica* was designed to demonstrate that the doctrine and faith of the Reformed church stands in the orthodox and catholic harmony with the apostolic truth, the truth that was held and delivered under the guidance of the ever same Holy Spirit by the prophets and the apostles through the pious fathers and the sound medieval doctors up to the Reformers and the Reformed orthodox, defeating the Roman church's condemnation of the Reformed church as heretic.
3. The true catholic, apostolic, and orthodox church, having been propagated through the efforts of all intermediators since the age of apostles, is one and always harmonious with itself but never dissented from itself.
4. The style of using patristic works by Polanus is summarized by preference for the orthodox content of patristic writings; eclecticism as its result in which he selectively quotes some orthodox contents of a church father even in the same writing; advocacy for the contextual understanding of each father and his patristic work; and the use of the church fathers in a manner, both *constructive* to consolidate and validate the catholic orthodoxy of Reformed doctrine and *polemic* to criticize the doctrinal deviation of Roman Catholicism from the true catholic and orthodox tradition of the church.
5. The function of patristic thought in Polanus's theology was not only concerning the doctrinal orthodoxy and catholicity of Reformed dogmatics but also diversely on his theological method and biblical exegesis.
6. The exertion of 'philosophical eclecticism' by the Reformed orthodox in theology indicates, at least in Polanus, neither a theological departure of Reformed faith from biblical orthodoxy and patristic catholicity established by the Reformers nor a rotten compromise of pious theology with pagan philosophy but evidences that the Reformed orthodox wisely accomplished the task of their age entrusted to them, that is, the further institutionalization, confessionalization, and systematization of the Reformation theology.

B. Theses Related to Ph.D. Course Work

7. In the Reformed orthodoxy, the formal place of ethics in theological system is posterior to its doctrinal part and yet doctrines are, in essence, not different from ethics as two sides of the same coin.

8. The essential unity and the formal distinction of faith and good works, or doctrines and ethics, are compatible in Polanus' theological system: 1) genus of theology: Polanus categorized the genus of theology as *scientia* and *sapientia*, which connotes the theoretical and practical character of theological system; 2) theology as *praxis*: though our theology consists of *theologia infusa* (doctrines) and *acquisita* (works) and also *theoria* is prior to *praxis* in the order of placement, which remain in human disposition, our theology and its *finis* are not just theoretical but much more practical; 3) the glorification of God as *summum bonum* permeates all *loci* of theology; 4) the same origin of *credenda* and *facienda*: insofar as it is through faith that *credenda* are known and *facienda* are done, each of them cannot be considered to pertain or subdue to the other; 5) the Decalogue is not discussed in the *loci* of *bona opera* but of faith; 6) the discussion of even the most theoretical doctrine, the attributes of God, follows the pattern of knowledge and application.

9. With regard to the rule of the self-interpreting Scripture (*scriptura sui ipsius interpretres*), a comparison of the biblical exegesis between a Christian humanist and a Reformer shows its methodological continuity but also theological discontinuity as evidenced in Erasmus and Calvin.

10. The unity of covenant (*pactum* or *testamentum*) in the Old and the New Testaments is not according to accident but according to substance, which refers to the same salvific doctrine of faith and the same author of the two Testaments: The eightfold reason for the unity of the two Testaments Polanus provides is God as the same Author, the same divine mercy, Christ as the same foundation, the same reality of promise as matter, the mutual obligation of God and the elect as the essential form of covenant, the same justification and regeneration as effect, the elect alone as the object of divine covenant, and the same Holy Spirit as internal seal.

11. All executions of God's will, even by his absolute power, are not contrary to God's nature but most fittingly following nature: it is only in respect to His absolute power that God could have forgiven sin without any satisfaction due to justice or without the death of Christ on the cross, while all the external works of God are grounded in divine decree.

12. God, as *Summum Bonum*, from which all good things come, is the *principium* and *finis* of theology, and every discussion in every *locus* should begin with and at the same time be headed for Him whom every creature desires.

C. Miscellaneous Theses

13. Following Romans 11:33 and Aquinas, I define theology like this: “theology is taught by God, teaches God, and leads to God”(Theologia a Deo docetur, Deum docet, ad Deum ducit): God is the alpha or subject of theology, the content or object of theology, and the omega or goal of theology.

14. Theology is the queen of all the sciences, embracing and supporting them.

Bibliography

Adam, Melchior. *Vitae Germanorum medicorum*. Heidelberg, 1620.

———. *Vitae Germanorum Theologorum qui superiori seculo Ecclesiam Christi voce Scriptisque Propagarunt*. Frankfurt: Johannes Georgius Geyder, 1620.

Alsted, Johann Heinrich. *Clavis artis Lullianae, et verae logices*. Strasbourg: Lazarus Zetzner, 1633.

———. *Panacea philosophica*. Herborn, 1610.

Altenstaig, Johannes. *Lexicon theologicum*. Antwerp: Petrus Bellerus, 1576.

Althaus, Paul. *Die Prinzipien der deutschen reformierten Dogmatik im Zeitalter der aristotelischen Scholastik*. Leipzig: Deichert, 1914.

Ambrosius. *Enarrationes in XII psalmos*, in *PL* 14.

———. *Expositio in psalmum cxviii*, in *PL* 15.

———. *Opera omnia*. Basel, 1538.

Ames, William. *Medulla ss. theologiae, ex sacris literis, earumque interpretibus, extracta, & methodicè disposita*. Amsterdam, 1623; London: Robert Allott, 1629.

Anacletus. *De ordinatione archiepiscoporum et reliquorum episcoporum, atque sacerdotum*, in *PL* 130.

Andreae, Samuel. *Disquisitio theologica de decreto absoluto*. Marburg, 1689.

Anselm. *Dialogus de casu diaboli*, in *PL* 158.

———. *Monologium*, in *PL* 158.

Apinus, Sigismus. "Vita Iohannis Iacobi Grynaei." In *Joannis Iacobi Grynaei Epistolae familiares LXVI*, a1-c2. Nurnberg, 1720.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Catena Aurea IV super libros Evang.* Paris, 1517.

———. *Expositio libri posteriorum analyticorum*. Textum Leoninum Romae, 1882.

———. *Quaestio disputata de anima*. Rome: Textum Taurini, 1953.

———. *Summa Theologiae*, in *Corpus Thomisticum*. Roma, 1888.

- . *Super II Epistolam B. Pauli ad Timotheum lectura*. Taurini, 1950.
- Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- . *Posterior Analytics, Topica*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.
- . *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.
- Armstrong, Brian G. *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth Century France*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.
- Asselt, Willem J. van. *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius (1603-1669)*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001.
- . “The Fundamental Meaning of Theology: Archetypal and Ectypal Theology in Seventeenth-Century Reformed Thought,” *WTJ* 64 (2002): 319-335.
- . “Johannes Coccejus en de Kerkvaders: Een Fragment uit het Zeventiende-Eeuwse Debat tussen Protestanten en Rooms-Katholieken over het Juiste Gebruik van de Kerkvaders in Theologische Geschillen.” In *De Kerkvaders in Reformatie en Nadere Reformatie*, edited by J. van Oort, 135-154. Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1997.
- . “Scholasticism Revisited: Methodological Reflections on the Study of Seventeenth-century Reformed Thought.” In *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion*, edited by Alister Chapman, John Coffey, and Brad S. Gregory, 154-174. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009.
- . “The Theologian’s Tool Kit: Johannes Maccovius (1588-1644) and the Development of Reformed Theological Distinctions.” *Westminster Theological Journal* 68 (2006): 23-40.
- Asselt, Willem J. van. et al., eds. *Inleiding in de Gereformeerde Scholastiek*. Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1998.
- . *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2001.
- Athanasius. *Dialogi V de sancta Trinitate*. Geneva, 1570.
- . *Epistola ad Adelphium*, in PG 26.
- . *Epistola ad Jovianum*, in PG 26.

———. *Epistola ad Marcellinum in interpretationem psalmorum*, in PG 27.

———. *Orationes adversus Arianos*, in PG 26.

———. *Synopsis Scripturae sacrae*, in PG 28.

Athenagoras et al. *Theologorum aliquot graecorum veterum orthodoxorum libri graeci et iidem latinitate donati*. Zürich, 1559-1560.

Augustine. *Ad populum factionis donatianaee*, in PL 33.

———. *Confessiones*, in PL 32.

———. *Contra Academicos libri tres*, in PL 32,

———. *Contra Cresconium grammaticum partis Donati*, in PL 43.

———. *Contra epistolam Fundamenti*, in PL 42.

———. *Contra epistolam Manichaei quam docant fundamenti*, PL 42.

———. *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, in PL 42.

———. *Contra litteras Petiliani*, in PL 43.

———. *Contra Maximinum Arianorum Episcopum*, in PL 42.

———. *De baptismo contra Donatistas*, in PL 43.

———. *De civitate Dei*, in PL 41.

———. *De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum*, in PL 40.

———. *De doctrina christiana libri quatuor*, in PL 34.

———. *De doctrina christiana*, in PL 34.

———. *De dono perseverantiae*, in PL 45.

———. *De dono perverantiae*, in PL 45.

———. *De genesi ad litteram*, in PL 34.

———. *De genesi contra Manichaeos*, in PL 34.

———. *De mendacio*, in PL 40.

- . *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et moribus manichaeorum*, in *PL* 32.
- . *De ordine*, in *PL* 32.
- . *De praedestinatione sanctorum*, in *PL* 44.
- . *De sermone Domini in monte*, in *PL* 34.
- . *De symbolo sermo ad catechumenos*, in *PL* 40.
- . *De trinitate*, in *PL* 42.
- . *De unitate ecclesiae*, in *PL* 43.
- . *De utilitate credendi ad Honoratum*, in *PL* 42.
- . *De videndo deo liber, seu epistola CXLVII*, in *PL* 33.
- . *Enarrationes in psalmos*, in *PL* 36.
- . *Enchiridion de fide, spe et charitate*, in *PL* 40.
- . *Epistolae secundum ordinem temporum*, in *PL* 33.
- . *In Joannis evangelium tractatus*, in *PL* 35.
- . *In Joannis evangelium tractatus*, xlvi, in *PL* 35.
- . *Liber de praedestinatione & gratia, qui intitulatur de voluntate Dei*, can be found in *D. Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi, Opera omnia ... repurgatorum à mendis innumeris, per Des. Erasmus Roterodamum*. Vol. 7. Basel: Froben, 1528-29.
- . *Opera omnia*. Basel, 1528-1529.
- . *Quaestiones XVII in Matthaeum*, in *PL* 35.
- . *Retractationum*, in *PL* 32.
- . *Tractatus CXXIV in Joannis evangelium*, in *PL* 35.

Backus, Irena D. "Calvin and the Church Fathers." In *The Calvin Handbook*, edited by Herman J. Selderhuis, 125-137. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

- . “Calvin and the Greek Fathers.” In *Continuity and Change*, edited by Robert James Bast and Andrew Colin Gow, 253-76. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . “Calvin’s Judgment of Eusebius of Caesarea: An Analysis.” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 22 (1991): 419-37.
- . “Calvin’s Knowledge of Greek Language and Philosophy.” In *Calvinus Praeceptor Ecclesiae*, edited by Herman J. Selderhuis, 343-350. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2004.
- . “Erasmus and the Spirituality of the Early Church.” In *Erasmus’ Vision of the Church*, Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies 33, edited by H. Pabel, 95-114. Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Journal, 1995.
- . “Influence of Some Patristic Notions of Substantia and Essentia on the Trinitarian Theology of Brenz and Bucer (1528).” *Theologische Zeitschrift* 37/2 (1981): 65-70.
- . “Irenaeus, Calvin and Calvinist Orthodoxy: The Patristic Manual of Abraham Scultetus (1598).” *Reformation & Renaissance Review* 1 (Jan, 1999): 41-53.
- . “Martin Bucer and the Patristic Tradition.” In *Martin Bucer and Sixteenth Century Europe, Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (28-31 août 1991)*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought 52, edited by C. Krieger, M. Lienhard, 55-69. Leiden: 1993.
- . “Patristics.” In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, 223-227. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- . “Piscator Misconstrued. Some Remarks on Robert Rollock’s Exegesis of Hbr. 9.” *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 14/1 (1984): 113-119.
- . “The Early Church in the Renaissance and Reformation.” In *Early Christianity: Origins and Evolution to A.D. 600*, edited by Ian Hazlett, 291-303. Nashville: Abingdon, 1991.
- . “The Fathers and Calvinist Orthodoxy: Patristic Scholarship.” In *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, edited by Irena D. Backus, vol. 2, 839-865. London, Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- . *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378-1615)*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Backus, Irena D., et al., eds. *Martin Bucer apocryphe et authentique: études de bibliographie et d’exégèse*. Geneva: Revue de théologie et de philosophie, 1983.

- Backus, Irena. D., ed. *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, 2 vols. Boston and Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- , ed. *Reformation Readings of the Apocalypse: Geneva, Zurich, and Wittenberg*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Bahlcke, Joachim. "Calvinism and Estate Liberation Movements in Bohemia and Hungary (1570-1620)." In *The Reformation Eastern and Central Europe*, edited by Karin Maag, 72-91. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997.
- Baronius, "Petri Rami Vita." In *Commentarium de religione christiana*. Frankfurt: Andrea Wechelus, 1576.
- Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics*. Edited by G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. Translated by H. Knight et al. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1956-1975.
- . *Kirchliche Dogmatik*. Zurich: EVZ, 1932-1970.
- Basil the Great. *Adversus Eunomium*, in PG 9.
- . *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam*, in PG 30.
- . *Expositio in sexdecim priora prophetae Esaiae*. In *Divi Basilii Magni Caesareae Cappadociae quondam archiepiscopi omnia quae in hvnc diem latino sermone donata svnt opera*. Antverpia, 1570.
- . *Homiliae IX in Hexaameron*, in PG 29.
- Bauch, Gustav. *Geschichte des Breslauer Schulwesens in der Zeit der Reformation*. Breslau, 1911.
- Bedouelle, Guy. *Le Quinqueplex Psalterium de Lefèvre d'Etaples: Un guide de lecture*. Geneva: Droz, 1979.
- . *Lefèvre d'Etaples et l'intelligence des Ecritures*. Geneva: Droz, 1976.
- Bellarmino, Robert. *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos*. Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1586.
- . *Opera omnia*. Neapoli: Josephus Giulianus, 1836.
- Benrath, Gustav A. *Die Selbstbiographie des Heidelberger Theologen und Hofpredigers Abraham Scultetus (1566-1624)*. Baden: Evangl. Presseverband Karlsruhe, 1966.
- . *Reformierte Kirchengeschichtsschreibung an der Universität Heidelberg im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*. Speyer am Rhein: Zechner, 1963.

- Benson, Edward. *Cyprian: His Life, His Times, His Work*. London: MacMillan, 1897.
- Bernard of Clairvaux. *De consideratione ad Eugenium*, in *PL* 182.
- . *Opera*. Basel, 1566.
- . *Sermones in cantica canticorum*, in *PL* 183.
- Beza, Theodore. *Confessio christianae fidei*. London, 1575.
- . *Correspondance de Theodore de Beze*, tom. 31, 1590. Geneva: Droz, 2010.
- . *De Praedestinationis Doctrina*. Geneva: Eustathius Vignon, 1582.
- . *Vita Calvini. Ioannis Calvini Opera quae supersunt omnia*. Vol. 21. Edited by G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss. Brunswick: C. A. Schwetschke, 1863-1900.
- Bierma, Lyle D. "Federal Theology in the Sixteenth Century: Two Traditions?" in *Westminster Theological Journal* 45 (1983): 304-21.
- . "The Role of Covenant Theology in Early Reformed Orthodoxy," in *Sixteenth Century Journal* 21/3 (1990): 453-462.
- Bietenholz, Peter G. *Basle and France in the Sixteenth Century: The Basle Humanists and Printers in Their Contacts with Francophone Culture*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1971.
- Bizer, Ernst. *Frühorthodoxie und Rationalismus*. Zürich: EVZ Verlag, 1963.
- Bonjour, Edgar. *Die Universität Basel, von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart 1460-1960*. Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn Basel, 1960.
- Bornkamm, Heinrich. *Luther and the Old Testament*. Translated by W. Eric Gritsch and Ruth C. Gritsch. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.
- Brauch, Gustav. "Petrus Vincentius, der Schöpfer des Görlitzer Gymnasiums und erste Breslauer Schulenspektor." In *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für deutsche Erziehungs- und Schulgeschichte* 19, 269-336. Berlin: A. Kofmann & Komp., 1909.
- Bröder, Paula. *Georg Cassanders Vermittlungsversuche zwischen Protestanten und Katholiken*. Phil. diss. Marburg, Düsseldorf, 1931.
- Brodrick, James. *Robert Bellarmine: Saint and Scholar*. London: Burns & Oates, 1961.
- Brouwer, Rinse H. R. "The Conversation between Karl Barth and Amandus Polanus on the Question of the Reality of Human Speaking of the Simplicity and the Multiplicity

in God.” In *The Reality of Faith in Theology: Studies on Karl Barth Princeton-Kampen Consultation 2005*, edited by Bruce McCormack and Gerrit Neven, 51-110. Bern: Peter Lang, 2007.

Bucanus, William. *Institutiones theologicae seu locorum communium christianae religionis*. Lausanne, 1602.

Bucer, Martin. *Declaratio articulorum germanica*. In *Martin Bucers Deutsche Schriften*, vol. 6-1. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1960ff.

Bullinger, Heinrich. *Confessio & expositio simplex orthodoxae fidei*. Tiguri, 1608.

Buri, Fritz. “Johann Jakob Grynaeus.” In *Der Reformation verpflichtet*, edited by Rene Teuteberg, 55-58. Basel: Christoph Merian Verlag, 1979.

Burnett, Amy N. “Generational Conflict in the Late Reformation: The Basel Paroxysm.” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32/2 (Autumn, 2001): 217-242.

———. “It Varies from Canton to Canton: Zurich, Basel, and the Swiss Reformation.” *Calvin Theological Journal* 44 (2009): 251-262.

———. *Karlstadt and the Origins of the Eucharistic Controversy: A Study in the Circulation of Ideas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

———. *Teaching the Reformation: Minsters and Their Message in Basel, 1529-1629*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

———. “The Educational Roots of Reformed Scholasticism: Dialectic and Scriptural Exegesis in the Sixteenth Century.” *Dutch Review of Church History* 84 (2004): 299-317.

Calvin, John. *Confessio Dei. Ioannis Calvini Opera quae supersunt omnia* (CO). Vols.5, 22, edited by G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss. Brunswick: C. A. Schwetschke, 1863-1900.

———. *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*. CO 8.

———. *Institutio christianae religionis 1559*. CO 2.

Capito, Wolfgang. “*De vita Oecolampadii*.” In Philip Melanchthon, *A famous and godly history*. London, 1561.

Cassander, Georgius. *De Articulis religionis inter catholicos et protestantes Consultatio*. Colonia, 1577.

———. *De officio pii viri in hoc dissidio religionis*. Paris, 1564.

- . *Evangelische Evangelienauslegung: Eine Untersuchung zu Luthers Hermeneutik*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1991.
- Chenu, Marie-Dominique. *Toward Understanding Saint Thomas*. Translated by A.-M. Landry and D. Hughes. Chicago: Regnery, 1964.
- Chlumecky, Peter R. *Carl von Zierotin und seine Zeit, 1564-1615*. Brünn: A. Nitsch, 1862.
- Chytraeus, David. *Catechesis seu summa theologiae christianae certa methodo comprehensa*. Johannes Crato, 1569.
- Cicero. *De finibus bonorum et malorum*. London: William Heinemann, 1914.
- . *Pro M. Caelo Oratio*. Paris, 1558.
- Clarke, Samuel. *The Marrow of Ecclesiastical Historie, contained in the Lives of the Fathers, and other Learned Men and Famous Divines*. London, 1650.
- Clement of Alexandria. *Epistolae antiquissimae, ac sacris institutionibus plenae*. Colonia, 1526.
- . *Protrepticus*, in PG 8.
- . *Stromata*, in PG 8, 9.
- Colmar, Grünhagen. *Geschichte Schlesiens*. Gotha: Friedrich A. Perthes, 1886.
- Congar, Yves M. J. *Tradition and Traditions: An Historical and Theological Essay*. New York: MacMillan, 1967.
- Crespin, Jean. *Bibliotheca studii theologici ex plerisque doctorum prisci seculi monumentis collecta*. Geneva: J. Crespin, 1565.
- , ed. *Refutatio dogmatis de fictitia carnis Christi omnipresentia*. Geneva, 1571.
- Crocus, Ludovicus. *Duodecas dissertationum exegeticarum et apologeticarum syntagmatis sacrae theologiae*. Breae, 1642.
- Croghan, Christopher M. "Melanchthon's 'Der Ordinanden Examen' and 'Examen Eorum': A Case Study in Pedagogical Method." Ph.D. diss., Luther Seminary, Minnesota, 2007.
- Cuno, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Daniel Tossanus der Ältere, Professor der Theologie und Pastor 1541-1602*. Amsterdam: Scheffer, 1898.
- Cyprian. *D. Caecilii Cypriani Carthaginiensis episcopi et gloriosissimi martyris opera*. Geneva, 1593.

—————. *Epistola 2 ad Donatum*, in *PL* 4.

—————. *Epistola 74 ad Pompeium*, in *PL* 3.

Cyril of Alexandria. *Commentarius in Ioannis evangelium, Opera*. Oxonium: Typographeus Clarendonianus, 1872.

—————. *Homilia diversiae*, in *PG* 77.

Daillé, Jean. *Apologia pro duabus ecclesiarum in Gallia protestantium Synodis*. Amsterdam, 1655.

—————. *De pseudepigraphis apostolicis*. Hardervici, 1652.

—————. *De usu patrum ad ea definienda religionis capita quae hodie sunt controversa*. Geneva: P. Chouet, 1656.

—————. *Traicté de l'employ des saincte peres, pour le iugement des differends, qui sont aujourd'hui en la religion*. Geneva: Pierre Aubert, 1632.

Daneau, Lambert. *De haeresibus ad quodvultdeum*. Geneva: Eustachium Vignon, 1576.

—————. ed. *Physique françoise, comprenant en treize livres ou traittez, assavoir l'un d'Aristote, onze de Basile, et un de Jean Damascene*. Geneva, 1581.

—————. *In Petri Lombardi Episcopi Parisiensis librum primum Sententiarum ... Commentarius triplex*. Geneva: Eustathium Vignon, 1580.

Dantine, Johannes. "Das christologische Problem in Rahmen der Prädestinationslehre von Theodor Beza." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 77 (1966): 81-96.

De Chartres, Yves. *Decretum beati luonis*. Louvain, 1561.

De Villanuño, Matías. *Summa Conciliorum Hispaniae*, vol.2. Matriti: Apud Joachimum Ibarra, 1785.

De Vooght, Paul. *Les sources de la doctrine Chrétienne d'après les théologiens du XIV^e siècle*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1954.

Deal, Max Eugene. "The Meaning and Method of Systematic Theology in Amandus Polanus." Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 1980.

Dillistone, F. W., ed. *Scripture and Tradition*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1955.

Dionysius, Areopagita. *D. Dionysii Areopagitae opera omnia*. Köln, 1557.

—————. *De divinis nominibus*, in *PG* 3.

- Donnelly, John Patrick. *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Duhamel, Albert. "Milton's Alleged Ramism." *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 67/7 (December, 1952): 1035-1053.
- Duns Scotus, Johannes. *Joannis Duns Scoti doctoris subtilis, ordinis minorum opera omnia*. Paris, 1894.
- . *Scriptum...super sententias tomus primus*. Venetia, 1506.
- Durandus of St. Pourçain. *In quatuor Sententiarum libros questionum*. Paris, 1508.
- Dürr, Emil, et al., eds. *Aktensammlung zur Geschichte der Basler Reformation in den Jahren 1519 bis Anfang 1534*. Basel: Historische und antiquarische Gesellschaft, 1921-50.
- Ebeling, Gerhard. "Die Angänge von Luthers Hermeneutik." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 48 (1951): 172-230.
- Erasmus, Desiderius, ed. *Tertius tomus operum Diui Ioannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani, in quo Homiliae in Matthaeum et Ioannem: praeterea commentarii digni lectu in Matthaeum incerto autore*. Basel, 1530.
- Esychius, Johannes. *Oratio de ecclesiae catholicae & apostolicae continuatione ... a Cl. Theologo Ioh. Iac. Grynaeo ornaretur*. Basel, 1589.
- Eusebius, *Avtores historiae ecclesiasticae*. Basel, 1544.
- . *De vita Constantini Magni*, in *Opera* tom.2, edited by Johann Jacob Grynaeus. Basel, 1570.
- Evans, R. J. W. *Rudolf II and His World: A Study in Intellectual History 1576-1612*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.
- Farmer, Craig S. *The Gospel of John in the Sixteenth Century: The Johannine Exegesis of Wolfgang Musculus*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Fatio, Olivier. *Méthode et théologie: Lambert Daneau et les débuts de la scholastique réformée*. Geneva: Droz, 1976.
- Faulenbach, Heiner. *Die Structur der Theologie des Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf*. Zürich: EVZ-Verlag, 1967.
- Felix, Marcus Minucius. *Octavius*. Heidelberg, 1560.
- Fichtner, Paula S. *Emperor Maximilian II*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.

- Fidansa, Eustachius, et al. *Sanctarum autoritatum veterum catholicae ecclesiae patrum*. Colonia, 1559.
- Firmilianus, *Epistola LXXV*. In *D. Caecilii Cypriani opera*, tom.1. Geneva, 1593.
- Fisher, Johannes. *Assertionis Lutheranae confutatio*. Antwerp, 1523.
- Fleischer, Manfred P. "Humanism and Reformation in Silesia: Imprints of Italy—Celtis, Erasmus, Luther and Melanchthon." In *The Harvest of Humanism in Central Europe: Essays in Honor of Lewis W. Spitz*, edited by Manfred P. Fleischer, 17-107. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1992.
- . *Späthumanismus in Schlesien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze*. München: Delp'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1984.
- Flesseman-van Leer, Ellen. *Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1955.
- Fraenkel, Peter. *Testimonia Patrum: The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon*. Geneva: Librairie E. Droz, 1961.
- Fudge, Thomas R. "Icarus of Basel? Oecolampadius and the Early Swiss Reformation." *Journal of Religious History* 21 (1997): 268-284.
- Gallagher, Edmon L. *Hebrew Scripture in Patristic Biblical Theory: Canon, Language, Text*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Gamble, Richard. "Switzerland: Triumph and Decline." In *Calvinism in Switzerland, Germany, and Hungary*, edited by Richard Gamble, 79-95. New York: Garland Publishing, 1992.
- Geiger, Max. *Die Basler Kirche und Theologie im Zeitalter der Hochorthodoxie*. Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1952.
- Gerhard, Johann. *Loci theologici*. Berolini: Schlawitz, 1863-1885.
- . *Patrologia, sive de primitivae ecclesiae christianae doctores vita ac lucubrationibus*. Jena, 1653.
- Gerson, Johannes. *De examinatione doctrinarum*, in *Prima pars Joannis Gersonis*. Basel, 1518.
- Gieseler, John. *A Text-Book of Church History*, vol. 3, edited by Henry Smith and translated by John Hull. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1858.
- Gilbert, Neal W. *Renaissance Concepts of Method*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.

- Gillet, F. A. *Crato von Crafftheim und seine Freunde*. Frankfurt: H. L. Bröner, 1860.
- Gindely, Anton, ed. *Quellen zur Geschichte der Böhmisches Brüder*. Vienna, 1859.
- Gomarus, Franciscus. *Disputationes theologicae*. In *Opera theologica omnia*. Amsterdam, 1644.
- Goudriaan, Aza. "Athanasius in Reformed Protestantism: Some Aspects of Reception History (1527-1607)." *Church History and Religious Culture* 90/2-3 (2010): 257-276.
- . "Cyprian's *De ecclesiae catholicae unitate*: Why Did Reformed Theologians Consider It a Useful Book (1559-1655)?" In *Cyprian of Carthage: Studies in His Life, Language and Thought*, edited by Henk Bakker, Paul van Geest and Hans van Loon, 225-241. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- Grabill, Stephen. *Rediscovering the Natural Law in Reformed Theological Ethics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Graham, W. Fred, ed. *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1994.
- Grane, Leif, et al., eds. *Auctoritas Patrum: Zur Rezeption der Kirchenväter im 15 und 16 Jahrhundert*. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1993.
- Greef, Wulfert de. *Calvijn en het Oude Testament*. Amsterdam: T. Bolland, 1984.
- . "*De Ware Uitleg*": *Hervormers en hun verklaring van de Bijbel*. Leiden: J. J. Groen, 1995.
- Green, Ian. "Reformed Pastors' and Bons Curés: The Changing Role of the Parish Clergy in Early Modern Europe." In *The Ministry: Clerical and Lay*, edited by W. J. Sheils and D. Wood, 249-286. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.
- Gregory the Great. *Commentarium in septem psalmos poenitentiales*, in *PL* 217.
- . *Expositio in librum Job*, in *PL* 75.
- . *Expositio super cantica canticorum*, in *PL* 79.
- . *Homiliarum in evangelia*, in *PL* 76.
- . *Homillae XL in Ezechielem*, in *PL* 76.
- . *Moralium in librum B. Job*, in *PL* 76.

Gross, Georg. *Theatrum Biblicum, Ex Scriptis Theologorum veterum atque recentium, maximam vero partem D. Amdandi Polani p.m. Concinnatum*. Basel: Ludwig Konig, 1614.

Gründler, Otto. *Die Gotteslehre Girolami Zanchis und ihre Bedeutung für seine Lehre von der Prädestination*. Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1965.

Grynaeus, Johann Jacob. *Analysis epistolae Pauli apostoli ad Galatas / in schola theologica Basiliensis academiae tradita, eo consilio, ut doctrina sana de Vocatione, de Iustificatione, de Ecclesiae gubernatione, et de Sanctificatione, illustraretur*. Basel: Bryllinger, 1583.

———. *Chronologia brevis evangelicae historiae: logicique artificii in epistola apostoli Pavli ad Romanos*. Basel, 1580.

———. *De catholicae ecclesiae sanctificatione de mundo theses didascalicae*. Heidelberg, 1585.

———. *De Christianae doctrinae certitudine, Theses Demonstrativae: oppositae periculosis imaginationibus Academicis & Pyrrhonijs, eorum qui de ijs autem, D. Iohan. Iacobo Grynaeo Praeside, postridie Calend. Iunii, in Theologico Auditorio, Deo iuvante, respondebit Andreas Baudisius Vratislaviensis*. Basel: Oporinus, 1582.

———. *De christiana fidei historia*. Basel, 1582.

———. *De eucharistica controversia capita doctrinae theologicae*. Heidelberg, 1584.

———. *De prima et catholica religione*. Basel, 1586.

———. *De unica & certissima fidei nostrae & morum regula, quae est Verbum Dei scriptum canonicum*. Basel, 1590.

———. *Deum opt. maximvm qve exomologesis. In Ioh Oecolampadii Dialogvs, quo Patrum sententiam de Coena Domini bona fide explanat*. Basel: Waldkirch, 1590.

———. *Διδασκαλία, de ecclesia catholica, quae est sanctorum communio; Θεωρημα, de certissimis eiusdem ecclesiae notis; Προβημα, de iisdem notis in reformatis ecclesiis conspicuis*. Basel, 1590.

———. *Epitomes sacrorum biblion, pars prima, complectens veteris testamenti tum librorum tum capitum argument*. Basel: Henricpetri, 1577.

———. *Eusebii Pamphili, Rvffini, Socratis, Theodoriti, Sozomeni, Theodori, Evagrii, et Dorothei Ecclesiastica Historia*. Basel, 1577.

- . *Explanatio Danielis V primorum capitum*. Basel: Sebastian Henricpetrus, 1587.
- . *Explanatio epistolae S. apostoli Pavli, ad Hebraeos*. Basel, 1586.
- . *Hypomnemata, in Malachiam prophetam: tradita in Basiliensi academia: quibus adjunctae sunt Theses analyticae, de epistola Pauli apostoli ad Galatas, de quibus in Scholis Theologorum disputatum fuit*. Basel: Leonhardus Ostenius, 1583.
- . *Ioh Oecolampadii Dialogvs, quo Patrum sententiam de Coena Domini bona fide explanat*. Basel: Waldkirch, 1590.
- . *Ionae prophetae liber, cvm enarratione*. Oporinus, 1581.
- . *Monvmenta S. Patrum Orthodoxographa*. Basel, 1569.
- . *Orationes duae, altera de symphonia prophetarum et evangelistarum de evangelio D. nostri Iesu Christi, altera de theorico et practico fine historiae*. Heidelberg, 1584.
- . *Problema de harmonia fidei catholicae et verbi Dei*. Basel, 1586.
- . *Theologica theoremata et problemata*, 3 vols. Basel: Sebastian Henricpetrus, 1588.
- . *Theorema de ecclesiae catholicae electione, et problema de eiusdem efficari vocatione*. Heidelberg, 1585.
- . *Theoremata duo, alterum quidem de fidei actione propria, alterum vero de praedestinatione sanctorum*. Basel, 1592.
- . *Thesium analyticarum, de epistola Pauli apostoli, ad Galatas*. Basel, 1582.
- Grynaeus, Simon. "De J. Oecolampadii obitu." In Philip Melanchthon, *A famous and godly history*. London, 1561.
- Guggisberg, Hans R. *Basel in the Sixteenth Century*. St. Louis: Center For Reformation Research, 1982.
- Gunnoe, Charles D. *Thomas Erastus and the Palatinate: A Renaissance Physician in the Second Reformation*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Hagen, Kenneth. *A Theology of Testament in the Young Luther: The Lectures on Hebrews*. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

- . *Hebrews Commenting from Erasmus to Beze, 1516-1598*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1981.
- . *Luther's Approach to Scripture as Seen in His "Commentaries" on Galatians, 1519-1538*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1993.
- Hagenbach, Karl R. *Die theologische Schule Basels und ihre Lehrer von Stiftung der Hochschule 1460 bis zu Dewette's Tod 1849*. Basel, 1860.
- . *Krische Geschichte der Entstehung und der Schicksale der ersten Baslerkonfession und der auf sie gegründeten Kirchenlehre*. Basel: J. G. Neukirch, 1827.
- Hall, Basil. "Calvin against the Calvinists." In *John Calvin: A Collection of Distinguished Essays*, edited by Gervase Duffield, 19-37. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966.
- Hanson, R. P. C. *Origen's Doctrine of Tradition*. London: SPCK, 1954.
- . *Tradition in the Early Church*. London: SCM, 1966.
- Hefele, Charles J. *A History of the Councils of the Church*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1872.
- Heppe, Heinrich. *Die Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantismus im sechzehnten Jahrhundert*, 3 vols. Gotha: Perthes, 1857.
- Herzog, Johann Jakob. *Leben Johannes Oekolampads*. Basel: Schweigerhaus, 1843.
- Hess, Salomon. *Lebensgeschichte D. Johann Oekolampads, Reformators der Kirche in Basel*. Zurich: Ziegler und Söhne, 1793.
- Hilary. *De trinitate*. In *Opera complura sancti Hylarii Episcopi*. 1511.
- Hincmar of Rheims. *De praedestinatione et libero arbitrio*, in *PL* 125.
- Hooykaas, Reijer. *Humanities, Mechanics and Painting: Petrus Ramus, Francisco de Holanda*. Coimbra, 1991.
- Hotson, Howard. *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and Its German Ramifications, 1543-1630*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Hunnius, Aegidius. *Articulus de providentia Dei, et aeterna praedestinatione*. Frankfurt, 1603.
- Hus, John. *Super IV. Sententiarum, Mag. Jo. Hus Opera omnia*, tom 2. Osnabrück: Biblio-Verlag, 1966.

- Hyperius, Andrea. *Methodi theologiae, sive praecipuorum christianae religionis*. Basel: Ioannes, 1567.
- Ignatius. *Epistola ad Ephesios*, in PG 5.
- . *Epistola ad Magnesios*, in PG 5.
- . *Gloriosi Christi martyris Ignatii Antiocheni antistitis*. Basel, 1520; Strassbourg, 1527.
- . *Ignatii cvi etiam nomen theophoro*. Dilingia, 1557.
- Im Hof, Ulrich. “Die Entstehung der reformierten Hohen Schule. Zürich (1528) – Bern (1528) – Lausanne (1537) – Genf (1559).” In *Beiträge zu Problemen deutscher Universitätsgründungen der frühen Neuzeit*, edited by Peter Baumgart et al., 243-262. Nendlen:KTO Press, 1978.
- Imbart de la Tour, Pierre. *Les Origines de la Reforme IV*. Paris: Firmin- Didot, 1935.
- Index Auctorum et librorum prohibitorum*. Roma, 1559.
- Irenaeus. *Adversus haereses*, in PG 7.
- Isidorus. *De summo bono*. Basel, 1505.
- Jacobs, Paul. *Prädestination und Verantwortlichkeit bei Calvin*. Neukirchen: Moers, 1937.
- James, Frank A. III. *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination: the Augustinian Inheritance of an Italian Reformer*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- James, Thomas. *A Treatise of the Corruptions of Scripture, Councils and Fathers*. London, 1611.
- Janssen, Johannes. *General Conditions of the German People from the so-called Religious Pacification of Augsburg in 1555 to the Proclamation of the Formula of Concord in 1580, History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Age*, vol. 8. London: Paul, 1905.
- Jerome. *Commentaria in Isaiam prophetam*, in PL 24.
- . *Commentarii in epistolas sancti Pauli*, in PL 30.
- . *Commentariorum in Isaiam prophetam*, in PL 24.
- . *Commentariorum in Michaeam prophetam*, in PL 25.
- . *Commentarium in Ezechielem prophetam*, in PL 25.

—————. *Epistola ad Hedibiam, de quaestionibus xii*, in *PL* 22.

—————. *Epistola CXII, ad Augustinum*, in *PL* 22.

—————. *Epistola CXXIX ad Dardanum, De terra promissionis*, in *PL* 22.

—————. *Opera omnia*. Basel, 1516.

—————. *Prologus Galeatus*, in *PL* 28.

Jewel, John. "A Treatise of the holy Scriptures." In *The Works of the very learned and reverend father in God John Jewell*. London, 1609.

John Chrysostom, *Homiliae LXXXVIII in Joannem*, in *PG* 59.

—————. *Homiliae X in epistolam secundam ad Timotheum*, in *PG* 62.

—————. *Commentarius in Acta Apostolorum*, in *PG* 60.

—————. *Commentarius in epistolam ad Galatas*, in *PG* 61.

—————. *Homiliae XC in Matthaem*, in *PG* 57.

—————. *Homiliae XXIV in epistolam ad Ephesios*, in *PG* 62.

—————. *In epistolam ad Colossenses commentarius*, in *PG* 62.

—————. *In epistulam II ad Thessalonicenses*, in *PG* 62.

—————. *Monitum ad homiliam in Psalmum XCV*, in *PG* 55.

—————. *Omnia opera septimus tomus*. Basel, 1525.

—————. *Opus imperfectum in Matthaevi Euangelium*, in *Omnia opera septimus tomus*. Basel, 1525.

John of Damascus. *Expositio fidei orthodoxae*, in *PG* 94.

Josephus, Flavius. *Jewish Antiquities*. London: Wordsworth, 2006.

Junius, Franciscus. *Animadversiones*, 1600-9.

—————. *Opera theologica*. Geneva, 1613.

—————. *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*. Amsterdam, 1882.

Justin Martyr. *Apologia prima*, in PG 6.

———. *Apologia secunda*, in PG 6.

———. *Christianarum ad Graecos Quaestionum Graecarumque Responsionum & earum Responsionum Confutationis*, in *Sancti Iustini philosophi et martyris opera*. Paris, 1615.

———. *Cohortatio ad gentiles*, in PG 6.

———. *Dialogus cum Tryphone Iudaeo*, in PG 6.

Keckermann, Bartholomäus. *Systema sacrosanctae theologiae*. Heidelberg, 1602.

Kickel, Walter. *Vernunft und Offenbarung bei Theodor Beza*. Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1967.

Kidd, I. G. "The Relation of Stoic Intermediates to the *Summum Bonum*, with Reference to Change in the Stoa." *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series 5-3/4 (July-October, 1955): 181-194.

Kimchi, David. *Commentarii Rabbi Daudis Kimchi*. Paris, 1557.

Kolde, Carl A. J. *Dr. Johann Heß, der schlesische Reformator*. Breslau: Ebuard Trewenbt, 1846.

Konrad, Joachim. *Die Schlesische Toleranz: Geschichtliches Erbe und politische Idee*. Düsseldorf, 1953.

Kristeller, Paul O. *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic, and Humanist Strains*. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.

Lactantius. *De sapientia itidem et religione*, in PL 6.

———. *De vera sapientia et religione*, in PL 6.

———. *Synthesis doctrinae Lactantii*, in PL 6.

Lancelloti, Giovanni Paolo, ed. *Corpus juris canonici*. Colonia, 1605.

Lane, Anthony N. S. *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999.

———. "Scripture, Tradition and Church: An Historical Survey." *Vox Evangelica* 9 (1975): 37-55.

Latinius, Latinus. *Bibliotheca sacra et profana*. Roma, 1677.

- Laurent, Gaspard. *Catholicus et orthodoxus Ecclesiae consensus, ex Verbo Dei, Patrum scriptis, Ecclesiae reformatae confessionum harmonia*. Geneva, 1595.
- Lecler, Joseph. *Histoire de la tolerance au siècle de la Reforme*. 2 vols. Paris: Aubier, 1955.
- Leigh, Edward. *A Treatise of Divinity consisting of three books*. London, 1646.
- . *A Treatise of Religion & Learning, and of Religious and Learned Men*. London, 1656.
- Leinsle, Ulrich. *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, trans. Michael Miller. Washington: CUA Press, 2010.
- Letham, Robert. "Amandus Polanus: A Neglected Theologian?" *Sixteenth Century Journal* 21-3 (Autumn, 1990): 463-476.
- Linder, Gottlieb. *Simon Sulzer und sein Antheil in der Reformation im Lande Baden sowie an den Unionbestrebungen*. Heidelberg, 1890.
- Louthan, Howard. *Johannis Crato and the Austrian Habsburgs: Reforming a Counter-Reform Court*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1994.
- Lubbertus, Sibrandus. *De principiis christianorum dogmatum libri VIII*. Franeker, 1591.
- Luoma, John K. "Who Owns the Fathers? Hooker and Cartwright on the Authority of the Primitive Church," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 8/3 (October, 1977): 45-59.
- Luther, Martin. *De servo arbitrio*, in WA 18.
- . *Predigten 1530; Reihenpredigten über Matthäus 5 –7*, in WA 32.
- . *Schriften 1520/21*, in WA 7.
- . "Vorrede auff die Epistel S. Paul an die Römer." In *Biblia, das ist, Die gantze heilige Schrift Deudsch*. Wittenberg, 1562.
- . *Wider das Papsttum zu Rom vom Teufel gestiftet 1545*, in WA 54.
- Lynde, Humphrey. *Via Devia: The By-Way: Mis-leading the weake and unstable into dangerous paths of Error, by colourable shewes of Apocryphall Scriptures, unwritten Traditions, doubtfull Fathers, ambiguous Councells, and pretended Catholike Church*. London, 1630.
- Mallinson, Jeffrey. *Faith, Reason, and Revelation in Theodore Beza, 1519-1605*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

- Marcuse, Deborah K. "The Reformation of the Saints: Biblical Interpretation and Moral Regulation in John Calvin's Commentary and Sermons on Genesis." Ph.D. diss., Duke University, Duke, NC, 2005.
- Maruyama, Tadataka. *The Ecclesiology of Theodore Beza: The Reform of the True Church*. Geneva: Droz, 1978.
- Mastricht, Petrus van. *Theoretico-practica theologia*. Amsteldam: Pontano, 1715.
- Mattox, Mickey L. "Defender of the Most Holy Matriarchs:" *Martin Luther's Interpretation of the Women of Genesis in the Enarrationes in Genesin, 1535-1545*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- McCoy, Charles S. "Johannes Cocceius: Federal Theologian." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 16 (1963): 352-370.
- McKee, Elsie A. *Elders and the Plural Ministry: The Role of Exegetical History in Illuminating John Calvin's Theology*. Geneva: Droz, 1988.
- . *John Calvin on the Diaconate and Liturgical Almsgiving*. Geneva: Droz, 1984.
- McLelland, Joseph. "Peter Martyr's Patristic Sources." In *The Visible Words of God: An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli*, edited by Joseph C McLelland, Thomas F Torrance, 267-271. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957.
- Meijering, E. P. "Calvinist Orthodoxy: Systematic Theology." In *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol. 2: 867-887.
- . *Calvin wider die Neugierde: Ein Beitrag zum Vergleich zwischen reformatorischem und patristischem Denken*. Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1980.
- . *Melanchthon and Patristic Thought*. Leiden: Brill, 1983.
- . *Reformierte Scholastik und Patristische Theologie: die Bedeutung des Väterbeweises in der Institutio Theologiae elencticae F. Turretins unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Gotteslehre und Christologie*. Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1991.
- Melanchthon, Philip. *Disputatio de ecclesia et propria ecclesiae doctrinae*, in *Philippi Melanthonis opera quae supersunt omnia* (MO), vol. 12. edited by C. G. Breschneider. 28 vols. Halle-Brunswick: C. A. Schwetschke, 1834-1860.
- . *Enarrationes aliquot librorum ethicorum Aristotelis*, in MO 16.
- . *Examen eorum*. Wittenberg: Seitz, 1554.

- . *Loci Communes theologici*, in MO 21.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *The Canon of the New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
- Mileto. *Melito Sardium Episcopus*, in PG 5.
- Milevitanus, Optatus. *Contra Parmenianum Donatistam*, in PL 11.
- Miller, I. "Oecolampadius: The Unsung Hero of the Basel Reformation," *Iliff Review* 39 (September, 1982): 5-25.
- Miller, Perry. *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Muller, Richard A. *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- . "Biblical Interpretation in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." In *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters*, 22-44. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2007.
- . *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- . "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition: A Historiographical Introduction." In *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates Within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, edited by Michael G. A. Haykin and Mark Jones, 11-30. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- . *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 Book House, 1991.
- . "A Note on 'Christocentrism' and the Imprudent Use of Such Terminology." *Westminster Theological Journal* 68 (2006): 253-260.
- . "Perkins' A Golden Chaine: Predestinarian System or Schematized Ordo Salutis." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 9/1 (1978): 69-81.
- . *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003.
- . "Reassessing the Relation of Reformation and Orthodoxy – A Methodological Rejoinder." *American Theological Inquiry* 4/1 (2011): 3-12.

- . “Reformation, Orthodoxy, ‘Christian Aristotelianism,’ and the Eclecticism of Early Modern Philosophy.” *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 81/3 (2001): 306-325.
- . “Scholasticism Protestant and Catholic: Francis Turretin on the Object and Principles of Theology.” *Church History* 55 (June 1986): 193-205.
- . *The Study of Theology: From Biblical Interpretation to Contemporary Formulation*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991.
- . *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Formation of a Theological Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “Vera Philosophia cum sacra Theologia nusquam pugnat: Keckermann on Philosophy, Theology, and the Problem of Double Truth.” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 15-3 (Autumn, 1984): 341-365.
- Muller, Richard A., and John Thompson, eds. *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Neele, Adriaan C. *Petrus van Mastricht (1630-1706), Reformed Orthodoxy: Method and Piety*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Nicolas of Lyra. *Glossa ordinaria cum expositione lyre litterali et morali*. Vol. 4. Basel, 1502.
- . *Postilla super epistulas sancti Pauli*. Köln, 1478.
- Nolte, Maria E. *Georgius Cassander en zijn Oecumenisch Streven*. Nijmegen: Dekker & Vegt, 1951.
- Nygren, Anders. *Meaning and Method: Prolegomena to a Scientific Philosophy of Religion and a Scientific Theology*, translated by Philip Watson. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.
- Oberman, Heiko A. *Forerunners of the Reformation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.
- . *Masters of the Reformation: Emergence of a New Intellectual Climate in Europe*. Translated by Dennis Martin. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- . “Scripture and Tradition: Introduction.” In *Forerunners of the Reformation: the Shape of Late Medieval Thought*, 53-66. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.

- . *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Oecolampadius, Johannes. *De genvina verborum Domini, host est corpus meum, iuxta uetustissimos auctores, expositione liber*. Strassbourg, 1525.
- Oecumenius, *Commentaria in epistolas Pauli*, in PG 119.
- Old, Hughes O. *Patristic Roots of Reformed Worship*. Züricher Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte 5. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1975.
- Ong, Walter J. *Ramus, Method and the Decay of Dialogue*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958.
- Oort, Johannes van. "John Calvin and the Church Fathers." In *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol. 2, 661-700.
- Origen. *Origenis Adamantii operum pars secunda*. Basel, 1536.
- Panormitanus, Abbas. *De electione c. Significasti*. In *Commentaria primae partis in primum decretalium librum*. Venice, 1592.
- Pareus, David. *Miscellanea catechetica, seu collectio eorum, quae catecheticis explicationibus prius sparsim intexta suerunt*. Heidelberg, 1612.
- Parker, T. H. *Calvin's New Testament Commentaries*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.
- . *Calvin's Old Testament Commentaries*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Luther the Expositor: Introduction to the Reformer's Exegetical Writings*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1959.
- Perkins, William. *A Treatise of the Manner and Order of Predestination*. In *The Workes of... Mr. William Perkins*, vol.2. London, 1850-1853.
- Philo. *De eo, quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat*. In *Opera omnia: Graeca et latine*, vol. 2. August Friedrich Pfeiffer, 1786.
- Pico della Mirandola, Johannes. *Cabalistarum selectiora, obscurioraque dogmata, a Ioanne Pico ex eorum commentationibus pridem excerpta*. Venice, 1569.
- . *Oratio de hominis dignitate*, in *Opera Joannis Pici*. Strassbourg, 1504.
- Piscator, Johannes. *Analysis logica evangelii secundum Mattheum, una cum scholiis et observationibus locorum doctrinae*. London: R. F. for B. Norton, 1594.

———. *Analysis logica libri S. Lucae qui inscribitur Acta Apostolorum*. London: Felix Kingston, 1597

Plato. *The Republic*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935.

Polanus, Amandus. *Analysis libelli prophetae Malachiae, aliquot praelectionibus Genevae proposita*. Basel: Waldkirch, 1587.

———. *Analysis libri Hoseae prophetae*. Basel: Waldkirch, 1601.

———. *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*. Basel, 1598.

———. *De concionum sacrarum methodo institutio*. Basel: Typis Conradi Waldkirchii, 1604.

———. *De ratione legendi cum fructu autores*. Basel: Waldkirch, 1603.

———. *De traditionibus*. Basel, 1593.

———. *Exegesis analytica illustrium aliquot vaticiniorum Veteris Testamenti de Incarnatione, Passione, Morte et Refurrectione Domini nostri Jesu Christi*. Basel, 1608.

———. *In Daniele Prophetam visionum amplitudine difficillimum*. Basel, 1600.

———. *In Daniele prophetam visionum amplitudine...Commentarius*. Basel: Waldkirch, 1599.

———. *In librum prophetiarum Ezechielis commentarii*. Basel: Waldkirch, 1608.

———. *In librum prophetiarum Ezechielis commentarii*. Basel, 1608.

———. *Logicae libri duo, juxta naturalis methodi leges conformati*. Herborn, 1590, 1593; Basel, 1598, 1599.

———. *Mellificium: In Quo Articuli Praecipui Symboli Apostolici De Dn. Nostri Jesu Christi Incarnatione, Nativitate, Passione ... enarrantur: Et Perspicua Methodo ostenditur, quâ ratione ... Conciones Ministris Ecclesiae formare liceat*. Amberg: Schönfeld, 1613.

———. *Partitiones theologicae*. Basel: Waldkirch, 1589; Geneva: Petrus Albertus, 1623.

———. *Partitiones theologiae*. London, 1591.

———. *Sylloge thesium theologiarum ad method leges conscriptarum*. Basel, 1597.

- . *Symphonia catholica seu consensus catholicus*. Basel: Conrad Waldkirch, 1607.
- . *Synopsis SS. Theologiae*. Basel: Conrad Waldkirch, 1598.
- . *Syntagma logicum Aristotelico-Ramaeum, ad usum inprimis theologicum accommodatum*. Basel: Waldkirch, 1605.
- . *Syntagma theologiae christianae*, 2 vols. Hanoviae, 1609-1610.
- Polman, Pontien. *L'élément historique dans la controverse religieuse du XVIe siècle*. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1932.
- Poythress, Diane. *Reformer of Basel: The Life, Thought, and Influence of Johannes Oecolampadius*. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage, 2011.
- Pranger, Burcht. "Sic et Non: Patristic Authority between Refusal and Acceptance: Anselm of Canterbury, Peter Abelard and Bernard of Clairvaux," in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol 1, edited by Irena D. Backus, 165-193.
- Preus, Robert. "The Doctrine of Election as Taught by the Seventeenth Century Lutheran Dogmaticians." *Quartalschrift: Theological Quarterly* 55 (October, 1958): 229-261.
- Quantin, Jean-Loius. *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Quenstedt, Johann Andreas. *Theologia didactico-polemica, sive systema theologicvm*. Lipsiae: Fritsch, 1702.
- Raitt, Jill. "The Elector John Casimir, Queen Elizabeth and the Protestant League." In *Controversy and Conciliation*, edited by Derk J. Visser and Dikran Y. Hadidian, 117-145. Allison Park: Pickwick Publications, 1986.
- . *The Eucharistic Theology of Theodore Beza: Development of the Reformed Doctrine*. Chambersburg, PA: American Academy of Religion, 1972.
- Ramus, Peter. *Aristotelicae animadversiones*. Lutetiae, 1548.
- . *Commentarium de religione chriatiana*. Francofurtum, 1576.
- . *Defensio pro Aristotele adversus Jac. Schegkium*. Lausanne, 1571.
- . *Dialectica*. Köln, 1587.

- . *Scholae in liberales artes*. Basel, 1569.
- Regan, Teresa. "A Study of the Liber de Spiritu et Anima; its Doctrine, Sources and Historical Significance." Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1948.
- Rehman, Sebastian. *Divine Discourse: The Theological Methodology of John Owen*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2002.
- Reid, J. K. S. *The Authority of Scripture: A Study of Reformation and Post-Reformation Understanding of the Bible*. London: Methuen, 1962.
- . "The Office of Christ in Predestination." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 1 (1948):166-183
- Reid, Steven J., et al., eds. *Ramus, Pedagogy and the Liberal Arts: Ramism in Britain and the Wider World*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2011.
- Reuter, Karl. *Das Grundverständnis der Theologie Calvins*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1963.
- Rivetius, Andrea. *Catholicus orthodoxus oppositus catholico Roman churchae*. Apud Commelinum, 1630.
- . *Critici sacri specimen*. Gotthard Voegelin, 1612.
- Rolston, Holmes III. *John Calvin versus the Westminster Confession*. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1972.
- Rorem, Paul. *Biblical and Liturgical Symbols within the Pseudo-Dionysian Synthesis*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1984.
- Rufinus. *Commentarius in symbolum apostolorum*, in *PL* 21.
- Scapula, Johann. *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum novum*. London, 1637.
- Scharpius, Johannes, *Cursus theologicus*. Geneva, 1620.
- Schegk, Jacob. *Hyperaspistes responsi, ad quatuor epistolas Petri Rami contr se editas*. Tübingen, 1570.
- Scherevelius, Cornelius. *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*. London: Gulielmus Robertson, 1676.
- Schindler, Alfred. "Zwingli und die Kirchenväter." In *Charisma und Institution*, edited by Trutz Rendtorff, 393-404. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1985.
- Schindler, Alfred. *Zwingli und die Kirchenväter, 147 Neujahrsblatt zum Besten des Waisenhauses*. Zurich: Stadt Zurich, 1984.

- Schmid, Heinrich. *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*. Gütersloh, 1893.
- Schreiner, Susan E. "Exegesis and Double Justice in Calvin's Sermons on Job." *Church History* 58 (1989): 322-338.
- . *The Theater of His Glory: Nature and the Natural Order in the Thought of John Calvin*. Durham, NC: Labyrinth Press, 1991.
- . *Where Shall Wisdom Be Found?: Calvin's Exegesis of Job from Medieval and Modern Perspectives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Schüling, Hermann. *Die Geschichte der Axiomatischen Methode im 16. und beginnende 17. Jahrhundert*. New York: Georg LOMS Verlag Hildesheim, 1969.
- Schweizer, Alexander. *Die Glaubenslehre der evangelisch-reformierten Kirche dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt*, 2 vols. Zürich: Orell, Füssli, 1844-1847.
- Scultetus, Abraham. *De cvrricvlo vitae, inprimis vero de actionibus pragensibus Abrah. Scvlteii*. Emda, 1625.
- . *Medulae theologiae partum Syntagma*. Ambergae, 1598; Frankfurt: Haeredes Jonae Rhodii, 1634
- Shantz, Douglas H. "Vermigli on Tradition and the Fathers: Patristic Perspectives from his Commentary on I Corinthians." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, edited by Frank A. James, 115-138. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Shorey, Paul. "Introduction." In *The Republic of Plato*, ix-lxxiii. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- Sick, Hansjörg. *Melanchthon als Ausleger des Alten Testaments*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959.
- Sixtus Senensis. *Bibliotheca sancta*. Colonia, 1586.
- Skalnik, James Veazie. *Ramus and Reform: University and Church at the End of the Renaissance*. Milwaukee: Merry Wiesner-Hanks, 2002.
- Skinner, Quentin. *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Smith, Lesley. *The Glossa ordinaria: the Making of a Medieval Bible commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Smits, Luchsius. *Saint Augustin dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin*. 2 vols. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1956-58.

- Southgate, W. M. *John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- Spencer, Thomas. *The Art of Logick delivered in the precepts of Aristotle and Ramus*. London: John Dawson, 1628.
- Stahelin, Ernst. *Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf*. Basel: Verlag von Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1955.
- . *Das theologische Lebenswerk Johannes Oekolampads, Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte*. Leipzig: Heinsius, 1939.
- Stahelin, Theophil. *Johann Oekolampad: Der Reformator von Basel*. Basel: Verlag christlicher Schriften, 1864.
- Stanglin, Keith. *Arminius and the Assurance of Salvation: The Context, Roots, and Shape of the Leiden Debate, 1603-1609*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2007.
- . *The Missing Public Disputations of Jacobus Arminius: Introduction, Text, and Notes*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2010.
- Stapleton, Thomas. *Principiorvm fidei doctrinalivm demonstratio methodica*. Basel: Michaelaes Sonnius, 1579.
- Stegmann, Andrea. *Johann Friedrich König: Seine Theologia positiva acroamatica (1664) im Rahmen des frühneuzeitlichen Theologiestudiums*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Steinmetz, David C. *Calvin in Context*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- . *Luther in Context*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- . *Misericordia Dei: The Theology of Johannes von Staupitz in Its Late Medieval Setting*. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- . "The Superiority of Pre-Critical Exegesis," *Theology Today* 37 (1980-81): 27-38.
- . "Theology and Exegesis: Ten Theses." In *Histoire de l'exegese au XVIe siecle*, edited by Olivier Fatio and Pierre Fraenkel, 382. Geneva: Droz, 1978.
- Surius, Laurentius. *Conciliorum omnium, tum generalium, tum provincialium atque particularium*. Coloniae Agrippinae, 1567.
- Szegedinius, Stephanus, ed. *Enchiridii locorum communium theologorum*. Basel, 1589.

- Taylor, Jeremy. *Ductor dubitantium or the Rule of Conscience*. London, 1660.
- Tertullian. *Adversus haereticos*, in *PL 2*.
- . *Adversus Marcionem*, in *PL 2*.
- . *De carne Christi*, in *PL 2*.
- . *De Monogamia*, in *PL 2*.
- . *Liber de Praescriptionibus adversus haereticos*, in *PL 2*.
- Theodoret of Cyrus. *Eranistes etoi polymorphos*, in *PG 83*.
- . *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, in *PG 83*.
- . *Interpretatio in Ezechielis prophetiam*, in *PG 81*.
- . *Interpretatio Michaeae prophetae*, in *PG 81*.
- . *Quaestiones in Genesim*, in *PG 80*.
- Theophilus. *Ad Autolyicum*, in *PG 6*.
- Theophylactus. *Expositio ad Ephesios*, in *PG 124*.
- . *Expositio in epistolam II ad Timotheum*, in *PG 125*.
- Thommen, Rudolf. *Geschichte der Universität Basel 1532-1632*. Basel: Detloffs Buchhandlung, 1889.
- Thompson, John L. *John Calvin and the Daughters of Sarah: Women in Regular and Exceptional Roles in the Exegesis of Calvin, His Predecessors and His Contemporaries*. Geneva Droz, 1992.
- Todd, W. N. "The Function of the Patristic Writings in the Thought of John Calvin." Th.D. thesis, Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1964.
- Torrance, James B. "Strengths and Weaknesses of the Westminster Theology." In *The Westminster Confession*, edited by Alisdair Heron, 40-53. Edinburgh: Saint Andrews Press, 1982.
- Tossanus, Daniel. *Synopsis de patribus, sive praecipuis et vetus tioribus ecclesiae doctoribus, nec non de scholastici*. Heidelberg, 1603.
- Tremellius, Immanuel, et al., eds. *Testamenti veteris Biblia sacra*. Hanovia: Wechelus, 1596.

Trueman, Carl R., et al., ed. *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2007.

———. “Reason and Rhetoric: Stephen Charnock on the Existence of God.” In *Reason, Faith and History: Philosophical Essays for Paul Helm*, edited by Martin Stone, 29-46. Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008.

Tuckney, Anthony. *Praelectiones theologicae*. Amsterdam, 1679.

Turretin, Francis. *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, translated by George M. Giger. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1992.

———. *Institutio theologiae elencticae*, 3 vols. Geneva, 1679.

Tutino, Stefania. *Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Twisse, William. *Vindiciae, gratiae, potestatis ac providentiae Dei*. Amsterdam, 1648.

Ursinus, Zacharias. *Doctrinae christianae compendium*. Cambridge, 1585.

———. *Explicatio Catecheticarum*. Cambridge, 1587.

———. *Oratio exhortatoria, ad doctrinae christianae studium*. In David Pareus, *Miscellanea catechetica seu Collectio eorum*. Geneva, 1616.

Ussher, James. *Historia dogmatica de scripturis et sacris vernaculis*. London, 1690.

Vermigli, Peter Martyr. *Loci Communes*. London: Thomas Vautrollerius, 1583.

Vincent of Lerins. *Commonitorium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915.

———. *Pro catholicae fidei antiquitate et veritate*. Venice, 1549.

Vincentius, Petrus. *Der Stadt Bresslaw Schul-Ordnung: Auff Eines Erbaren Raths befehl und anordnung gestellet*. Breslau, 1570.

———. *Orationes dvae et epigrammata quaedam de initiis novae scholae*. Gorlic, 1565.

Visser, Derk, ed. *Controversy and Conciliation: The Reformation and the Palatinate 1559-1583*. Allison Park, PA: Pickwick, 1986.

———. *Zacharias Ursinus: The Reluctant Reformer, His Life and Times*. New York: United Church Press, 1983.

- Von Drey, Johann Sebastian. *Neue Untersuchungen über die Constitutionen und Kanones der Apostel*. Tübingen, 1832.
- Waddington, Charles. *Ramus (Pierre de la Ramée): Sa vie, ses écrits et ses opinions*. Paris: C. Meyrueis et Cie, 1885.
- Wandel, Lee P., ed. *History Had Many Voices*. Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2003.
- Weber, Hans Emil. *Die philosophische Scholastik des deutschen Protestantismus in Zeitalter der Orthodoxie*. Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer, 1907.
- Weiss, F. "Johann Jakob Grynaeus." In *Basler Biographien*, 159-200. Basel: B. Schwabe, 1900.
- Wengert, Timothy. *Philip Melancthon's Annotationes in Johannem in Relation to Its Predecessors and Contemporaries*. Geneva: Droz, 1987.
- Wesel-Roth, Ruth. *Thomas Erastus*. Lahr, Baden: Verlag Moritz Schauenburg, 1954.
- Westcott, B. F. *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament*. Edinburgh, 1881.
- Whitaker, William. *Disputatio de sacra scriptura contra huius temporis Roman churchas*. Cantabriga, 1588; in translation, *A Disputation on Holy Scripture, against the Papists, especially Bellarmine and Stapleton*, trans. and ed. William Fitzgerald. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1849.
- Wisse, Maarten, et al., eds. *Scholasticism Reformed: Essays in Honour of Willem J. van Asselt*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Wollebius, Johannes. *Compendium theologiae christianae*. Basel, 1626.
- Wright, David F. "Exegesis and Patristic Authority." In *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, edited by W. J. T. Kirby et al., 117-132. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Zabarella, Jacobus. *De doctrinae ordine apologia*. Paulum Meietum, 1584.
- . *De methodis*. In *Opera logica*. Strasbourg: Lazarus Zetzner, 1608.
- Zanchius, Jerome. *De natura Dei*. In *Omnium operum theologicorum*, vol. 1. Geneva, 1619.
- . *De religione christiana fides*. Neustadt, 1601.
- Zeller, Eduard. *Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy*, edited by Wilhelm Nestle and translated by L. R. Palmer. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.

Zephyrinus. *Epistolae Decretaque*, in *PG* 10.

Zumkeller, A. "Die pseudoaugustinische Schrift 'De praedestinatione et gratia,' Inhalt, Überlieferung, Verfasserfrage und Nachwirkung." *Augustinianum*, 25/1-2 (1985): 539-563.