

Gyeongcheol Gwon

Christ and the Old Covenant

Francis Turretin (1623–1687) on Christ's
Suretyship under the Old Testament



Reformed Historical Theology

Edited by
Herman J. Selderhuis

in Co-operation with
Emidio Campi, Irene Dingel, Elsie Anne McKee,
Richard Muller, Risto Saarinen, and Carl Trueman

Volume 51

Gyeongcheol Gwon

Christ and the Old Covenant

Francis Turretin (1623–1687) on Christ's Suretyship
under the Old Testament

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek:
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data available online: <http://dnb.de>.

© 2019, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Theaterstraße 13, D-37073 Göttingen
All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means,
electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and
retrieval system, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Typesetting: 3w+p, Rimpär
Printed and bound: Hubert & Co. BuchPartner, Göttingen
Printed in the EU

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

ISSN 2197-1137
ISBN 978-3-647-51641-7

In loving memory of my father

Contents

Preface	11
Chapter 1 Introduction	13
1.1 Turretin and Reformed Scholasticism	19
Chapter 2 Turretin’s Life and His <i>Institutio</i>	25
2.1 Turretin’s <i>Institutio</i>	32
2.2 Conclusion	35
Chapter 3 Historical Views of Christ’s Suretyship under the Old Testament	37
3.1 From Roman Law to Early Orthodoxy	37
3.2 The Cocceian-Voetian Debate	43
3.3 Conclusion	52
Chapter 4 Turretin’s <i>Institutio</i> and Leydekker’s <i>Vis veritatis</i> on the Sponsor of the Covenant of Grace	53
4.1 The Structures of <i>Vis veritatis</i> and of the <i>Institutio</i> Compared	53
4.2 Leydekker’s and Turretin’s Varied Introductions	54
4.3 The Three Sections of <i>Vis veritatis</i> and of the <i>Institutio</i> Compared	56
4.3.1 The First Section, the Statement of the Question	56
4.3.2 The Second Section, Proofs	64
4.3.3 The Third Section, Sources of Solution	70
4.4 A Revision of Current Research	77
Chapter 5 Turretin’s <i>Institutio</i> and Leydekker’s <i>Vis veritatis</i> on the Status of the Old Testament Fathers	81
5.1 Reasons for the Fathers’ Absolute Deliverance from <i>reatus</i>	82
5.2 Scriptural Evidence in the <i>fontes solutionum</i> , the Third Section	84
5.2.1 Romans 3:25	84

5.2.2 <i>Jeremiah 31:33–34</i>	85
5.2.3 Hebrews 10:18	87
5.2.4 Hebrews 10:1–3	88
5.2.5 Zechariah 3:1	90
5.3 Salvation in the Legal Economy	90
5.4 Discontinuities between Turretin’s <i>Institutio</i> and Leydekker’s <i>Vis veritatis</i>	92
5.5 Conclusion	98
Chapter 6 Christ’s Suretyship and Satisfaction: Turretin’s <i>De satisfactione Christi</i>	101
6.1 Grotius’s <i>Defense of the Catholic Faith</i>	101
6.2 <i>De satisfactione Christi</i> : An Overview	106
6.2.1 Necessity	106
6.2.2 Reality	109
6.2.3 Perfection	111
6.3 Leydekker’s Use of <i>De satisfactione Christi</i>	112
6.3.1 Christ’s sponson	112
6.3.2 Isaiah 53 and the imputation of sins to Christ	113
6.3.3 The ceremonial law and the fathers	114
6.3.4 Forgiveness in the Old Testament	115
6.4 Conclusion	118
Chapter 7 Christ and the Old Testament	119
7.1 <i>Le vray autel des chrétiens</i>	121
7.2 <i>Ten Miscellaneous Disputations</i>	124
7.3 The Later Collection of Sermons	127
7.4 Conclusion	129
Chapter 8 Conclusions	131
8.1 A Summary of the Argument	131
8.2 Corollaries	132
8.3 Suggestions for Further Research	134
Appendix The Contents of Leydekker’s <i>Vis Veritatis</i>	137
Index Controversiarum	137
LIBER PRIMUS De Foedere Gratiae & Testamento Dei	137
LIBER SECUNDUS De Sponsore & Sponsione Foederis Gratiae.	138
LIBER TERTIUS De Natura Veteris Testamenti	139
LIBER QUARTUS De Lege Dei	140

LIBER QUINTUS De Statu Patrum Sub V. Testamento	141
Bibliography	147
1. Primary Sources	147
1.1 Works by Francis Turretin	147
1.2 Other Primary Sources	147
2. Secondary Sources	150
Index	159

Preface

There is no scholarly consensus on the nature of the Mosaic law and its role in the history of redemption. To what extent did the Mosaic law recapitulate the covenant of works? How were the people of God saved under the legal economy? How did Christ reveal himself to his people before the incarnation? These are the key questions that should be answered when one situates the Mosaic law within the framework of covenant theology.

It is little known today that the Reformed orthodox in the seventeenth century already debated over these questions. Johannes Cocceius (1603–1669) and his followers maintained that the Mosaic law inculcated in the Israelites the curse of the broken covenant between God and Adam and that Christ’s crucifixion benefited the faithful in the Old Testament not as much as it benefited the saints in the New. On the contrary, Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676) and his followers put the Mosaic law under the rubric of the covenant of grace and emphatically argued that the benefits of Christ’s sacrificial death were the same yesterday, today, and forevermore.

This study explores this intra-Reformed controversy through the eyes of Francis Turretin (1623–1687).¹ In the literature on Turretin, the Genevan theologian’s account of the Cocceian-Voetian debate over Christ’s suretyship under the Old Testament has been either only sketched or outright overlooked, so this book will show how Turretin adheres to the Voetianism of the Utrecht theologian Melchior Leydekker (who is also known as Leydecker or Leidekker, 1642–1721) while remaining conciliatory to the Cocceians. With Leydekker, Turretin argues that Christ’s suretyship in the Old Testament is identical to what it is in the New Testament. As the Father decrees that Christ is the most perfect and certain fulfiller of God’s promise, the ancients benefit from Christ’s sacrifice as much as do the saints in the New. The sins of the elect must be fully forgiven regardless of

1 Francis Turretin is also known as François Turretini in French, Franciscus Turretinus in Latin, and Francesco Turretini in Italian. As this study is written in English, we will use the name most popular among English speakers, “Francis Turretin.”

the progress of redemption in history, for the faithful both in the Old and the New are saved by the same grace of Christ, the *expromissor*. At the same time, not only does Turretin leave out some of the controversial issues between the two parties, but he also tends to neutralize Leydekker's acid criticism of the extreme Cocceian whose booklet *De state des gemeynden verschils over het onderscheyd der vergevinge der sonden onder het Oude en Nieuwe Testament* ("The state of the serious dispute over the distinction between the forgiveness of sins in the Old and New Testaments") greatly disturbed the Voetians in the Netherlands.² This conciliatory gesture indicates that Turretin does not consider Cocceianism his archenemy. His major treatise on atonement, *De satisfactione Christi*, aims to refute Socinianism and Roman Catholicism, rather than Cocceianism. Likewise, there is no hint of the Dutch dispute in his sermons. Except for his publications between the late 1670s and early 1680s, Turretin remains silent on the debate. Seen in this light, Turretin can be viewed as a moderate and peaceful Voetian.

This monograph is a slightly revised edition of my doctoral dissertation submitted to Westminster Theological Seminary in 2016. I give my heartfelt thanks to Dr. Herman J. Selderhuis for accepting this work as a part of his series on Reformed Historical Theology. I am indebted to my advisor, Dr. Jeffrey K. Jue, who liked my dissertation and encouraged me to publish it. I also want to thank Dr. Carl R. Trueman for directing me to Dr. Selderhuis and his series. I truly appreciate the constructive comments from my external reader, Dr. J. Mark Beach, whose helpful suggestions have been a guideline for my revision. I would like to express my appreciation to Saehan Presbyterian Church in Seoul, Korea, where I am currently serving as a youth pastor. Finally, I would like to extend my sincerest gratitude to my mother, who has taken care of me so that I can focus on revising my dissertation.

2 This translation of the booklet's title is Van Asselt's. See Van Asselt: 2003, 46. Although Van Asselt suggests that this booklet was written by Momma, we are not sure whether Momma actually wrote it.

Chapter 1 Introduction

According to Richard Muller, one of the most prominent researchers on seventeenth-century Reformed theology, Francis Turretin of Geneva is highly celebrated for his distinguished contribution to the development of Protestant scholasticism:

In Protestant circles, particularly among the Reformed, the name of Francis Turretin (1623–1687) is virtually synonymous with the term “Protestant scholasticism.” Turretin’s system, the *Institutio theologiae elencticae* (1679–1685), stands at the apex of the development of scholastic theology in the post-Reformation era, prior to the decline of Protestant system under the impact of rationalism, pietism, and the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century (2003a, 138).

Turretin’s scholasticism in his *magnum opus*, *Institutio*, is not only intended to meet the needs of seventeenth-century Reformed institutions of higher education, but it is also designed to refute various theological errors of the enemies of post-Reformation Reformed orthodoxy, including the Roman Catholics, the Arminians, and the Socinians (Muller: 2003a, 141–144).

Seen in this light, Turretin’s “Twelfth Topic: The Covenant of Grace and Its Twofold Economy in the Old and New Testaments” in his *Institutio*, particularly the issue of Christ’s suretyship under the Old Testament, may look unusual,¹ because he tends to be too descriptive and irenic to be polemical.² By way of example, in his treatment of Christ’s suretyship, Turretin quotes Johannes Cocceius (1603–1669) with great respect, while supporting Melchior Leydekker (1642–1721), the Utrecht theologian who follows Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676)

1 Here, the original Latin title is “De foedere gratiae et duplici ejus oeconomia in Veteri et Novo Testamento.”

2 Admittedly, Turretin is far from being irenic when he explains the covenant of nature, on which the Remonstrants and Socinians disagree with the Reformed theologians of his time. It is also true that he is polemical when he deals with the Socinians and Lutherans in the twelfth topic. But when he faces different arguments within the circle of Reformed theology, he tends to be irenic and respectful. For Turretin on the covenant of works, see Spencer: 1994, 71–91.

and is critical of Cocceius (Van Asselt: 1998, 308).³ Turretin's expression, "the very celebrated Cocceius," pays homage to Cocceius's covenant theology (12.9.9). At the same time, Turretin recommends that the reader study Leydekker's "solid and detailed" *Vis veritatis* (1682, 12.9.20),⁴ which is devoted to refuting the thoughts of Cocceius and his extreme pupil who wrote *De state des gemeynden verschils over het onderscheyd der vergevinge der sonden onder het Oude en Nieuwe Testament*.

How then can we explain the seemingly untoward coexistence of the two opposing parties in Turretin's treatment of Christ's sponson in the Old Testament? To put it another way, to what extent does Turretin adopt Leydekker's polemic against Cocceius and his pupils? In order to find an answer to this question, we need to read Turretin carefully in light of the heated debate between the Cocceians and the Voetians over the nature of Christ's guarantorship under the Old Testament. In spite of Voetius's objection to Cocceius's contention that the ancient saints' forgiveness was inferior to that of the faithful in the New Testament, some followers of Cocceius stretched their master's teaching and claimed that Christ's suretyship in the old days had been imperfect as long as the Lord of glory had not yet been crucified to purchase redemption for us. In doing so, the Cocceians named Christ in the Old Testament *fidejussor* (or *fideiussor*) and his forgiveness *πάρεσις*, but in the New *expromissor* and *ἄφεσις*, respectively.⁵ In opposition, serving the cause of Voetianism, Leydekker became one of the fiercest critics of that distinction. Being well versed in the works of both parties in the debate, Turretin gently corrects the advocates of *fidejussio* in his *Institutio* (1682, 12.9–10). He observes that it is not necessary to distinguish *fidejussio* from *expromissio*, but if we do make a distinction, the latter can explain Christ's sponson better than the former (1682, 12.9.4–5). Given his predilection for *expromissio*, it is not groundless to argue that Turretin is closer to the Voetians than to the Cocceians in the area of Christ's suretyship under the Old Testament.

Turretin's outlook on the controversy, however, has largely been overlooked. In spite of his comment on the Cocceian-Voetian debate over Christ's sponson, little attention has been given to his interaction with the Cocceian and Voetian theologians involved in the controversy. Beardslee's extensive work on Turretin,

3 Although Leydekker studied under Cocceius at Leiden, he did not shy away from criticizing Cocceius's interpretation of Deuteronomy 31. A more detailed biography of Leydekker can be found in Hoek: 2013, 36–78.

4 "Qui plura voluerit consultat Celeber. Leideckerum Theologum et Professorem Ultrajectinum, qui hoc argumentum fuse et solide exequitur, Lib. II. *Vis veritatis*, Cont. 1. et 2."

5 For definitions of these words and their original usages in Roman law, see chapter three of this study. In this case, the words, *fidejussio* and *πάρεσις* imply that Christ's taking up the sins of the elect under the Old Testament was conditional, whereas *expromissio* and *ἄφεσις* connote the absolute sort of substitution.

which claims that supernaturalism and rationalism pervade Turretin's scholastic orthodoxy (1956, 701), and Kennedy's monograph dedicated to Beardslee do not provide us with any analysis of Turretin on the Cocceian-Voetian debate (1989, 104–116),⁶ except for Beardslee's suggestion that there is room for "a study of the relationship of F. Turretin's theology to that of both Voetius and Cocceius, on the basis of their entire theology, not of a few formal doctrines" (1956, 724). The same lack of attention dominates Phillips's writing on the link between Turretin's prolegomena and his view of the Bible, as Phillips singles out Turretin for delimiting biblical inspiration to the fundamental articles of the faith at the expense of the "formalistic, abstract," and even mechanical view of verbal inerrancy upheld by American evangelicals (1986, 512, 776, 805–806).⁷ Jensen's work on the fundamental continuity between Calvin and Turretin on such doctrines as supralapsarianism, double predestination, definite atonement, and the inability of human will, also omits the subject at hand (1988, 266–269). Spencer's comparative study on Aquinas's and Turretin's views of the incarnation is no exception to this indifference, as the goal of his dissertation is to prove that scholasticism is far from being monolithic (1988, 250). Bruce's (2013) inquiry into Turretin's Thomistic affirmation of natural law (cf. Grabill: 2005, 261–279) and Vos's articles on the Scotistic interplay between the contingency and necessity of divine knowledge and will—or between absolute and ordained power—in Turretin's thought likewise do not address the controversy (1996, 114–122; 2010, 74–91). Eef Dekker, Beck, and Pleizier (2010), in line with Vos, underline the way that Turretin makes room for human choice. According to them, Turretin avoids determinism by adopting what is so-called synchronic contingency in the tenth *locus* of the *Institutio*. In the course of their argument, however, they do not pay attention to Turretin's view of Christ's suretyship under the Old Testament.⁸ This silence marks many other theologians' books. Willem Dekker, who is critical of Turretin's view of the covenant that underpins the separation between God's essence and his relationality, concludes that Turretin's scheme diminishes divine power and freedom (2008, 91–92, 308). In doing so, however, he does not expound on Turretin's attitude toward Cocceius, the champion of covenant theology. Crisp leaves out Turretin's view of Christ's suretyship when he raises objections to Turretin's argument for the necessity of Christ's incarnation for human salvation (2010, 69–91). Alexander's (1848), Bolognesi's (1987), and Roberts's (2008) introductions to Turretin's life and thoughts are too general to

6 Kennedy contrasts Turretin's pessimistic view of the future with Hodge's optimistic outlook of it. He writes, "There seems to be both more optimism and less expectation of the imminent return of Christ in Hodge than in Turretin." Kennedy: 1989, 111.

7 In contrast, Allison, Rogers, and McKim fault Turretin for the formalization of the doctrine of biblical inerrancy. See Allison: 1958, 8; Rogers and McKim: 1979, 176.

8 For the concept of synchronic contingency, see Scotus: 1994, 150–151, 168–169.

cover Turretin's view of the intra-Reformed debate, whereas Maris's article is too specific to cover it, as he limits his analysis to the fifteenth *locus* of Turretin's *Institutio* (1997, 63–77). Meijering's book, which highlights Turretin's indebtedness to the early church fathers—particularly in such areas as theology proper and Christology—has little to do with our subject, as Turretin does not have reference to any of the fathers while dealing with the Cocceian-Voetian debate (1991, 17). Unlike the works listed above, Wallace's article on Turretin's covenant theology illuminates Turretin's moderate approach to various intra-Reformed debates, including the Cocceian-Voetian controversy over the Sabbath and remission (2002, 176–178). Nevertheless, it falls short of informing the reader of the details of the Dutch controversy over Christ's suretyship. Similarly, Inman's dissertation gives us an overview of Turretin's description of Christ as "surety and head" in the twelfth *locus* of the *Institutio*, but it excludes the Cocceian-Voetian debate, as Inman is concerned mainly with defending his thesis that theology proper gives thematic cohesion to Turretin's seemingly independent *loci* (2004, 21, 280–290).

Despite this scarcity of research, some scholars acknowledge our subject at least in passing, but even those who do it fail to reach a consensus on Turretin's relation to the seventeenth-century debate. Ignoring his appreciation for Leydekker's polemic against Cocceianism, Good assumes that Turretin "was an adherent of the new and lower Calvinism of Cocceianism, which he heard in the university in Holland" (1913, 159). In contrast, Bavinck grasps that Turretin's idea of Christ's guaranteeing the efficacy of the future redemption for the faithful in the Old Testament is pitted against Cocceius's. Bavinck first makes sure that the orthodox, including Cocceius, commonly held to the scriptural teaching that "in the pact of salvation Christ had from all eternity become the guarantor, not of God to us [...], but of us before God" (2006, 213). Then, he moves on to observe that for Voetius, Leydekker, Maastricht, and Turretin, Christ's taking up the sins of the elect under the Old Testament in the *pactum salutis* was absolute, whereas for Cocceius, Wittichius, Allinga, Van Til, d'Outrein, Perizonius, it was conditional.

From the jurists...the disputants derived the distinction between a *fideiussor* (one who gives bail in advance, a guarantor) and an *expromissor* (one who promises to pay for another), and dealt with the question whether in the "pact of salvation" Christ took the sins of the Old Testament elect upon himself "conditionally" or "absolutely." The former was the position of Cocceius, Wittichius, Allinga, Van Til, d'Outrein, Perizonius, and others; the latter that of Leydekker, Turretin, Maastricht, Voetius, and others (Bavinck: 2006, 213–214).

Here, Bavinck's conclusion that Turretin prefers *expromissor* to *fideiussor* is valid. At the same time, it is important to remember that Turretin and Leydekker do not always strictly distinguish a *fideiussor* from an *expromissor* (e. g. Turretin:

1682, 12.9.4; Leydekker: 1679, a:74, 84).⁹ Moreover, Bavinck does not delve into the reason that the disagreement between Cocceius and Leydekker cannot prevent Turretin from quoting Cocceius's writing with respect while endorsing Leydekker's anti-Cocceian book, *Vis veritatis* (e.g. Turretin: 1682, 12.9.9; 12.9.20). Even though Turretin shares Leydekker's criticism of Cocceius, Turretin tends to be softer than Leydekker in terms of his polemic.¹⁰

In line with Bavinck, J. Mark Beach aligns Turretin with the Voetians (2007, 285).¹¹ While acknowledging the inadequacy of the legal terms in explaining Christ's suretyship, Turretin "nonetheless robustly rejects *fidejussor* and by comparison stoutly defends the idea of *expromissor*" (2007, 279) as his contemporary Reformed theologians commonly do (2007, 275). Therefore, in refutation of Cocceius's distinction between the remission of sins under the Old Testament (*πάρεσις*) and that under the New Testament (*ἀφεσις*), Turretin asserts that Christ, the perfect and absolute *expromissor*, was the reason that "the fathers were truly freed from the punishments" (2007, 275–276). This conclusion can be supported by Isa 53:5–6, Ps 40:7–8, and Rev 13:8 (2007, 276–277). To meet God's righteous requirement, Christ, the *expromissor*, whose "sure payment for sins" were foreknown by God, is needed (2007, 277). Moreover, Christ's suretyship is closer to that of *expromissio* than to that of *fidejussio* in that the latter "cannot assure a creditor that payment will actually be made by the *fidejussor* himself" (2007, 278). If a debtor's guarantor is a *fidejussor*, rather than an *expromissor*, the debtor himself may be under further obligation (2007, 278). Finally, given that an *expromissor* is the only one by whom all the debt is paid back in place of the original debtor, Christ the surety is not a *fidejussor*, but an *expromissor* (2007, 278–279). Having summarized Turretin's argument in favor of Christ as an *expromissor*, Beach concludes that Van Asselt, who casts doubt on the identity of Turretin's thought with Leydekker's on this issue, may underestimate Turretin's refutation of *fidejussio* (2007, 279). Even though Turretin is cautious in parsing out the continuities and discontinuities between the Old and the New Testaments, he is clearly leaning towards the Voetian side of the debate, not the Cocceian, "for he concludes his discussion by commending Melchior Leydekker's work, saying that he engages the subject 'fully and solidly'" (2007, 285).

9 "Nec hic sollicite distinguendum putamus inter Fidejussorem et Expromissorem" (Turretin: 1682, 12.9.4; Leydekker: 1679, a:74, 84).

10 Whereas the twelfth *locus* of Turretin's *Institutio* does not explicitly mention the name of Cocceius except for 12.9.9. Leydekker's *Vis veritatis* is full of anti-Cocceian arguments. For instance, the index for *liber 2, controversia 4, sectio 1* even reads, "[...] collusionem quandam D. Cocceji cum Antinomis, Pontif., Socin., Remonst., Pelagianis, &c."

11 Beach writes, "[...] although Turretin wants to be circumspect in how he treats this matter [the differences between the Old and New Testaments], his sympathies are clearly allied with the Voetian side of the debate, for he concludes his discussion by commending Melchior Leydekker's work [...]."

Although Beach's point is solid and is well founded on the primary source, he does not provide the reader with a thorough analysis of Turretin's concept of Christ's suretyship under the Old Testament in the context of Leydekker's *Vis veritatis*, let alone the difference in tone between them.

From the perspective of Van Asselt, however, Bavinck and Beach may somewhat overstate Turretin's leaning toward Voetianism. Of course, unlike Good, Van Asselt does not think that Turretin is Cocceian. Nevertheless, Van Asselt suggests that it is debatable whether Turretin's thought on the topic parallels that of Leydekker in every way (2003, 51). In his article on Leydekker's *Filius Dei sponsor*, he displays Leydekker's thought on Christ's suretyship in comparison with Turretin's (2003, 44). In doing so, Van Asselt points out that Leydekker, having lopped off some of Turretin's qualifications, depicts Turretin as his ally in refusing the *fidejussio* of Cocceianism (2003, 51). According to Van Asselt, Leydekker's interpretation of Turretin is mostly correct, because there is no question that Turretin prefers *expromissio* to *fidejussio* (2003, 51). At the same time, Van Asselt emphasizes Turretin's statement that "Christ's *sponsio* could not be called an *expromissio* in every sense" (2003, 51). Leydekker fails to do full justice to this qualifier, by which Turretin means that he "did not regard the terms *fideiussio* and *expromissio* as suitable for a discussion of Christ's suretyship," knowing that Christ's suretyship under the Old Testament cannot be fully elucidated by the terms borrowed from civil law (2003, 51). Van Asselt's reading, however, tends to exaggerate Turretin's break with Leydekker, and it thereby tones down Turretin's anti-Cocceian polemic. Our study will show that neither Turretin nor Leydekker draw absolutely on civil law when they explicate Christ's suretyship. Although it is true that Turretin's and Leydekker's writings on the debate are not monolithic, they demarcate the border of *fidejussio* and *expromissio* more often than not.

Having outlined scholars' varied interpretation on the extent of Turretin's leaning toward the Voetian assessment of the two alleged modes of Christ's suretyship in redemptive history, we can realize the need for further research into Turretin's take on the Cocceian–Voetian debate over Christ's suretyship under the Old Testament. It is especially important to compare and contrast Turretin's treatment of the Dutch debate with that of Leydekker, as the latter's *Vis veritatis* is highly recommended by Turretin for gaining in-depth knowledge on the debate. By paralleling Turretin and Leydekker on this intra-Reformed controversy, the following thesis will be substantiated: there is a strong bond between the two theologians when it comes to their rebuttal of the Cocceian proposal, but Turretin tends to be less militant than Leydekker in terms of his polemic against the erring Cocceians.

1.1 Turretin and Reformed Scholasticism

According to Beardslee, Turretin's theology is lifeless, and this lack of vitality has something to do with Turretin's arid scholasticism and rationalism (1956, 174, 313, 721). He adds, "F. Turretin's system, awaiting the breath of life, is dust, but not bad dust" (1956, 315). This disparaging remark about Turretin reflects the popular prejudice of the older scholarship against seventeenth-century Reformed theology.¹² Bizer claims that already in the era of early orthodoxy, the orthodox, especially Beza and Ursinus, manifested their rationalistic bents (1963, 6, 12, 25). Armstrong contends that Reformed scholasticism not only distorted Calvin's teaching, but also transformed orthodoxy into a deductive, anthropocentric, and predestination-centered system of theology (1969, 136–137). Maris maintains that for Turretin, who is scholastic, reason and philosophy have priority over the Bible and church (1997, 76–77).¹³

Unfortunately, the older literature has failed to grasp that for the seventeenth-century Reformed orthodox, scholasticism had more to do with methodology than philosophy (Muller: 2000, 45; Trueman: 2004, 228–229). As Muller writes, "'Scholastic' indicates an academic style and method of discourse, not a particular theology or philosophy" (2003b, 1:30).¹⁴ It was this mistake—equating scholasticism with rationalism—that more or less plagued the old scholarship (Muller: 2003b, 1:29).

Understanding scholasticism as a pejorative term is also bound up with the assumption that there is a radical break between Calvin and the Calvinists. Until recently, a number of researchers tended to accentuate this discontinuity mainly because they thought that Calvin was not scholastic, whereas the seventeenth-century Reformed orthodox theologians were (cf. e.g. Armstrong: 1969, 32; Hall: 1966, 25–29).¹⁵ According to this view, by appropriating scholasticism, the post-

12 In this study, "Reformed orthodoxy" and "Reformed scholasticism" commonly refer to the seventeenth-century Reformed theology upheld and developed by such a figure as Turretin. This does not mean, however, that there is no difference between the two words, scholasticism and orthodoxy. According to Muller, orthodoxy is a broader term than scholasticism: "The term scholasticism has a narrower reference than the term orthodoxy: it well describes the technical and academic side of this process of the institutionalization and professionalization of Protestant doctrine in the universities of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries" (Muller: 2003, 1:34).

13 In contrast, Bolognesi questions the legitimacy of reducing Turretin to one of the scholastics, as Turretin was a serious student of the Bible as much as the Reformers were. See Bolognesi: 1987, 143.

14 Similarly, Steinmetz writes, "Scholastic theology was, as the name implies, theology appropriate to a school. If, as Calvin argued, the church was a school as well as a nurturing mother, then it was essential to craft a theology appropriate to it" (1999, 28).

15 In contrast to Armstrong and Hall, Jensen argues for the fundamental continuity between

Reformation Reformed theologians degenerated from Calvin's non-speculative theology into the rationalistic and deductive system of dogma (Van Asselt and Dekker: 2001, 29). For instance, Rogers and McKim claim, "Turretin radically departed from the approach of Calvin by resting belief in the authority of Scripture on rational proofs of its inspiration and inerrancy" (1979, 176). "Turretin," they continue, "followed the Aristoelian-Thomistic method of placing reason before faith. The arguments Turretin used in his attempt to demonstrate the authority of the Bible were the same type as those used by Thomas Aquinas and the scholastic tradition" (1979, 176). In other words,

Reformed scholasticism reached its full flowering in the theology of Francis Turretin... Turretin chose the theological method of Thomas Aquinas's *Summa* as the pattern for his theology. In developing his doctrine of Scripture, Turretin quoted 175 authorities but did not mention Calvin. Scripture was the formal principle on which he founded a scientific, systematic theology... No trace of Calvin's concept of accommodation was to be found in Turretin's work (1979, 188).

This radical "discontinuity theory," which is predicated on an inadequate definition of scholasticism, is effectively refuted by Muller (Van Asselt and Dekker: 2001, 29). First, he points out that Calvin's theology was not as "overtly antagonistic to medieval scholasticism" as many scholars assume (Muller: 2000, 52). In other words, Calvin did not reject scholasticism in general. Rather, in many cases, what Calvin really had in mind when he expressed his distaste for scholasticism was the Sorbonne theologians, his scholastic opponents. Muller proves this point by showing that Calvin's 1560 French *Institutes* substituted "*théologiens Sorboniques*" for the "*scholastici*" found in the 1559 Latin *Institutes* twelve times out of twenty-six (2000, 50).

Furthermore, to label Calvin scholastic is not an oxymoron because scholasticism as a method had existed and gradually developed from the Middle Ages through the Reformation to the seventeenth century (Van Asselt and Dekker: 2001, 30–31; Muller: 2003b, 1:35–36). As Muller writes, "Scholasticism and Aristotelianism must not be understood as static or as purely medieval phenomena, as if neither underwent a historical development that extended through the sixteenth into the seventeenth century" (2003a, 71). Therefore, finding scholastic elements in the writings of Calvin does not necessarily indicate that his version of scholasticism is the same as that of Thomas Aquinas in every way (Muller: 2003b, 1:35; cf. Spencer: 1988, 89–96, 261). Having in mind this diversity, there is more chance that we can find scholastic aspects of Calvin's writings. In the same way, Turretin's scholasticism does not prevent him from being more exegetical and less philosophical than Aquinas in his treatment of the incarnation (Spencer:

Calvin and Turretin in the area of soteriology. See Jensen: 1988, 9. 76. 164; cf. Keizer: 1900, 234–235.

1988, 260). As Spencer notes, “while both [Aquinas and Turretin] can be identified as scholastics, any definition of that phenomenon must have considerable flexibility in order to include both men” (1988, 261).

It is also important to note that just as there is diversity within scholasticism, humanism is also far from being monolithic. As humanism is mainly about “literary ornaments,” it cannot replace scholasticism, and therefore, in most cases humanists are eclectic (Kristella: 1961, 17–21, 43). This eclecticism increases the chance of symbiosis of scholasticism and humanism.¹⁶ We can find this coexistence from Calvin’s exegetical writings. As Steinmetz shows, sometimes Calvin resorts to medieval, scholastic distinctions to harmonize seemingly contradictory passages in the Bible, either wittingly or unwittingly (1995, 40–52).¹⁷ At the same time, Calvin’s exegetical method bears resemblance to his humanistic commentary on Seneca’s *De Clementia*, in that Calvin aims for “the faithful exposition—and contemporary application—of the original text” (Spencer: 1988, 83). Seen in this light, it is not groundless to argue that Calvin has both humanistic and scholastic traits in his writings. Thus, in spite of his occasional antipathy toward scholasticism, one should avoid depicting Calvin as a purely anti-scholastic theologian. Again, Turretin resembles this eclectic approach of Calvin in that he is indebted to Renaissance jurors’ contribution to the study of Roman law in refuting the Cocceian separation between *fidejussio* and *expromissio* (1682, 12.9.18).¹⁸

Given that the relationship between Calvin and scholasticism is far more complicated and nuanced than it appears, the scholasticism of seventeenth-century Reformed orthodoxy does not necessarily indicate “a fatal deviation” from the theology of the Genevan Reformer (Van Asselt and Dekker: 2001, 29). Because of this, the difference between Calvin and his theological descendants should not be exaggerated. Just as the scholastic aspect of Calvin has little to do with speculative reasonings, Turretin’s scholasticism is far from leading him to

16 Rummel looks askance at Kristella’s idea of the peaceful coexistence of humanism and scholasticism in 1995, 17–18. According to Rummel, Kristella’s thesis is valid for the early Renaissance, but not for the period of Erasmus and Luther. Rummel’s proposal, however, is unable to explain scholastic aspects of Calvin, not to mention those of Melanchthon, who is viewed by Rummel as the embodiment of Christian humanism. Rummel’s opinion also stands in opposition to some researchers’ observation that the Protestant scholastics are indebted to Melanchthon. By way of example, Platt points out the influence of Melanchthon’s doctrine of God on Ursinus and Cocceius. Furthermore, according to Platt, neither Luther nor Melanchthon cease to be scholastic—as long as we define scholasticism as a scholarly method serving higher education—in their instruction at the University of Wittenburg. See Platt: 1982, 33, 240. For Luther’s scholasticism, see Bagchi: 1999, 3–15.

17 Steinmetz shows that Calvin unwittingly makes the same distinction of *potentia absoluta* and *potentia ordinata* as nominalists. According to Beck, the presence of this scholastic distinction in Calvin was already acknowledged by Voetius. See Beck: 2011, 132.

18 See Turretin, *Institutio* 12.9.18. We will have a more detailed look at this in chapter 4.

rationalism, for he gives little room for natural theology.¹⁹ Indeed, just as Calvin affirms both the seed of religion and the total depravity of the human (1960, 1.4.1), Turretin argues that the natural knowledge of God exists, but it is “most greatly disturbed in corrupted man” (1679, 1.2.7). Therefore, although it is true that Turretin is more scholastic than his Genevan predecessor in terms of his methodology, on a deeper level, we can still find a fundamental continuity between them.

The matter of continuity and discontinuity between Calvin and the Reformed orthodox regarding scholasticism also sheds light on the Voetius–Cocceius controversy. In the past, a number of scholars thought that in this debate Cocceius was anti-scholastic whereas Voetius was scholastic (Van Asselt: 2001a, 228). For instance, Van den Berg alleges that “in terms of their methodology, Voetius stood in the line of scholasticism, whereas in Cocceius [...] the anti-scholastic element was dominant” (1994, 17–18).²⁰ Graafland similarly claims that Voetian dogmatics was faithful to the tradition of Aristotelian, deductive, theocentric structure of systematic theology that the orthodox upheld, while Cocceius abandoned “scholastic philosophy” (1994, 30–31).²¹ In the same vein, Kuiper states, “Cocceius attempted to rescue theology from scholastic spirit and from the bondage of Aristotelian philosophy” (1900, 202).²² On the other hand, Van Asselt rightly observes, “If we take into account the result of recent research on scholasticism in general, and Reformed scholasticism in particular, then our opinion on Cocceius’s relationship to scholasticism needs radical revision” (2001, 230; cf. Hoek: 2013, 59–60). According to Van Asselt, “Scholastic elements are definitely present in Cocceius’s writings, especially in his doctrine of God, as explained in his main systematic work, the *Summa theologiae ex Scripturis repetita* (1662) and in some parts of his doctrine of covenant” (2001, 229).²³

19 According to Jue, for Turretin, “natural theology served no purpose but to leave individuals inexcusable in their sins.” (2007, 181); cf. Rehnman: 2002, 255–269.

20 “Methodisch stond Voetius in de lijn van de scholastiek, terwijl bij Cocceus toch [...] het anti-scholastieke element overheerst.”

21 “De Voetiaanse dogmatiek houdt dus het traditionele spoor. Dat betekent dat men aansluit bij wat al direct na de Reformatie aan geloofssystematiek was gegeven, o. a. door Theodorus Beza, Hieronymus Zanchius, en later door Granciscus Gomarus, Johannes Maccovius, Samuel Maresius, enz. In houdelijk ziet deze er zo uit dat men een strak deductief–theocentrische structuur invoert; die in grote mate wordt beheerst door een aristotelisch–causaal denkpaatje, waarin de eeuwige, goddelijke predestinatie een, ik zeg niet het en nog minder het enige, maar wel een structuur–bepalend centrum vormt [...] Nu had Cocceus zelf de scholastieke filosofie afgezworen, omdat hij haar nadelige invloed had opgemerkt in de traditionele geloofsbezinning.”

22 “Cocceus trachtte de theologie te verlossen van den schoolschen geest en de banden der Aristotelische wijsbegeerte.”

23 It is remarkable that it was this *Summa theologiae* that was cited by Turretin in his *Institutio* 12.9.9.

Moreover, it is anachronistic to depict Cocceius as an anti-scholastic biblical theologian, given that the distinction between biblical theology and systematic theology started with Johann Philipp Gabler (1753–1826) (Van Asselt: 2001a, 229). Of course, it is true that Cocceius rejected “certain extreme forms of scholasticism as found in the writings of medieval schoolmen and Counter Reformation theologians,” mainly because of their content: semi-pelagianism (Van Asselt: 2001a, 229). But if scholasticism should be defined as methodology, as we have seen above, then Cocceius’s rejection of certain forms of scholasticism does not necessarily mean that he tried to eliminate every trace of scholasticism from his theology, just as Calvin’s antipathy toward *scholastici* is different from the wholesale rejection of scholasticism. In fact, if scholastic exegesis is characterized by setting up distinctions and taking an academic approach to the biblical text (Knapp: 2013, 539–540),²⁴ Cocceius’s distinction between two sorts of forgiveness, which is based on his exegesis of Romans 3:25, is no less scholastic than Voetius’s refutation to this distinction presented in the *Selectarum disputationum* (Cocceius: “Moreh nebochim,” §1–126; Voetius: 1669, 5:301–382). Cocceius’s appeal to Beza is especially illuminating, as he does not assume a break between Beza, who is scholastic, and himself (“Moreh nebochim,” §27–28). Thus, it is untenable to reduce the Cocceius-Voetius debate to the conflict between anti-scholasticism and scholasticism.

Having refuted the depiction of Cocceius as an anti-scholastic biblical theologian, we conclude that Turretin’s scholasticism has little to do with his choosing the Voetian side of the debate. Just as Turretin and Voetius are scholastic, Cocceius is also scholastic. Thus, we need to find reasons other than scholasticism to explain Turretin’s support of the Voetians, particularly Leydekker. In order to achieve this goal, more detailed attention should be given to Turretin’s context. Hence, in the next chapter, we will investigate Turretin’s background, so that we may figure out the reason for Turretin’s moderate Voetianism. Turretin’s Geneva suffered more from the menace of Rome than from the Cocceians in the late seventeenth century. This situation, as well as Turretin’s way of explaining any given subject in the *Institutio* with “brevity and clarity” (*brevitate et perspicuitate*) (1847, 1:xxv), led Turretin to simplify a number of anti-Cocceian points made by Leydekker.

On the other hand, as we will argue in chapter 3, it was natural for Leydekker than for Turretin to take the Cocceian-Voetian debate more seriously, because the controversy raged in Leydekker’s hometown. Being indebted to the development of covenant theology and Roman law, the Cocceians put their own spin on the two

24 According to Knapp, such characteristics of Puritan exegesis as “the use of finely construed distinctions and definitions” and of “academic” or “pedagogical” interest betray the influence of scholasticism on the Puritans.

synonymous terms for surety, *fidejussio* and *expromissio*. By distinguishing these words, some of the Cocceians attempted to further Cocceius's insight that the remission of the Old Testament is different from that of the New. The distinction of these words was staunchly defended by the anonymous author whose publication of *De state* greatly increased the tension between the Cocceians and the Voetians.

Chapters 4 through 7 lie at the heart of this book. In chapter 4 we will compare Turretin's *Institutio*, 12.9.1–20 to Leydekker's *Vis vertatis*, book 2, *controversia* 1–2. Chapter 5 will cover the *Institutio*, 12.10.1–32 and the fifth book of the *Vis vertatis*. Through these comparisons, we will show how Turretin adopts, summarizes, and dilutes Leydekker's personal or *ad hominem* arguments against the unidentified author of the booklet. The theologians share a number of points, such as the pronouncement of divine decree for Christ's suretyship as *expromissio*, the use of the distinction between the pecuniary and penal debts, and the case for the Old Testament saints' participation in the same forgiveness that the New Testament believers enjoy. In fact, all major points made by Leydekker are adopted by Turretin. More often than not, they even appeal to the same scriptural text to justify their views. Nevertheless, in the course of his argument, Turretin wants to interact with the Cocceians in general, including Heidanus, one of his Cocceian friends, whereas Leydekker is preoccupied with antagonizing the author of *De state*. In chapter 6, we will test the validity of Leydekker's statement that Turretin's *De satisfacione Christi* supports the Voetian side of the debate. Placing Turretin's work in the context of Grotius's anti-Socinian book on Christ's satisfaction, we will assert that Turretin primarily has in mind Socinianism rather than Cocceianism in his book. Although it is true that a number of anti-Cocceian arguments find their origin in the orthodox's refutation of Socinianism, Turretin's *De satisfacione Christi* was written too early to have in mind the Cocceian innovation. We will investigate Turretin's sermons and his *Decas disputationum miscellanearum* in chapter 7 and prove that Turretin's interest in the Dutch debate over Christ's suretyship was short-lived and hardly reflected in his sermons. Turretin's relatively extensive account of the Old Testament saints' communion with Christ in some of the *Decas disputationum miscellanearum* had marked the beginning of this interest, which would quickly fade once the debate was covered in the second volume of the *Institutio* in 1682. Lastly, we will state the conclusion of this study in chapter 8, along with some suggestions for further inquiry.

Chapter 2

Turretin's Life and His *Institutio*

Turretin's role in the formulation of the Helvetic Formula Consensus is relatively well-known.¹ However, little is known about the historical background that shaped his view of the Dutch debate on Christ's suretyship under the Old Testament. This is partially because there arose no great disturbance about the intra-Reformed debate in Turretin's Geneva. Nevertheless, given that Turretin's context must have influenced his treatment of the Cocceian-Voetian debate at least to a certain extent, it is important to take a look at his life.

Francis Turretin was born in 1623 to Benedict Turretin (1588–1631), who was a Genevan delegate to the Synod of Alès and professor of theology at the Geneva Academy.² Having lost his father at an early age, the young Turretin learned theology under Jean Diodati, Theodore Tronchin, and the successor of Benedict, Frederic Spanheim. Upon graduation in 1644 he went abroad to study further, first to Leiden, where under the supervision of his former teacher, Spanheim, he publicly defended his theses *De verbo Dei scripto* (On the Written Word of God). Although Johannes Cocceius was in Franeker at that time, Turretin might have heard about him in Leiden, given that in several years Cocceius was nominated as the successor to Spanheim. Then Turretin moved to Utrecht to meet Voetius (1589–1676) and Johannes Hoornbeek (1617–1666). There is a chance that this Utrecht experience played a latent role in Turretin's later leaning toward Voetianism in the area of Christ's suretyship. The young Genevan also spent some time at such places as Saumur, Paris, Montauban, and Nimes, encountering a number of supporters of the Saumur Academy and Amyraldianism, including Moïse Amyraut (1596–1664) himself.³ This grand tour may have equipped Tur-

1 De Budé: 1871, 143–165; Keizer: 1900, 96–200, 165–324; Beardslee: 1956, 1–72; Klauber: 1990, 103–123; Klauber: 1994, 25–35; Dennison: 1997, 3:639–658; Dennison: 1999, 244–255; Phillips: 1998, 77–92; Wallace: 2002, 155–162, 173–176; Moser: 2013, 216–221.

2 For the Synod of Alès, see Dennison: 1997, 3:641–642. It was the French national synod that adopted the Canons of Dordt.

3 The Saumur Academy, which was located in western France, was famous especially for its three professors: Louis Cappel (1585–1658), Josué de la Place (?–1655), and Moïse Amyraut. Cappel