Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Autopistia : the self-convincing authority of scripture in reformed theology

Belt, H. van der

Citation
Belt, H. van der. (2006, October 4). *Autopistia : the self-convincing authority of scripture in reformed theology*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4582

Version:	Corrected Publisher's Version
License:	Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4582

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

4 Reformed Orthodoxy

The period of Reformed orthodoxy extends from the Reformation to the time that liberal theology became predominant in the European churches and universities. During the period the Lutheran, Reformed, and Anglican churches were the official churches in Protestant countries and religious polemics between Catholicism and Protestantism formed an integral part of the intense political strife that gave birth to modern Europe.

Reformed orthodoxy is usually divided into three periods that represent three different stages; there is no watershed between these periods and it is difficult to determine exact dates. During the period of "early orthodoxy" the confessional and doctrinal codifications of Reformed theology took place. This period is characterized by polemics against the Counter-Reformation; it starts with the death of the second-generation Reformers (around 1565) and ends in the first decades of the seventeenth century.[1] The international Reformed Synod of Dort (1618-1619) is a useful milestone, because this synod codified Reformed soteriology.[2] The second period, called "high orthodoxy," is the time in which the all-embracing Reformed theological systems were developed; scholasticism became the dominant scholarly method at the Protestant theological faculties in Europe. It is difficult to give an exact date for the end of the second period, but mostly the change of the centuries is taken as the landmark. In the eighteenth century, the period of "late orthodoxy," the character of orthodoxy changed due to confrontation with the intellectual climate of the early Enlightenment. In this chapter we will focus on the first two periods because they turned out to be the most interesting for the development of the *autopistia* of Scripture.[3] In the period of late orthodoxy the theological system was mostly reproduced in the hope of maintaining the correct statements of earlier generations.[4] Moreover, it was hard to find examples of the use of term αὐτόπιστος in the representative theological works of this period.[5]

---

1 Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 30-32. For the division of early, high, and late orthodoxy, Muller refers to Weber, *Grundlagen der Dogmatik* 1, 140-148.

2 The termination of the three periods is from W.J. Van Asselt. W.J. Van Asselt and P.L. Rouwendal, eds., *Inleiding in de gereformeerde scholastiek*, Zoetermeer 1998, 114. At this point Van Asselt does not follow Muller who distinguishes two phases of early orthodoxy (ca. 1565-1618 and 1618-1640). Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 94. Cf. Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 31. 94.

3 We use the term "Reformed orthodoxy" rather than "Reformed scholasticism" because "scholasticism" stands for a method. "Orthodoxy" in this chapter has a historical and not a normative meaning. Cf. R.A. Muller, 'The Problem of Protestant Scholasticism: A Review and Definition,' in *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise*, ed. W.J. Van Asselt and E. Dekker, Grand Rapids 2001, 45-64, 50-53.

4 Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 84.

5 The term αὐτόπιστος is not used by Bernard De Moor (1709-1780) in his doctrine of Scripture in his extensive commentary on the theological compendium of his teacher John À Marck (1656-1731). B. De Moor, *Commentarius perpetuus in Johannis Marckii Compendium theologiæ Christianæ didactico-elencticum*, Leiden 1761-1778, 7 vol. He brought nearly all the substantial material together from the major dogmatic works of his predecessors in Utrecht and Leiden. It is called the "tomb monument" of Reformed orthodoxy. Van Asselt and Rouwendal, *Inleiding*, 150. Αὐτόπιστος is not used by John À Marck either. J. À Marck, *Compendium theologiae Christianae didactico elenchticum*, 2nd ed., Groningen 1690.

The aim of this study is not to give a complete survey of the use of the term, but to trace its use in the history of Reformed theology and to draw some theological conclusions from the use and meaning of αὐτόπιστος. This cross-section is important, because the *autopistia* of Scripture is essential for the ongoing quest for certainty in Protestant theology.[6] We have chosen to analyze the use and meaning of the term αὐτόπιστος and its derivatives in the context of four aspects in the theological development:

1. The Reformed concept of the self-convincing character of Scripture was influenced by the developing debate between early Reformed orthodoxy and the Catholicism of the Counter-Reformation. We will look at the use of αὐτόπιστος in this polemical context and especially at the theology of William Whitaker (4.2).
2. During the period of early orthodoxy Reformed theology was institutionalized at the universities; therefore we will study the *autopistia* of Scripture in the context of this academic education. We will study this aspect from the theology of the Leiden professor Franciscus Junius (4.3). As we will see the terms *externum* and *internum* become more and more important in the development of the relationship between *autopistia* and *testimonium*; therefore we will discuss the word-pair in a separate paragraph (4.4).
3. The period of high orthodoxy was characterized by increasing internal Protestant polemics. We will trace how αὐτόπιστος was used in the Arminian Controversy (4.5). Another conflict regarded textual criticism and we will study the position of Francis Turretin in this debate (4.6).
4. A change took place in the intellectual sphere; the Enlightenment followed the Renaissance. Reformed orthodoxy was confronted with the rationalism of the early modern philosophers like René Descartes (1596-1650) who took the self-evident proposition *ego cogito ergo sum* as his methodological starting point. It is not our intention to analyze the tensions between orthodoxy and modernism, but we are curious if the debate with early modernism influenced the Reformed concept of the *autopistia* of Scripture. For this aspect we will analyze the use of αὐτόπιστος by Gisbert Voetius (4.7).

Before turning to the four above-mentioned aspects, the relationship between Reformation and Reformed orthodoxy will first be discussed (4.1).

4.1 Reformation and Reformed Orthodoxy

The comparison of Reformed orthodoxy with the Reformation often evokes feelings of sympathy for the Reformers and antipathy for their heirs, because their theology is interpreted as a deviation from the Reformation and a return to medieval scholasticism. In recent research the continuity between Reformation and Reformed orthodoxy is more strongly emphasized and Reformed orthodoxy is rehabilitated. The "theory of decline and discontinuity" and the "theory of negative continuity" are rejected by the adherents of the "theory of positive continuity." In this theory the theology of the Middle Ages, the Reformation, and the Post-Reformation orthodoxy develops progressively and this

[6] Heim concludes that the historical development of the problem of certainty in Protestant orthodoxy hinges on the *autopistia* of Scripture. Heim, *Das Gewißheitsproblem*, 282.

development is interpreted positively.[7] The Protestant Reformers were influenced by the medieval method of scholasticism from the very beginning, notwithstanding the new theological discoveries; there was a theological and methodological continuity from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century. The advocates of this third theory take the differences between the rhetoric and dialectic style of the Reformation and the static and academic style of orthodoxy and the differences in theological context and literary genre into account. This is a correction of the simplification that presupposed and thus found an antithesis between Calvin and the Calvinists.[8]

The scheme of the three different theories for the relation between Reformation and Reformed orthodoxy is a simplification, for the question whether continuity or discontinuity is valued as negative or positive is due to the chosen approach to Reformed orthodoxy. For instance the Dutch "Further Reformation" to which many of the Dutch Reformed orthodox theologians belonged, emphasized the practice of piety (*praxis pietatis*) more strongly than the Reformation.[9] This discontinuity must be interpreted in the light of the emerging international and interconfessional movement of Pietism. If the rise of Pietism is valued positively, this discontinuity with the Reformation can also be valued positively.[10] In the field of spirituality some scholars advocate a "theory of positive discontinuity."

The newer approach comes forth from a desire to separate the historical and the theological tasks.[11] This is understandable as a reaction to the theological bias in the historical research of dialectical theology, but the distinction of the historical and the theological tasks should not become a separation. This is neither possible nor desirable. In dialectical theology it was clear through which colored glasses Reformed orthodoxy was approached. The theologians of the newer approach also have their own theological

---

7 According to the representatives of the third view, the "theory of decline and discontinuity" interprets orthodoxy as a scholastic deviation from the Reformation and the "theory of negative continuity" acknowledges the scholastic influence in the Reformation, but regrets it. Van Asselt and Rouwendal, *Inleiding*, 25-28. Cf. Van Asselt and Dekker, *Reformation and Scholasticism*, 30-32.

8 According to the advocates of the theory of positive continuity, this simplification occurs mainly among the representatives of dialectical theology. The title of an article by Basil Hall often serves as an example. B. Hall, 'Calvin Against the Calvinists' in *John Calvin*, ed. G. E. Duffield, Grand Rapids 1966, 12-37. Cf. Van Asselt and Dekker, *Reformation and Scholasticism*, 12.

9 On the Dutch Further Reformation (Nadere Reformatie) cf. J.R. Beeke, *Assurance of Faith: Calvin, English Puritanism, and the Dutch Second Reformation*, New York 1991, 383-413. The term "Further Reformation" is preferred to "Second Reformation," because its representatives did not aim at a repetition but at a deepening of the Reformation. The Dutch term "*Nadere Reformatie*" was derived by its representatives from the Puritan term "further reformation." Cf. C. Graafland, W.J. Op 't Hof, and F.A. Van Lieburg, 'Nadere Reformatie: opnieuw een poging tot begripsbepaling,' *Documentatieblad Nadere Reformatie* 19 (1995), 105-184, 113.

10 According to the representatives of the *Nadere Reformatie*, the Reformers focussed on the right doctrine due to their context. In the new context the Reformed church became an established church and therefore the focus must be more on spirituality and sanctification. Thus the Further Reformation nuanced the Reformation in a certain sense. Cf. Graafland, Op 't Hof, and Van Lieburg 'Nadere Reformatie,' 142.

11 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 24. It is one thing to discover the accommodations of others, but it is another thing to present one's own view as unaccommodated. Cf. Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 4.

prejudices; at least they desire to unmask the faults of dialectical theology. It is always safer to be aware of and acknowledge your own theological paradigm, than to deny and conceal it. The emphasis on a positive continuity, however, can become a simplification, because a stress on the differences in context and literary genre easily conceals important theological shifts. In the contextual approach of the representatives of the theory of positive continuity, differences are too easily harmonized and real shifts in the theological position overlooked. Therefore we acknowledge the new perspective on Reformed orthodoxy as a welcome correction of a biased view, but at the same time we will try to weigh the shifts that we find theologically.

In an hermeneutical study it is impossible to separate the theological task from the historical task. The purpose of our historical research is to listen carefully to the voices of those who have gone before us and to apply what we have found in our historical research for Reformed theology today. This hermeneutical approach does not necessarily lead to a biased view of the history of theology; nevertheless, it remains very important to be clear on this issue and to avoid a hidden agenda. Therefore we will carefully keep in mind the distinction between the historical research and the theological evaluation, but it is not our intention to separate both tasks. We will first turn to the sources and then weigh what we have found in a theological evaluation. The questions that we have formulated in the introduction and in the chapters on Calvin will be helpful to keep on track. Therefore we will focus on the relationship between the authority of the church and the authority of Scripture, the role of the evidences and the relationship between the *testimonium* of the Spirit and the *autopistia* of Scripture. First of all, we will give a summary of what can be found on the term αὐτόπιστος in two historical surveys that deal with the period.

4.1.1 Heinrich Heppe

Heinrich Heppe (1820-1879) offered an introduction to the main themes of Reformed orthodoxy in his *Dogmatik der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche*. This textbook became very influential and both Benjamin B. Warfield and Herman Bavinck used it as a sourcebook. In the school of dialectical theology it was used as the standard survey of Reformed orthodoxy. In 1958 Ernst Bizer (1904-1975) issued a new edition of Heppe's *Dogmatik* with an introduction by Karl Barth.[12] The 28 chapters of Heppe's *Dogmatik* consist of a summary of the Reformed doctrine and a number of quotations (*Belegstellen*) from Reformed orthodox authors. Three *loci* precede the discussion of the existence and knowledge of God; the first is on "Natural and Revealed Theology," the second on "Holy Scripture," and the third on "The Foundation of Holy Scripture." This division of the prolegomena does not flow from the sources; the distinction between natural and revealed theology is not as common for Reformed orthodoxy as Heppe suggests and in the sources a separate *locus* on the covenant of God as the foundation of

[12] H. Heppe, *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-reformierten Kirche dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt*, ed. E. Bizer, Neukirchen 1935. Cf. H. Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources*, 2nd ed., ed. E. Bizer, trans. G.T. Thomson, Grand Rapids 1984. It is mainly because of Heppe's influence that we have chosen to discuss his work, we have also glanced at some other interesting surveys of Reformed orthodoxy such as Althaus, *Die Prinzipien der deutschen reformierten Dogmatik*. but not found any specific extra information on the term αὐτόπιστος.

Scripture or of the doctrine of Scripture will hardly be found.[13] The structure of Heppe's work depends on the sequence in which Theodore Beza dealt with the several *loci* of theology, but this is not representative for all Reformed theologians.[14]

The term αὐτόπιστος occurs in Heppe's survey in the second *locus* called *De scriptura sacra*. After stating that Scripture is the only source and norm of all Christian knowledge, Heppe continues with the question of the canon. In one of his *Belegstellen* he quotes the reasons Guilielmus Bucanus (d. 1603) gives to reject the apocrypha of the Old Testament. They have no canonical authority "(1) because they are not written either by the prophets or by the apostles, and they are not αὐτόπιστοι; (2) in them the ἐνεργεία, force and majesty do not shine forth as in the canonical books."[15]

Next Heppe discusses the identification of *Scriptura sacra* and *verbum Dei* and the concept of inspiration, interprets both as a deviation from the Reformation and then turns to the attributes of Scripture. In virtue of its *auctoritas* Scripture is the *principium* of theology. Heppe refers to the Leiden *Synopsis* (1625) that calls Scripture "the αὐτόπιστος and irrefragable witness and judge, i.e. its own evidence, by which every controversy raised about divine things should be judged."[16] We will turn to the *Synopsis* later on; the fact that the term is connected with the *evidentia* leads to the question how the *autopistia* is related to the evidences. Heppe continues by stating that the divinity and authenticity of Scripture in no wise – not even *quoad nos* – rests upon the acknowledgement of the church, but simply and solely on Scripture itself "which as God's Word is αὐτόπιστος and ἀνυπεύθυνος."[17] Heppe's survey also show that sometimes ἀξιόπιστος was used next to or instead of αὐτόπιστος. Heppe refers to Voetius, who says:

> As Scripture itself, as the *principium externum* radiates by its own light, (without the intervening of any other *principium* or means of demonstration or conviction), is by itself and

---

13 In the index the title of this *locus* is *De fundamento doctrinae scripturae sacrae*. In the chapter title the word *doctrinae* is striked. The difference is significant, for in a certain sense the concept of the covenant can be the foundation of the *doctrine* of Scripture, from a Reformed orthodox perspective, but certainly not the foundation of *Scripture*. H. Heppe, *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-reformierten Kirche: dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt*, Elberfeld 1861, [iv], 31. Cf. Heppe, *Dogmatik*, ed. Bizer, [v], 34, where the same difference occurs.

14 The treatment of predestination before creation is not as common as Heppe suggests. Muller, *PRRD* 1[2], 130-131. Cf. Van Asselt and Rouwendal, *Inleiding*, 20-21.

15 "1) Quia nec a prophetis nec ab apostolis scripti sunt, nec sunt αὐτόπιστοι; 2) nec in ipsis ἐνεργεία, vis et maiestas divini Spiritus elucet, sicut in canonicis." Heppe, *Dogmatik*, 15. Cf. Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 14. Cf. G. Bucanus, *Institutiones theologicae seu locorvm commvnivm christianae religionis*, Geneva 1612, iv.8. In the footnotes that refer to Reformed orthodox authors we will sometimes use the subdivision of the author rather than the number of the page or column. Upper case Roman numerals stand for the volumes, lowercase Roman numerals for the chapters and Arabic numerals for the sections; if Roman numerals are absent, a page or column is intended.

16 "Testis denique et iudex αὐτόπιστος et irrefragabilis, sua scil. evidentia, a quo iudicanda omnis, quae de rebus divinis agitatur, controversia." Heppe, *Dogmatik*, 19. Cf. Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 21. Cf. J. Polyander, A. Rivetus, A. Walaeus, and A. Thysius, *Synopsis purioris theologiae, disputationibus quinquaginta duabus comprehensa ac conscripta*, ed. H. Bavinck, Leiden 1881, iii.18.

17 Heppe, *Dogmatik*, 10. Cf. Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 22. This is from Heppe's main text; in the *Belegstellen* he does not give examples of the use of ἀνυπεύθυνος "beyond criticism."

> in itself ἀξιόπιστος or credible – so the Holy Spirit is the *internum*, supreme, first, independent *principium*, actually opening and illuminating the eyes of our mind, effectually persuading us of the credible authority of Scripture, from it, along with it and through it, so that being drawn we run, and being passively convicted within we acquiesce.[18]

The fact that Voetius uses the expression *per se et in se* ἀξιόπιστον *seu credibile* leads to the question if the use of αὐτόπιστος was declining. It is also important to notice that Voetius calls Scripture a *principium externum* and the Holy Spirit a *principium internum*. We will keep this distinction in mind while we study the development of Reformed orthodoxy. Finally Voetius's use of *acquiescere* reminds us of Calvin. Heppe continues the discussion of the other attributes of Scripture such as its *perfectio*, *necessitas*, and *perspicuitas*, but the term αὐτόπιστος does not occur in these paragraphs.

4.1.2 Richard Muller

Richard A. Muller's *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy* is a four volume survey of the Reformed orthodox prolegomena and of the doctrines of Scripture and of God. We have chosen to discuss Muller next to Heppe because he is the most prominent representative of the abovementioned "theory of positive continuity" and his work functions as a standard for all recent research in the field of Reformed orthodoxy.

Muller criticizes Heppe's thesis that Reformed orthodoxy moved away from the Reformation emphasis on the Word towards a view of biblical authority grounded on inspiration.[19] According to Muller, the influence of medieval theology in Reformed orthodoxy is most explicit in the field of the prolegomena. The Reformers did not provide a structural theological model or discuss the meaning of the term *theologia*; the only theological prolegomena on which the orthodox Reformed theologians could draw back were those of the medieval systems. Following the medieval schools the orthodox theologians identified theology as a science with its own method and foundations (*principia*).

For the term αὐτόπιστος Muller refers to Zacharias Ursinus (1534-1583) who "provides a clear definition of the *sola Scriptura* of the Reformation as 'Scripture alone is worthy of faith (*autopistos*) and the rule of faith.' This is so inasmuch as faith rests on

---

18 "Ebenso Voet. (V, 14): Ut enim ipsa scriptura tanquam principium externum proprio lumine radians (nullo alieno interveniente tanquam principio aut medio demonstrationis aut convictionis) per se et in se ἀξιόπιστον seu credibile est, – sic *Spiritus S.* est internum, supremum, primum, independens principium actualiter *mentis nostrae oculos aperiens atque illuminans*, et credibilem scripturae auctoritatem ex ea, cum ea, per eundem *efficaciter persuadens*, sic ut nos *tracti curramus* et *passive in nobis convicti acquiescamus*." Heppe, *Dogmatik*, 22. Cf. Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 25-26. Cf. G. Voetius, *Selectae disputationes theologicae*, Utrecht 1648-1669, V.ii.2.

19 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 89. Heppe's idea that the Reformed orthodox simply identified Scripture and the Word is also criticized by Muller. Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 182. Heppe influenced Barth's evaluation of Reformed orthodoxy as a deviation of the original position of the Reformation, for instance in the idea that the revealed religion is the confirmation of natural religion, according to the Reformed orthodox. Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 172.

the Word alone and inasmuch as Scripture alone is sufficient for salvation."[20] Muller also explains where the statement that Scripture is the *principium unicum* of theology comes from:

> The early orthodox theologians inherited the preliminary discussion of *principia* or foundations of theology from the medieval doctors, but they inherited from the Reformers a principial concentration on Scripture as the sole ultimate source of teaching about God. The medieval conception of fundamental doctrines as the *principia theologiae* gave way to a conception of the source of those doctrines as the *principium theologiae* or *principium unicum theologiae*.[21]

The development from the multiple dogmatic *principia* to the concept of Scripture as *principium theologiae* had taken place in the work of the Reformed theologians of the last three decades of the sixteenth century like Antoine de la Roche Chandieu (1534-1591), Francicus Junius (1545-1602), and Sibrandus Lubbertus (1555-1625).[22]

In his paragraph on "The Divinity of Scripture: Authority, Authenticity, and Evidences" Muller concludes that Calvin's position implies a "balance between the subjective and inward certainty resting on the Spirit and on faith alone and an external objective certainty resting on evidence."[23] During the era of Reformed orthodoxy this balance became increasingly difficult to maintain and there is "in the writings of the high orthodox era an increasingly apologetic emphasis on the observable or empirical *notae divinitatis* in the text."[24]

According to Muller, the definitions of biblical authority offered by the Reformed orthodox lead to a series of related concepts that further characterize the authority of the text and one of these concepts is the *autopistia* or self-authentication of Scripture.[25] The Reformed orthodox writers place the *autopistia* of Scripture in the framework of the concept of theology as a science (*scientia*). Muller refers to Benedict Pictet (1655-1724) who writes: "We ought to consider Scripture, which is the first principle of faith, as we view the principles of other bodies of knowledge, which do not derive their authority from any other source, but are known of themselves and prove themselves."[26] If Scripture is to be the first principle of theology as a *scientia* it follows logically that its authority is identified as *autopistia*.

If Muller is right, this implies a shift compared with the Reformation. For Calvin the Spirit teaches us to find rest in Scripture because it is αὐτόπιστος, and for the Reformed orthodox Scripture is αὐτόπιστος because it is the *principium* of theology. The

---

20 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 104. Cf. Z. Ursinus, *Opera Theologica*, ed. Q. Reuter, vol. 1, Heidelberg 1612, 445. Muller translates αὐτόπιστος as "worthy of faith", in another case he translates "capable in and by itself of belief." Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 119.

21 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 95-96.

22 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 160.

23 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 259. According to Muller, the subjective certainty is necessary to maintain the Reformed emphasis on grace alone but the objective certainty is also necessary to ground the subjective conviction in reality.

24 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 263.

25 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 264.

26 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 265. Cf. B. Pictet, *Theologia christiana*, Geneva 1696, I.viii.3. Cf. Edward Leigh (1602-1671) "As in other Sciences, there are alwaies some principles *per se nota* & *indemonstrabilia*, whence other things are proved, so in Divinity all conclusions in point of beleef and practice are proved by the Scripture." E. Leigh, *A Systeme or Body of Divinity*, London 1654, I.ii. Cf. Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 264, n. 177.

differences in style and genre must be taken into account and both statements do not exclude each other, but the shift is evident.

Then Muller turns to the evidences of the divinity of Scripture, with the challenging statement that the continuity of the orthodox position with the Reformation is nowhere clearer than here.[27] The orthodox Reformed authors hold to the same order and priority of the discussion of the evidences as was found in Calvin's *Institutes*. The *testimonium* remains the primary key to the authority and divinity of Scripture and the evidences flow necessarily from the divine character of Scripture and function as ancillary testimonies to it. Muller does not deal elaborately with the question how the *autopistia*, the *testimonium* and the evidences are interrelated in Reformed orthodoxy. Instead he discusses the distinction between the internal or intrinsic evidences that belong to the text of Scripture itself and the external or extrinsic evidences in detail.[28] His claim that continuity with the Reformation is most clear at this point must be evaluated in the light of the complicated interrelationship of *autopistia*, *testimonium* and evidences.

Muller makes some general remarks on this relationship earlier in his work and shows the development in Reformed orthodoxy. In high orthodoxy "the polemic with Rome has become formalized: it is no longer a new battle, but rather a long-established battle with clearly defined lines and even more clearly set answers."[29] This influences the relationship between the *testimonium* and the evidences. Although the *testimonium* still holds first place in the theological argument for the authority of the text, a relative shift in emphasis to the attributes of Scripture and to the evidences occurs in the writings of many of the high orthodox. Muller interprets this as an evidence of the crisis of theological certainty, caused both by the hermeneutical changes and by the rise of rationalism.[30]

In Muller's *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms* αὐτόπιστος is translated as "trustworthy in and of itself." He explains that "if Scripture is trustworthy in and of itself (*in se* and *per se*), no external authority, whether church or tradition, need be invoked in order to ratify Scripture as the norm of faith and practice."[31] Muller remarks that the term is often paired with ἀξιόπιστος.

4.1.3 Αὐτόπιστος and Ἀξιόπιστος

In our own research we also often came across the term ἀξιόπιστος next to or instead of αὐτόπιστος. Antoine de la Roche Chandieu in his *De Verbo Dei Scripto* (1580) discusses the authority of Scripture and says that "theologians should not dispute about their principles, because they are ἀξιόπιστος by themselves, and fixed beyond any risk of

27 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 265.
28 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 269.
29 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 127.
30 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 128. Cf. "Although these later orthodox theologians still uniformly assert the basic principle that the historical and empirical evidences of the authority, inspiration, and divinity of Scripture are insufficient to convince the heart without the inward testimony of the Spirit, their expositions of doctrine appeared to give more and more weight to the discussion of historical and empirical evidences." Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 147.
31 Muller, *Dictionary*, 54.

doubt."[32] Chandieu pleads for special theological *principia* and he rejects human reason as a *principium* of theology.[33] Scripture is the only true *principium* of theology. In his definition of the *principium theologiae* Chandieu uses the term αὐτόπιστος:

> A theological *principium* is an indemonstrable and self-convincing axiom (*axioma* ἀναπόδεικτος & αὐτόπιστος) concerning sacred things, from which, having been posited, a conclusion concerning things that belong to religion follows evidently and necessarily. Of this kind is this axiom: ALL HOLY SCRIPTURE IS ΘΕΟΠΝΕΥΣΤΟΣ, which no Christians doubt.[34]

This theological *principium* cannot depend on the authority of the church or on human reason, because it ought to be self-convincing. "Now it must be concluded from what we have said, that the *principium theologicum* is αὐτόπιστος; it cannot depend on the bare authority of the church nor on human reason."[35] Chandieu even goes further, for the one *principium* of theology can be divided into *principia* and thus Scripture becomes a sourcebook of theological truths. For Chandieu every passage of Scripture gains the status of an axiom, from which conclusions can be drawn.[36] Scripture provides the theologian with statements that function as principles of theology and these statements easily become isolated *loci probantia*. For Chandieu the Bible is not a single *principium*, but the source of theological *principia*.[37]

In his *Tractatus de sacra Scriptura* Jerome Zanchi (1516-1590) calls the holy Scriptures the foundation of the whole theology.[38] The context is the discussion with Rome about the authority of the church regarding Scripture. Zanchi uses the example of the sun to illustrate the authority of Scripture. The sun has its light of itself, but our eyes must be opened to see the sun, so Scripture has its authority of itself, but we need the work of the Holy Spirit to open our eyes for it.[39] Some scholars have interpreted this as a deviation from Calvin, but he uses the same example in the *Institutes.*[40] Zanchi

---

32 "Theologici non disputant de suis principiis, quippe quae sunt per se ἀξιόπιστα, & extra omnem dubitationis aleam constituta." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, 7.

33 "At nos de Theologia ex principiis Theologicis disputandum esse." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, 7. "Humana autem ratio non potest esse principium theologiae." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, 10. Cf. D. Sinnema, 'Antoine De Chandieu's Call for Scholastic Reformed Theology,' in *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, ed. W.F. Graham, Kirksville 1994, 159-190, 178.

34 "Principium autem Theologicum mihi videtur esse Axioma de rebus sacris ἀναπόδεικτον & αὐτόπιστον, quo posito, conclusio de iis quae ad Religionem pertinent, evidens & necessaria consequatur: cuiusmodi est hoc Axioma: SCRIPTURA SACRA TOTA EST ΘΕΟΠΝΕΥΣΤΟΣ: de quo nulli Christiani dubitant." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, 9-10.

35 "Nunc autem ex iis quae diximus colligitur Principium Theologicum esse αὐτόπιστον, nec esse petendum ex nuda Ecclesiae auctoritate, neque ex humana ratione." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, 11.

36 "Nullus est enim locus qui non conficiat conclusionem primariam, & ipsi loci habent vim summi axiomatis." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, 14.

37 Sinnema, 'Antoine De Chandieu's Call,' 177, 189-190.

38 "Sunt enim Scripturae sanctae fundamentum totius Theologiae." H. Zanchius, *Opera Theologica,* vol. 8, Heidelberg 1613, 319.

39 Zanchius, *Opera Theologica* 8, 333.

40 According to W. Neuser, the example implies a division of the light of the sun and the eye. "Durch die Unterscheidung des Sonnenlichtes vom Sehorgan ist im Gleichnis die Zusammengehörigkeit von Schrift und Geist aufgelöst; bei Calvin sind beide noch ungetrennt." Neuser, 'Dogma und Bekenntnis in der Reformation,' 316. Neuser depends on Heim,

continues: "The church after all has not given the Scripture this dignity, to be ἀξιόπιστος by itself and authentic."[41] Instead of αὐτόπιστος Zanchi uses the expression *per se* ἀξιόπιστος.

In Lutheran orthodoxy the terms αὐτόπιστος and αξίοπιστος are also used together. Abraham Calov (1612-1686) says: "Every Word of God is αξίοπιστος and αὐτόπιστος and must be believed *per se* simply because it is the Word of God, because God has declared it and said it, even though our reason may not understand or grasp it."[42]

There is a difference between the two terms, for Scripture can be worthy of our faith for many other reasons, while αὐτόπιστος expresses the self-convincing authority of Scripture. The addition of *per se* or *in se*, however, gives ἀξιόπιστος the same meaning as αὐτόπιστος.

4.1.4 The Dictionaries

The dictionary entries of the term αὐτόπιστος in this period show a complicated picture. As we have seen the important *Thesaurus linguae graecae* (1572) of Henry Estienne gives the definition "Per se probabilis seu credibilis, Cui per se fides adhibetur, sine argumentis." This dictionary remained influential for centuries. The ancient meaning of the term was still current in the seventeenth century, as the second edition of the *Lexicon philosophicum terminorum philosophis usitatorum* (1662) of Johannes Micraelius (1579-1658) shows, where αὐτόπιστος refers to an "indemonstrable *principium* of such excellence and dignity, that it gains faith through itself."[43] William Robertson (d. 1686), a philosopher and linguist, gave the following definition in his *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (1676): "Αὐτόπιστος: producing faith without arguments: αὐτόπιστον, credible of itself, knowable of itself (*per se notum*)."[44] The Dutch philologist Cornelius Schrevelius (1615-1661) published a *Lexicon manuale Graeco-Latinum et Latino-Graecum*; it does not have an entry for αὐτόπιστος.[45] A later edition of the *Lexicon*

Gewißheitsproblem, 293-294. Cf. Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.2.34, *OS* 4, 45 and Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.2.21, *OS* 3, 264.

41 "Ecclesia enim nunquam dedit Scripturae hanc dignitatem, ut esset per se ἀξιόπιστος & αὐθέντικα." Zanchius, *Opera Theologica* 8, 344. Cf. "Scriptura sacra, quam habet in se autoritate, hoc est dignitatem & vim, qua in se est ἀξιόπιστος: eam non habet ab Ecclesia sed a Deo." Zanchius, *Opera Theologica* 8, 339. The use of *dignitas* can point to the axiomatic character of Scripture, for *dignitas* is a Latin translation of ἀξίωμα.

42 A. Calov, *Socinismus Profligatus, hoc est, Errorum Socinianorum Luculenta Confutatio*, 2nd ed., Wittenberg 1668, 78. Cited in Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 296-297.

43 "AYTόπιστον, principium indemonstrabile, ejus excellentiae & dignitatis, ut à seipso mereatur fide." J. Micraelius, *Lexicon philosophicum terminorum philosophis usitatorum: Instrumenta philosophica*, ed. L. Geldsetzer, vol. 1, Düsseldorf 1966 [reprint of the 2nd ed., Stettin 1662], 205.

44 "Αὐτόπιστος: per se fidem faciens sine argumentis: αὐτόπιστον, per se credibile, per se notum." W. Robertson, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae in epitomen: sive Compendium redactus et alphabetice secundum Constantini methodum et Schrevelii referatus*, Cambridge 1676.

45 At least not in the edition of 1682 printed in Amsterdam; I have not checked previous editions. C. Schrevelius, *Lexicon manuale Graeco-Latinum et Latino-Graecum*, Amsterdam 1682. The *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum et Latino Graecum* of Johann Caspar Suicer (1620-1684), a professor at Zurich, also does not have the lemma αὐτόπιστος. J.C. Suicer, *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum, et Latino-Graecum, summa cura elaboratum*, Tuguri [Zurich] 1683.

manuale edited by Joseph Hill (1625-1707) and published in Amsterdam (1709) does have the entry and gives the same definition as Robertson in his *Thesaurus*.[46] Maybe the several dictionaries copied each other or were compiled from the same sources.

If we compare these results with those of the sixteenth-century dictionaries, the early definition of Budé *per se fidem faciens sine argumentis* remarkably still occurs twice. In the seventeenth century, however, the definition *per se notum* is given next to *per se credibile* and the term is expressly connected with *principium*. These differences may indicate a development in its use.

4.1.5 Piscator's Summary of the *Institutes*

We will close this introduction to Reformed orthodoxy by taking a glance at the summary of Calvin's *Institutes* given by Johannes Piscator (1546-1625), professor of theology at Strasburg and Heidelberg. The *Aphorismi doctrinae christianae, ex Institutione Calvini excerpti* was first published in 1589. Piscator writes: "Although this Scripture deserves faith from all as θεόπνευστος and αὐτόπιστος, still the Holy Spirit must sanctify it in our hearts to establish its authority as certain to us so that we also may have full faith in it."[47] This is a shift of emphasis; Calvin says that those whom the Holy Spirit has inwardly taught, truly find rest in Scripture that is αὐτόπιστος, while it still owes the certainty that it deserves among us (*meretur apud nos certitudinem*) to the testimony of the Spirit. As we have seen for Calvin αὐτόπιστος characterizes the authority of Scripture for believers; it refers to the intrinsic *maiestas* of Scripture that is only discerned by faith through the *testimonium* of the Spirit. Piscator says that Scripture deserves faith from all and connects the term αὐτόπιστος with this faith that Scripture deserves. Probably Piscator was led to this exegesis by the following sentence in the *Institutes* that stems from the 1539 edition where Calvin says that although Scripture gains reverence for itself by its own majesty, still it only then really impresses us seriously when it is sealed by the Spirit to our hearts.[48] But as we have seen, in 1539 Calvin referred to believers who are overwhelmed by the *maiestas* of God in Scripture. In Piscator's summary the *autopistia* of Scripture shifts from believers to all people and from the realm of trust to the realm of truth; the *testimonium* is a surplus for believers.[49]

A few remarks can already be made from this first impression of Reformed orthodoxy:

---

46 "Αὐτόπιστος, per se fidem faciens sine argumentis αὐτόπιστον, per se credibile, per se notum." J. Hill, *Cornelii Schrevelii Lexicon manuale Graeco-Latinum*, Amsterdam 1709, 114.

47 "Etsi autem haec scriptura fidem apud omnes meretur tanquam θεόπνευστος και αὐτόπιστος, tamen testimonio Spiritus sancti sanciri in cordibus nostris oportet, ut nobis certa ejus constet authoritas, ac proinde ut plenum ei fidem habeamus." J. Piscator, *Aphorismi doctrinae christianae, maximam partem ex Institutione Calvini excerpti; sive loci communes theologici, brevibus sententiis expositi*, 10th ed., Herborn 1626, 18-19.

48 "et si enim reverentiam sua sibi ultro maiestate conciliat, tunc tamen demum serio nos afficit, quum per Spiritum obsignata est cordibus nostris." *OS* 3, 70. Cf. Calvin, Battles, *Institutes*, 80.

49 Heppe misses the mark when he states that Piscator says that Scripture proves itself to be θεόπνευστος and αὐτόπιστος, purely by the witness of the Holy Spirit; "daß sich die heil. Schrift lediglich durch das Zeugnis des heil. Geistes als θεόπνευστος und αὐτόπιστος erweise." Heppe, *Dogmatik*, 22. Cf. Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 25.

1. It is clear that the term αὐτόπιστος is still used in Reformed orthodoxy to define Scripture, yet there seems to be a shift in the interpretation of the term as Piscator's summary of the *Institutes* shows.
2. Other Greek terms like ἀξιόπιστος and ἀνυπεύθυνος are used next to it or instead of it; although the meaning of these terms is different, yet they are used as synonyms especially when *per se* or *in se* is added.
3. The term seems to be related to the canonicity and authenticity of Scripture given with its prophetic and apostolic origin.
4. Αὐτόπιστος is connected with Scripture as a *principium* of theology; for Chandieu Scripture is a source of theological *principia*. In the dictionaries we have found the Latin definition *per se notum* to define the term αὐτόπιστος. The *autopistia* of Scripture seems to follow logically from the fact that Scripture is the first principle of theology. It is also remarkable to find the distinction between Scripture as the *principium externum* and the Holy Spirit as the *principium internum* of theology.
5. The example of the light of the sun is used to explain the *autopistia* of Scripture; this example leads to further thoughts on sin as blindness and on the illumination of the Spirit as the taking away of the blindness; in essence these examples go back to Calvin.

4.2 William Whitaker (1547-1595)

Now we will turn to the influence of the debate with Catholicism on the Reformed orthodox concept of the authority of Scripture. One of the main representatives of the Counter-Reformation was Robert Bellarmine SJ (1542-1621), whose *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos* (1586) elicited more than 200 reactions from Lutheran and Reformed sides.[50] One of the Reformed reactions came from William Whitaker, a professor at Cambridge and a leading theologian of the Elizabethan Church who was deeply involved in the polemics on the authority of Scripture with Counter-Reformation theologians. We have chosen Whitaker as the representative of early Reformed orthodoxy to examine the possible influence of the debate with the Counter-Reformation on the concept of the *autopistia* of Scripture. Whitaker not only wrote against Bellarmine but also against the Louvain professor Thomas Stapleton (1535-1598), a fellow Englishman. Stapleton held an extreme position within Roman Catholicism, because he explicitly said that the authority of the church was greater than the authority of Scripture.[51]

In the Church of England Whitaker strove for the Calvinistic cause. To establish the doctrine of predestination more officially in the Church of England he drew up the *Lambeth Articles* as an addition to the *Thirty-nine Articles*.[52] He agreed with Calvin on

---

50 Van Asselt and Rouwendal, *Inleiding*, 97. Bellarmine does not use the term αὐτόπιστος in connection with Scripture. R.F.R. Bellarmino, *De controversiis christianae fidei adversvs hvivs temporis haereticos*, editio ultima, vol. 1, Coloniae Agrippinae [Cologne] 1628.

51 G.H. Tavard, *Holy Writ or Holy Church: The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation*, New York [1959], 231. According to Tavard, Stapleton stood alone among the Catholics at this point.

52 This was just before his death in 1595; the articles never gained confessional authority in the Church of England. Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom* 1, 658. For the text of the *Lambeth Articles* cf. Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom* 3, 523-525.

all main points of doctrine, except the relationship between church and state.[53] The theological debate between the Counter-Reformation and Protestantism was the intellectual side of a political conflict. On the Continent theological institutes were erected to train Roman Catholic Englishmen for missionary work as priests in England.[54] The government urged Whitaker and his colleagues to make propaganda for the Protestant cause and give a scholarly theological answer to the sophisticated critique of the Jesuits. Polemical theology was of such political importance that spies laid their hands on Bellarmine's lecture notes and handed them over to Whitaker so that he could discuss the ideas of Bellarmine even before his lectures were published.[55]

In 1588 Whitaker wrote his *Disputatio de Sacra Scriptura*.[56] He intended to deal with all the controversial subjects in a series of disputations, of which this was the first, but he never accomplished the whole series. He chose the three offices of Christ to classify his disputations, because he believed that all the heresies of Rome concerned the offices and merits of Christ. Under the prophetic office of Christ Whitaker dealt with the Scriptures, under the royal office he placed the church, and under the priestly office the mediation of Christ and the sacraments.[57] This classification remained quite unique in Reformed orthodoxy, although the work was of great influence.[58] For Whitaker the authority of Scripture belonged to Christology and more specifically to the prophetic office of Christ.[59]

---

53 F.G.M. Broeyer, 'William Whitaker 1548-1595: A Cambridge Professor on the Doctrine of the Church,' in *Lines of Contact: Proceedings of the Second Conference of Belgian, British, Irish and Dutch Historians of Universities*, ed. J.M. Fletcher and H. De Ridder-Symoens, Gent 1994, 5-20, 11. Broeyer calls him an Anglo-Calvinist, a term he derives from Whitaker's opponent Stapleton. Broeyer, 'William Whitaker: A Cambridge Professor,' 5, 20.

54 H. De Ridder-Symoens, 'The Place of the University of Douai in the Peregrinatio Academica Britannica,' in *Lines of Contact*, ed. Fletcher and De Ridder-Symoens, 21-34, 25. Cf. Dulles, *History of Apologetics*, 117.

55 Broeyer, 'William Whitaker: A Cambridge Professor,' 13-14. Cf. F.G.M. Broeyer, 'Traces of the Rise of Reformed Scholasticism in the Polemical Theologian William Whitaker (1548-1595),' in *Reformation and Scholasticism*, ed. Van Asselt and Dekker, 155-180, 157. Whitaker believed that he was able to propagate his opinion by careful reasoning in polemical disputations and arguments. Broeyer, 'William Whitaker: A Cambridge Professor,' 7.

56 W. Whitaker, *Disputatio de Sacra Scriptura, contra huius temporis Papistas, in primis Robertum Bellarminum Jesuitam, Pontificium in Collegio Romano, & Thomam Stapletonum, Regium in Schola Duacena Controversiarum Professorem: Sex Quaestionibus proposita et tractata a Guilielmo Whitakero Theologiae Doctore, ac Professore Regio, & Collegii D. Joannis in Cantabrigiensi Academia magistro*, London 1588. Cf. W. Whitaker, *A Disputation on Holy Scripture against the Papists*, trans. W. Fitzgerald, Cambridge 1849.

57 This was only the first part of his structure. After the offices of Christ he intended to deal with the benefits of Christ, and with the person of Christ. The controversies that he had in mind were the soteriology and the Christology. Cf. F.G.M. Broeyer, *William Whitaker (1548-1595): Leven en werk van een anglocalvinistisch theoloog*, Utrecht [1982], 126-127.

58 At the publication of Petrus Van Mastricht's *Theoretico-practica theologia* (1682-1687) it was still recognized as a definitive work. Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 108.

59 Bellarmine took the Apostolic Creed as matrix for his theological structure and, according to Whitaker, he had reduced all the controversies to three articles of the creed: faith in the Catholic Church, the communion of saints, and the forgiveness of sins. W. Whitaker, *Opera Theologica, duobus tomis nunc primum collecta: subiuncta est ad primi tomi finem, de auctoris vita & morte descriptio*, Geneva 1610, vol. 1, 258. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 22.

In early Reformed orthodoxy the authority of Scripture was not exclusively discussed in the prolegomena. Robert Rollock (1555-1599) discusses the authority and *autopistia* of Scripture in the context of soteriology in his *Treatise of God's Effectual Calling* (1597). In this book the covenant forms a key for arranging and tying together all the subjects of Reformed theology; Rollock also discusses Scripture as part of pneumatology. Rollock writes in English, but a Latin note in the margin says: "Scriptura est αὐτόπιστος." In the main text he writes:

> We have no need simply of any other light, or of any one special evidence to demonstrate to this matter, but that very light which is in the Scripture. For the Scripture (being the first and immediate Word of God) is of authority sufficient in itself, and so likewise of itself most clear and evident, and the only cause of all that light which is in the church and in the hearts of men. For like as the light of the sun is not perceived nor to be seen by means of any other light, for that it so far exceeds all other bodily and external light, so, that spiritual light of the Scripture hath no need in itself of any other light to set forth the same.[60]

In his *Medulla theologiae* William Ames's (1576-1633) does not discuss the authority of Scripture at the beginning of his survey, but as a part of his ecclesiology.[61] The term αὐτόπιστος does not occur in this work. The examples of Whitaker, Ames, and Rollock show that Calvin's decision to discuss Scripture in the introduction of the *Institutes* was not always followed. The place of the *autopistia* of Scripture in Reformed theology begs for further theological consideration.

4.2.1 The Authority and Αὐτοπιστία of Scripture

In the *Disputatio* Whitaker discusses most of the controversial points with Rome regarding Scripture. In six scholastic *quaestiones* he deals with (1) the number of canonical books, (2) the Hebrew and Greek originals as the only authentic version of Scripture, (3) the authority of Scripture based on the testimony of the Spirit rather than on the authority of the church, (4) the perspicuity of Scripture sufficient for our salvation, (5) the proper interpretation of Scripture, and (6) the perfection of Scripture over against human traditions. He criticizes the idea that Scripture is only partly the *regula fidei* of the church.[62] He rejects the fourfold interpretation of Scripture and emphasizes the interpretation of Scripture by Scripture.[63] Whitaker adheres to the infallibility of Scripture; with a reference to Augustine he rejects the idea that the authors of Scripture could err.[64] In the third *quaestio* he deals with the most central theme of the book, the relationship between the authority of Scripture and the church. According to Whitaker, this is the most fundamental issue between Reformation and

---

60 R. Rollock, *Select Works: Reprinted from the Original Editions*, ed. W. M. Gunn, vol. 1, Edinburgh 1844, 68. This reminds us of the remarks by Zanchi on the example of the sun to explain the relationship of Word and Spirit, but here the self-convincing character of light is emphasized.

61 G. Ames, *Medulla theologica*, Amsterdam 1659. These examples show that the presentation of Reformed orthodoxy in several *loci* by Heppe is a simplification.

62 "Nisi enim Scriptura sit totalis et perfecta regula, non erit omnio regula." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 407b. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 662.

63 "Scripturam esse ex Scriptura interpretandum." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 366a. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 488.

64 Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 262ab. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 37. Cf. Broeyer, *William Whitaker*, 128.

Rome; both sides agree that the Scriptures have authority, but they disagree about the final basis of this authority.

> The question, therefore, between us and the papists is, from where they have received such great authority and what it is, and on what this whole weight of such divine dignity and authority depends. The subject is difficult and complicated and I really do not know whether there is any other controversy between us of greater importance.[65]

Whitaker deals with the objections of Thomas Stapleton against the Reformed position step by step. Bellarmine had only discussed this fundamental issue in passing, but Stapleton had written on the subject in his *Principiorum Fidei Doctrinalium Demonstratio Methodica*.[66] Quoting Stapleton, Whitaker summarizes the Roman Catholic position: "The Scriptures are in themselves (*in se*) worthy of all reverence, but with regard to us (*quoad nos*), they would not by themselves (*per se*) have been held in such honor."[67] The final basis for the authority of Scripture for us is the authority of the church. It is exactly this point that Whitaker objects to in his third *quaestio*; for him the authority of Scripture is independent of the authority of the church not only in itself, but also with regard to us. Whitaker disagrees with Rome on the final ground of certainty in the Christian faith. It is either the church through which we believe Scripture or it is Scripture through which we believe the church.[68]

Stapleton and Whitaker disagreed fundamentally on the authority of Scripture, but they did not disagree on the importance of the issue. Leaving the other five *quaestiones* untouched, Stapleton found the third *quaestio* important enough to answer extensively. According to the general custom among the controversy-theologians, he copied the whole *Disputatio* and responded to it piece by piece in his *Defensio Authoritatis ecclesiasticae circa S. Scripturarum*.[69] Whitaker on his turn copied the whole work of Stapleton, including his own text and answered Stapleton piece by piece in a so-called *Duplicatio*. Whitaker blamed Stapleton of being too copious, but his own final text was

---

65 "Igitur inter nos & Papistas quaeritur, unde tantam authoritatem acceperint, & quid sit, ex quo totum hoc pondus tam divinae authoritatis ac maiestatis pendeat. Locus difficilis ac perplexus: & certe nescio an ulla inter nos fere gravior Controversia sit." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 314a. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 275. Cf. "Non videtur magna controversia, tamen est maxima." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 315a. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 279.

66 T. Stapleton, *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium demonstratio methodica*, Paris 1579. Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 316b. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 285.

67 "Omni enim reverentia (inquit) scripturae in se dignae sunt, non autem quoad nos in tanto honore per se haberentur." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 314b. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 277. This is a loose quotation. Cf. T. Stapleton, *Opera quae extant omnia*, ed. H. Hollandus, Paris 1620, vol 1, 311. "Illud enim Scripturae sacrae reverentiam considerat, ut in seipsa es; & hoc eadem considerat quoad nos, de qua re postea."

68 "The central issue in the debate between Whitaker and his opponents about the Holy Scripture was whether belief in the truths of revelation required the authority of the Church in order to acknowledge them obediently." Broeyer, 'Traces of the Rise of Reformed Scholasticism,' 164. Cf. Tavard who regrets the loss of the unity of Word and Church. Up to the Middle Ages "Holy Writ and Holy Church are mutually inclusive." Tavard, *Holy Writ or Holy Church*, 244.

69 T. Stapleton, *Authoritatis ecclesiasticae circa S. Scripturarum approbationem, adeoque in universum, uculenta & accurata defensio libris III. digsta. Contra disputationem de Scriptura Sacra Guilielmi Whitakeri Anglocalvinistae*, Keerberghen: Jan Van Antwerpen, 1592.

twenty-five times as large as the original text of the third *quaestio* in the *Disputatio*.[70] Stapleton's final response, his *Triplicatio*, was published after Whitaker's death and only dealt with a few subjects of the controversy; Stapleton reasserted that the determination of the canon depends on the church and explained why the testimony of the church was necessary to accept the authority of Scripture.[71]

The fact that the authority of Scripture was the central issue in this debate is proved by the subtitle of Whitaker's *Duplicatio*, which reads: *Pro Authoritate atque Αὐτοπιστίᾳ Sacrae Scripturae*.[72] The term αὐτόπιστος is so important for Whitaker that he uses it to define his position on the authority of Scripture; *authoritas* and ἀυτοπιστία are inseparable. We will have to examine the use of αὐτόπιστος both in the *Disputatio* and the *Duplicatio* to see how the authority of Scripture is connected to its ἀυτοπιστία; and if the use of the substantive instead of the adjective indicates a shift in the meaning of the term. Self-convincingness has now become one of the attributes of Scripture just like *perspicuitas* or *sufficientia*.

Whitaker uses the term αὐτόπιστος three times in his *Disputatio*. In the *Duplicatio* Whitaker uses the term more frequently and in a broader sense, for instance calling the preaching of Christ αὐτόπιστος in contrast with the preaching of the church.[73] In another place he says: "Even if the church were αὐτόπιστος, then it does not follow that the Scriptures are sealed only by the testimony of the church, for the Scriptures themselves are αὐτόπιστοι."[74]

4.2.2 The Evidences

The evidences do not occupy a large place in Whitaker's polemics. In the *Disputatio* he mentions them in passing while he is answering the Roman Catholic objections.

---

70 Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 88a. Cf. Broeyer, *William Whitaker*, 140. The third *quaestio* of the *Disputatio* covers 20 pages in the *Opera Theologica*. Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 314-334. The *Duplicatio* covers more than 500 pages. Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 1-509. The tone of the book was so sharp that Whitaker excused himself for his rude language. Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 509b. Cf. Broeyer, *William Whitaker*, 139.

71 In the *Triplicatio* Stapleton responded to Whitaker's answer to the paragraphs 1.1, 1.13 and 2.6 of the *Defensio*. Cf. H. Schützeichel, *Wesen und Gegenstand der kirchlichen Lehrautorität nach Thomas Stapleton: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Kontroverstheologie im 16. Jahrhundert,* Trier 1966, 31, n. 5. The terms *duplicatio* and *triplicatio* originate from Roman law, where a plaintiff could bring his *actio* and a defendant respond with his *exceptio*. The plaintiff could reply with a *replicatio*, which in turn might be met with a *duplicatio* and in exceptional cases the pleadings might advance to a *triplicatio* and a *quadruplicatio*. Cf. G. Long, 'Actio,' in W. Smith (ed.), *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, London 1875, 9-13.

72 W. Whitaker, *Adversus Thomae Stapletoni Anglopapistae in Academia Lovaniensi Theologiae Professoris Regii Defensionem Ecclesiasticae Authoritatis, quam ipse Luculentam & Accuratam Inscripsit, Tribusque Libris Digessit, Duplicatio: pro Authotitate atque Αὐτόπιστιᾳ Sacrae Scripturae*, Cambridge 1594.

73 "Nam Christi praedicatio erat per se sine ullo alio testimonio αὐτόπιστος." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 15b, Cf. Schützeichel, *Kirchlichen Lehrautorität nach Thomas Stapleton*, 56-57.

74 "Etsi enim ut Ecclesia esset αὐτόπιστος, non proinde sequeretur Scripturas per solum ecclesiae testimonium consignari, cum scripturae ipsae αὐτόπιστοι sint." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 129a.

Whitaker faces the question how to persuade persons that do not acknowledge the authority of any book of the Bible, without the church. He answers that such infidels will also reject the authority of the church and that the evidences gathered from the Bible have more weight then the authority of the church. "I speak not now of the internal testimony of the Spirit (*internum Spiritus testimonium*), but of certain external testimonies, which may be drawn from the books themselves, to prove them divinely inspired writings."[75] Then he mentions eight evidences, largely following Calvin's *Institutes*. He says that (1) the majesty of the doctrine of Scripture surpasses all human writings; (2) Scripture is written in a simple, pure, and divine style; (3) the books of Moses are more ancient then any other writings; (4) the oracles or prophesies are very exact for example the names given to persons ages before their birth; (5) the miracles confirm the authority of Scripture; (6) the enemies of Scripture have never been able to destroy it; (7) the martyrs have sealed the doctrine of Scripture by their blood and (8) the books are not written by previously qualified authors.[76] Still all these evidences are completely insufficient unless the testimony of the Spirit "fills our minds with a wonderful plenitude of assurance, confirms them, and causes us most gladly to embrace the Scriptures, giving force to the preceding arguments."[77] Whitaker connects the evidences with the *testimonium*, by saying that the *testimonium* gives power (*vis*) to the evidences. Whitaker distinguishes between the urging and constraining (*cogere* and *premere*) force of the arguments and the persuading force (*persuadere*) of the *testimonium*.[78] The *testimonium* remains the pivot on which the authority of Scripture hinges.[79] Some object that the *testimonium* is external and not inherent in the Word, because it is not drawn from the Bible, but Whitaker answers:

> Although the testimony of the Holy Spirit is not the same as the books themselves; still it is not external (*non externum*), separate or alien from the books, because it is received from the doctrine (*doctrina*) delivered in those books; for we do not speak of any enthusiastic influence of the Spirit.[80]

The *testimonium internum* of the Spirit is so strongly related to Scripture that it is called *non externum* because it is found in Scripture itself; the *testimonium* is received from the *doctrina* of Scripture. Thus *internum* not only refers to "in the heart," but also to "in Scripture."

---

75 "Non loquor iam de interno Spiritus testimonio, sed de externis quibusdam testimoniis, quae ex ipsis libris desumi possunt, quibus scripturas ipsas divinas esse intelligamus." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 318b. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 293.

76 Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 318b. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 294.

77 "Illud vero quando accedit, mirifica quadam πληροφορία animos nostros complet, confirmat, facitque ut scripturam libentissime amplectamur, & superioribus illis argumentis vim addit." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 319a. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 295.

78 "Priora quidem argumenta cogere possunt & premere, hoc autem solum argumentum, internum intelligo Spiritus sancti testimonium, nobis persuadere potest." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 319a. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 295.

79 Cf. Broeyer, *William Whitaker*, 132.

80 "Respondeo: Etsi quidem Spiritus sancti testimonium non sit idem, quod ipsi libri; externum tamen non est, nec ab ipsis libris seiuctum & alienum, quia percipitur ex doctrina, quae in ipsis libris traditur: non enim Spiritum aliquem ἐνθουσιαστικόν intelligimus." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 319a. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 295.

Whitaker deals with Augustine's *Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me catholicae Ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas* and agrees with Calvin's interpretation. Even if believers are moved (*commovere*) by the authority of the church to receive the gospel, it does not follow that their "intimate inward persuasion" is produced in the same way. "To be moved is one thing, to be persuaded is another."[81] The testimony of the church can only urge (*cogere*) and not persuade (*persuadere*). "It is one thing to force men to acknowledge the Scriptures, and quite another to persuade them of their truth."[82]

4.2.3 The Vulgate and the Septuagint

Whitaker uses the term αὐτόπιστος for the first time in his *Disputatio* in the second *quaestio*; the issue is the claim of the Council of Trent that the Vulgate is the authentic version of Scripture.[83] "Our churches, on the contrary, determine that this Latin edition is very generally and miserably corrupt, is false and not authentic; and that the Hebrew edition of the Old and the Greek of the New Testament are the real and authentic Scripture of God."[84] Whitaker responds to Bellarmine, who argued that the Vulgate had been used for more than a thousand years and that it was fit for the Latin Church to have the authentic version of Scripture in its own language. According to Whitaker, a translation can never be authentic in itself.

> For translations of Scripture are always to be brought back to the originals of Scripture, received if they agree with those originals and corrected if they do not. That Scripture only, which the prophets, apostles, and evangelists wrote θεοπνεύστως, is in every way αὐτόπιστος & αὐθέντικη.[85]

The term αὐτόπιστος is a synonym of authentic; it is not used to express the self-convincing character of Scripture, but to safeguard the originals. Whitaker uses the term αὐτόπιστος to express their ultimate authority. Behind the translations stands the original, therefore the translation cannot be αὐτόπιστος, the highest authority. The term gains a specific meaning in the context of the relationship between the original text and the translations of Scripture. Whitaker does not deal with textual criticism, but he trusts

---

81 "Aliud autem est commoveri, aliud persuaderi." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 325a. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 322.

82 "Sed aliud est, cogere homines, ut agnoscant scripturas; aliud vero, efficere ut de earum veritate persuadeantur." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 324a. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 317. On the influence of Whitaker's summary of the Reformed exegesis of Augustine's dictum, cf. Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 367.

83 Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 278a. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 110-111.

84 "Nostrae contra Ecclesiae hanc Latinam esse passim & misere corruptam, esse falsam, non esse authenticam: Hebraicum vero veteris, & Graecam novi Testamenti sinceram & authenticam Dei scripturam statuunt." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 278a. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 111.

85 "Semper enim Translationes Scripturarum ad primos Scripturarum fontes reuocanda sunt, & si cum illis congruunt, recipiendae: si discrepant, corrigendae. Illa dumtaxat Scriptura, quam Prophetae, Apostoli, atque Evangelistae, θεοπνεύστως conscripserunt, est omni modo αὐτόπιστος & αὐθέντικη." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 283b. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 138.

that we now have the very ancient scriptures of Moses and the other prophets, although we might not have exactly the same forms and shapes of the letters.[86]

In this context Whitaker also discusses the authority of the Septuagint. He acknowledges that Augustine and other church fathers held it in high esteem, but denies that it stands on the same level as the original Hebrew text.[87] The Roman Catholic emphsis of this authority rested on the supposed miraculous agreement of the seventy-two translators and on the normative use of the Septuagint in the New Testament. Whitaker deals with the first argument, rejecting Bellarime's suggestion that the translators of the Septuagint were prophets, but not with the second argument.[88]

The Roman Catholic appeal to the Septuagint to argue for the authority of the Vulgate and the apocrypha may have led to a rejection of the authority of the Septuagint in Reformed orthodoxy and may have complicated its use for textual criticism. Further study of this point may be interesting.

4.2.4 The *Status Controversiae*

The second time Whitaker uses the term is in the introduction to the third *quaestio*. Here he defines the *status controversiae* that has to be discussed. Whitaker does not despise the testimony of the church concerning the Scriptures, but he does not want to make its authority depend on the church. The internal testimony of the Holy Spirit (*testimonium internum Spiritus sancti*) more certainly persuades us that these books are sacred.[89] Whitaker explains how this *testimonium* is related to the authority of Scripture:

> The sum of our opinion is, that Scripture is αὐτόπιστος, that is, it has all its authority and credibility from itself; that it must be acknowledged and received, not so much because the church has determined and commanded this, but because it comes from God; and that we certainly know that it comes from God, not from the church but by the Holy Spirit.[90]

For Whitaker αὐτόπιστος means that Scripture has all its *authoritas* and *fides* from itself (*ex se*). This self-convincing character of Scripture belongs to his *summa sententiae*; in scholastic jargon this is the principal point of the disputation. But how are *testimonium* and αὐτόπιστος related to each other? Whitaker says three things: (1) Scripture is αὐτόπιστος, (2) it must be accepted because it comes from God, and (3) we know this through the Spirit. The Spirit gives believers the knowledge of the divine origin of Scripture; through the Spirit Scripture is not only αὐτόπιστος in itself, but also for us (*quoad nos*).

In his *Defensio* Stapleton does not seem to have any difficulty with the term αὐτόπιστος; he answers Whitaker's remark that Scripture is "*ex se* αὐτόπιστον" with the comment that every dogma of the faith and every revealed truth is true of itself and does not become true when it is proclaimed, but Stapleton does not quote Whitaker

---

86 Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 279a. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 117. Cf. Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 405.

87 Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 279b. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 120.

88 The reference to Jerome who called the seventy "interpreters" and not "prophets" was quite common in Reformed orthodoxy. Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 432.

89 Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 315a. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 279.

90 "Summa nostrae sententiae est, esse scripturam αὐτόπιστον, id est ex se suam omnem authoritatem & fidem habere; esse agnoscendam, esse recipiendam, non tantum quia Ecclesia sic statuit & iussit, sed quia a Deo prodiit: prodisse autem a Deo, non ab Ecclesia, sed ex Spiritu sancto, certo intelligi." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 315a. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 279-280.

accurately and interprets αὐτόπιστος as "true from itself" instead of "convincing or credible of itself."[91] Perhaps Stapleton did not know the meaning of the term αὐτόπιστος.[92] In his *Duplicatio* Whitaker exposes this misinterpretation; the unnecessary addition of *ex se* shows that Stapleton does not know what αὐτόπιστος means. "You really do not know what the meaning of this word is, or you pretend not to know. […] For αὐτόπιστος means not only that something is true of itself, but that it does not stand in need of an argument, by which it is confirmed or of a demonstration."[93] In the margin Whitaker refers to Proclus's commentary on Euclid's *Elements*.[94] This reference to Proclus is striking; for it is an indication that Whitaker connected the theological term to the philosophical text of Proclus on Euclid. In that case Proclus may have influenced the use of αὐτόπιστος in the Reformation as well, although this reference at the end of the sixteenth century does not prove that Proclus was the source of the term for Calvin and Bullinger. "I have called Scripture αὐτόπιστος, just like a philosopher calls a definition αὐτόπιστος when it does not need a proof."[95] The reference shows that Whitaker was familiar with the original philosophical meaning of αὐτόπιστος. In his *Duplicatio* he says that the Scriptures can be compared with the *principia* in the sciences:

> Those things are self-convincing and undemonstrable (αὐτόπιστος and ἀναπόδεικτος), that do not require external proofs and from which other things are proved evidently (*per se notis*) and clearly. Just as the arts (*artes*) depend on their principles (*principia*), from which all things are proved while they stand through themselves, so the religion of all Christians depends on the Holy Scriptures and unless they are certain by themselves (*per se certae*), the religion must vacillate.[96]

---

91 "Taceo quod his ais 'scripturam ex se esse αὐτόπιστον', quum illud cuilibet dogmati fidei, cuilibet revelatae veritati commune sit, quod ex se fidem habeat, id est ex se vera sit, non ex authoritate praedicantis veritatem accipiat, de quo etiam iam multa diximus." Stapleton, *Opera Omnia* 1, 862. Cf. Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 17b.

92 In a quotation from Calvin's *Institutes* in his *Principiorum Fidei Demonstratio* Stapleton leaves the term αὐτόπιστος away. "Maneat ergo hoc fixum, Scripturam quidem ipsam demonstrationi & rationibus subiici fas non esse: quam tamen apud nos meretur certitudinem Spiritus testimonio consequi." Stapleton, *Opera Omnia* 1, 312. In the *Triplicatio* he gives the exact quotation. Stapleton, *Opera Omnia* 1, 1120.

93 "Namqui scripturam αὐτόπιστον vocat, non illi opus est illud 'ex se' addere. Si enim αὐτόπιστος sit, ex se fidem atque authoritatem habet. Tu vero aut nescis quae vis verbi huius sit, aut te nescire simulas. […] Nam αὐτόπιστον est, non modo quod ex se verum est,sed quod argumentum, quo confirmatur, aut demonstrationem non desiderat." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 18b.

94 "Proclus in tertio Euclid." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 18b.

95 "Sic igitur αὐτόπιστον Scripturam dixi, ut philosophus ὡροτασιν vocat αὐτόπιστον, quae probationem non requirit, quaeque ob eam causam apistos quoque appellatur, cum demonstrari nequeat." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 18b.

96 "Sunt autem quaedam αὐτόπιστα atque ἀναπόδεικτα, quae probationes externas non requirunt, ex quibus per se notis ac manifestis caetera probantur. Quemadmodum autem artes suis principiis nituntur, ex iisque probantur omnia, ipsa per se consistunt: sic religio omnis Christianorum ex sacris scripturis pendet, quae nisi per se certae sint, religio vacillet necesse est." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 93b. Whitaker sometimes refers to Aquinas, but it is not clear if Whitaker's idea of αὐτόπιστος is influenced by the medieval idea of the *principia per se nota*. He quotes Aquinas more than the other medieval authors, but he uses him eclectically,

In his theological application of this philosophical term Whitaker seems to make a differentiation; he does not use the expression *per se nota*, but *per se certae* and this indicates that the Scriptures are not self-evident in the same way as the principles of science are. In the *Duplicatio* he says: "Scripture is αὐτόπιστος because it is to be believed by itself and for itself (*per se & propter se credenda*)."[97]

4.2.5 *Internum* and *Externum* as Private and Public

Stapleton stated in his *Demonstratio* that the Calvinists completely discredited the testimony of the Church regarding Scripture by their insistence on the hidden (*arcanum*) *testimonium* of the Spirit.[98] "The testimony of the Spirit must be public and not only private; manifest and certain, not hidden."[99] Whitaker in turn denied that this was the most important point. He did not reject the testimony of the church but was willing to embrace it.[100] Whitaker emphasized in his *Disputatio* that the *status controversiae* was whether the Scriptures are to be believed only on account of the testimony of the church or rather on account of the persuasion of the Spirit. Without using the term αὐτόπιστος Whitaker explains the relation between αὐτόπιστος and the *testimonium* in his formulation of the *status controversiae*.

> The *status* therefore of the controversy is whether we are to believe that these Scriptures which we have, are sacred and canonical only on account of the testimony of the church, or rather on account of the internal persuasion of the Holy Spirit that causes Scripture – just as it is canonical and authentic in itself – also to appear as such to us and without which the testimony of the church is mute and powerless.[101]

Whitaker says that Scripture is not only authentic in itself, but also with respect to us. There was no discussion with Rome about the authority of Scripture *in se*. In the discussion with the Counter-Reformation the self-convincing character of Scripture was not separated from the internal witness of the Spirit; the witness of the Spirit makes Scripture αὐτόπιστος *quoad nos*.[102] The *testimonium* of the Spirit is contrasted with the *testimonium* of the church. The internal witness of the Spirit does not stand in opposition to the "external Word," but it stands in opposition to the institutional witness of the church. The contrast *internum* versus *externum* is not subjective versus objective

---

reading him and the other medieval theologians from Calvin's perspective. Cf. Broeyer 'Traces of the Rise of Reformed Scholasticism,' 165, 178-179.

97 "Scriptura αὐτόπιστος est, quia per se & propter se credenda est." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 109a.

98 "Punctum ergo Controversiae inter nos & adversarios hac in re est, quod illi quidem Ecclesiae testimonium vel nullius prorsus authoritatis esse sentiunt, ut Calvinus & eius sequaces." Stapleton, *Opera Omnia* 1, 312.

99 "debere hoc testimonium Spiritus publicum esse, non privatum tantum: & manifestum ac certum, non arcanum." Stapleton, *Opera Omnia* 1, 314.

100 "Non ergo Ecclesiae testimonium respuimus, ut de nobis Papistae mentiuntur, sed amplectimur." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica*, 1, 315a. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 279.

101 "Status igitur Controversiae est, Utrum credendum sit, has Scripturas, quas habemus, sacras ac Canonicas esse, tantumodo propter Ecclesiae testimonium, an potius propter internam Spiritus sancti persuasionem: quae facit ut quemadmodum Scriptura est in se Canonica atque authentica, sic nobis quoque videatur, & sine qua testimonium Ecclesiae mutum atque invalidum est." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 315a. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 280.

102 Heim misinterpreted Whitaker when he said that he separated *sacra Scriptura per se* αὐτόπιστος and the *testimonium Sp. S. quoad nos*. Heim, *Gewißheitsproblem*, 295.

but personal versus ecclesiastical. Stapleton does not agree with Whitaker's definition of the *status controversiae*. In his *Defensio* he replies: "The *status controversiae* that you now put forward as being between us and you, is nothing, it is your opinion, it is a monster, most stupidly invented by yourself."[103] He objects to Whitaker's antithesis of the testimony of the church and the testimony of the Spirit, for, according to him, the personal testimony of the Spirit depends on the public or institutional testimony of the church. Stapleton says that, according to the Calvinists, Scripture is to be believed only because of the private *testimonium* of the Spirit and Whitaker says that, according to the Catholics, Scripture is to be believed only because of the public *testimonium* of the church.

At the background of Stapleton's convictions stands the Roman Catholic doctrine of faith; according to Stapleton, the *actus* of faith is impossible without the *habitus* of faith. He defined this *habitus* as the internal persuasion of the Holy Spirit (*interna persuasio Spiritus Sancti*), copying the Calvinistic terminology.[104] For Stapleton the church is a necessary means of grace, because the *persuasio* of the Spirit or the *habitus* of faith that is the basis for the *actus* of faith is the result of the infused grace (*gratia infusa*) that is given in the church through the sacraments. In the *Duplicatio* Whitaker rejects this distinction between *actus* and *habitus fidei*. For him the "infused disposition of faith" meant the act of faith itself, including the sure persuasion of the Spirit.[105] Whitaker reformulates his original *status controversiae*:

> We affirm, teach and defend that Scripture is αὐτόπιστος, which means that it is for us canonical by itself and its divinity ought to be recognized and is recognized by us not because of the judgment of the Pope that is worthless, nor because of the testimony of the church and all the churches – for the whole church depends on Scripture and Scripture in no wise depends on the church – but because of the supremely divine character of the Scriptures.[106]

According to Whitaker, Stapleton is wrong in his demand that the *testimonium* on which the authority of Scripture is based has to be *externum* and *publicum*.[107] Whitaker says that Scripture has no external power of compulsion, but only internally compels the

---

103 "Status controversiae quem tu hic ponis, quasi inter nos & te, nullus est, commentum tuum est, chimaera est, a te stultissime inventa." Stapleton, *Opera Omnia* 1, 864.

104 "Impossibile esse sine habitu fidei infuso (quae est interna persuasio Spiritus Sancti ut tu semper stilo Calviniano loqueris) actu fidei iustificantis credere." Stapleton, *Opera Omnia* 1, 864. Cf Broeyer, *William Whitaker*, 140.

105 "Nam habitus ille fidei infusus, quid aliud est, nisi ipsa fides, in qua certa est Spiritus Sancti persuasio." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 23b. Cf. Schützeichel, *Kirchlichen Lehrautorität nach Thomas Stapleton*, 46-47. In this rejection he followed the Reformers. "The *habitus gratiae* implies an intrinsic righteousness in the believer, whereas the Reformers' concept of imputed righteousness is extrinsic." Muller, *Dictionary*, 134. The term *habitus* was not rejected completely in Reformed orthodoxy, probably because of the concept of the faculties of the soul. Cf. Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 355-359.

106 "Nos contra afferimus, docemus, defendimus scripturam esse αὐτόπιστον, id est sibi nobisque per se canonicam: divinamque a nobis agnoscendam esse & agnosci non propter aut Papae iudicium, quod nucem vitiosam non valet, aut Ecclesiae Ecclesiarumque omnium testimonium, eum Ecclesia tota ex Scripturis pendeat, Scripturae nullo modo pendeat ex Ecclesia, sed propter ipsum Scripturarum divinissimum characterem." Whitaker, *Opera* 2, 24b-25a.

107 Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 13b. "Tu tale spiritus testimonium in Ecclesia constituis, quod neque scripturarum sit, neque internum, cuiusmodi nullum ne cogitari potest." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 449b.

mind to assent.[108] The problem with the authority of the church or the pope is that it is external and therefore unable to persuade us inwardly. "Unless that inward persuasion of the Holy Spirit comes into force, our heart can never securely and resolutely find rest (*acquiescere*) in any interpretation."[109] For Whitaker the church is a helpful aid in the acceptance of Scripture, but it is not essential.[110] For Whitaker the *testimonium internum* of the Spirit in most cases is not paired with the *testimonium externum* of the Word, but with the *testimonium externum* or the institutional witness of the church.[111] The distinction *externum* and *internum* refers to the authority of the church and the authority of the Spirit witnessing though the Word in the hearts of believers.

To illustrate this we can compare Whitaker's statements with what Rollock says in his *Treatise of Effectual Calling*. The Holy Spirit effects the work of illumination by certain means and instruments. Rollock distinguishes two kinds of means, the first internal and the second external.

> The inward mean is in the very Scripture itself; the outward is without the Scripture. The internal mean is the principal organ or instrument of God's Spirit in this work and it is that very light which shineth in the Scripture. The Holy Ghost, then, doth first of all open the eyes of our understanding, by the light of the Scripture, to discern that light of the Scripture, so bright in itself, and so unknown unto us.[112]

Under the external means or testimonies, Rollock primarily discusses the witness of the church regarding Scripture. The Spirit does not work faith in our hearts by this second kind of external means, but only prepares our hearts to receive faith or confirms that faith afterwards. Sometimes this second kind of means is sent before Scripture; Rollock refers to Augustine, who says that he would not have believed the gospel without the authority of the Catholic Church moving him. According to Rollock, Augustine means that he was prepared by the authority and testimony of the church to believe the gospel, but afterwards the Spirit that had thus prepared him worked faith in his heart through Scripture.[113]

4.2.6 The Effect of the Word

Whitaker gives nineteen arguments to prove "that the authority of the Scriptures for us (*quoad nos*) does not depend on the judgment and authority of the church"[114] His fourth argument is a syllogism and runs as follows:

---

108 Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 356b. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 446.

109 "Imo nisi interna ista Spiritus sancti persuasi accesserit, nunquam in ulla interpretatione secure & constanter animus noster acquiescet." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 356b. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 447. Cf. Broeyer, *William Whitaker*, 133.

110 Whitaker is accused by Stapleton of deviating from Calvin at this point. Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 3b.

111 Nevertheless, there are a few cases in which *externum* and *internum* refer to Word and Spirit. Whitaker says that "the *internum testimonium* of the Spirit always and necessarily is joined with the *externum testimonium* of the Scriptures." Whitaker, *Opera* 2, 414a. Cf. Broeyer, *William Whitaker*, 142. Cf. Whitaker, *Opera Theologica*, 1, 349a. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 415.

112 Rollock, *Select Works* 1, 70.

113 Rollock, *Select Works* 1, 71-72. Rollock follows Calvin's exegesis of Augustine at this point.

114 The title of *Quaestio* 3.9, is: "Argumenta nostra, quibus probamus, Scripturarum authoritatem, quoad nos, non pendere ex Ecclesiae iudicio ac testimonio." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 327b. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 332.

> If Scripture has such great force and virtue in itself, as to draw up our souls to itself, to infuse into us an intimate persuasion of the truth, and of itself to commend itself to our belief; then it is certain that it is to us of itself αὐτόπιστος, canonical and authentic. Now the first is true, therefore also the second. There is no controversy about the major. The minor may be confirmed by testimonies of Scripture[115]

This third occurrence of αὐτόπιστος in the *Disputatio* shows that the term stands for the independent authority of Scripture. The conclusion that Scripture *quoad nos* is of itself αὐτόπιστος, canonical, and authentic, confirms Whitaker's general thesis that the authority of Scripture *quoad nos* does not depend upon the judgment of the church. Here the effect of Scripture on the believer is an argument for its *autopistia*. The *vis* and *virtus* of Scripture to persuade us of its truth imply that Scripture is αὐτόπιστος. Whitaker refers to the parable of the seed (Luke 8,11). The Word of God is like seed that springs up of itself, breaks forth, and manifests its energy.

> There is a certain divine force, virtue and efficacy in Scripture, which reaches not only the ears, but also the soul itself and penetrates to the inmost recesses of the heart and proves the most certain divinity of Scripture. Scripture therefore, which has such a force in itself and which so openly shows, proves, establishes itself and persuades us of its own truth, is by all means of itself canonical and authentic.[116]

In his *Defensio* Stapleton answers that the seed mentioned by Jesus in the parable is not Scripture or the written Word of God, but the proclaimed Word of God.[117] In his *Duplicatio* Whitaker denies the antithesis between the written Word and preached Word. "If the *verbum praedicatum* is αὐτόπιστος then the *verbum scriptum* must also be αὐτόπιστος, because the preaching of the Word originates from Scripture."[118] Both opponents pass as ships in the night, because Whitaker goes back from the efficiency of preaching to the efficiency and *autopistia* of Scripture while Stapleton distinguishes between the original preaching of Christ and the later scriptural registration of that preaching. For Stapleton the *verbum predicatum* is primary and for Whitaker it is secondary to the *verbum scriptum*. For Stapleton the preaching of Christ was broader than its scriptural report in the gospels, while Whitaker would not accept any extra-scriptural *verbum predicatum* of Christ.

---

115 "Si scriptura tantam in se vim ac virtutem, ut mentes nostras ad se rapiat, ut nobis penitus persuadeat, ut fidem nobis per se faciat, tum eam certum est per se αὐτόπιστον, Canonicem, & authenticam nobis esse. At primum verum: ergo & secundum. De maiora nulla controversia. Minor vero scripturae testimoniis confirmari potest." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 328b. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 335.

116 "Ex his omnibus locis intelligimus, divinam quandam vim, virtutem, & efficacitatem scripturis inesse, quae non ad aures modo perveniat, sed ad ipsum usque animum, & ad intimos cordis recessus penetret, & scriptuarum certissimam divinitatem comprobet. Scriptura ergo, quae talem in se vim habet, quaeque tam palam se prodit, arguit, confirmat, nobis de sua veritate persuadet, omnino Canonica per se & authentica est." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 328b. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 336. He also refers to 1 Peter 1,13 and to Paul who says that his preaching was in demonstration of the Spirit and of power (1 Cor. 2,4).

117 "Semen enim de quo Christus loquitur Luc. 8. non est scriptura aut verbum Dei scriptum, sed verbum predicatum, quod auditu accipitur." Stapleton, *Opera Omnia* 1, 1037. Cf. Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 386a

118 "Fixum igitur manet non aliud esse verbum praedicatum quam scriptum: quare si praedicatum verbum αὐτόπιστον sit, & scriptum erit, cum praedicatio ex scripturis proficiscatur." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 387a-387b.

For Whitaker the *autopistia* of Scripture is the basis for its canonicity and authenticity. The term is used to counter one of the strongest arguments for the authority of the church: the determination of the canon. Whitaker develops the idea of the *autopistia* of Scripture exactly to answer this argument. The determination of the canon does not rest on the decision of the church, but flows from the *autopistia* of Scripture. On this issue Stapleton in the *Defensio* asks Whitaker how he will be able to establish the canonicity of the Scriptures without the authority of the church. In his *Duplicatio* Whitaker answers that the books of the canon ought to be indubitable in the church; it follows that these books cannot be accepted in the canon because of the authority of the church, but because of their own authority and divinity.[119] The church did not make the books authentic or canonical, but only recognized them as such.

The term αὐτόπιστος indicates that the authority of Scripture *in se* and *quoad nos* is independent of and precedes the authority of the church; *autopistia* has become a technical term in the discussion between Reformation and Rome. This is illustrated by the fact that in the *Duplicatio* Whitaker underlines his point of the independent authority of Scripture by saying that there are many things that demonstrate the αὐτοπιστία of the Scriptures.[120] This, however, is a contradiction in the terms, for *demonstranda* and αὐτοπιστία exclude each other. *Autopistia* has become an attribute of Scripture and a synonym for its independent authority and the original philosophical meaning of the term and its application in the theology of Calvin is lost out of sight.

4.2.7 Summarizing Remarks

Whitaker deals with the authority of Scripture in the context of anti-Catholic polemics. In this context the term αὐτόπιστος is useful to explain the Protestant position, although there is a tension between the polemical method and the original meaning of the term αὐτόπιστος, for if Scripture is self-convincing it does not need a polemical defense. We have seen that in the polemical context the meaning and the use of αὐτόπιστος has changed in several ways.

1. The term is not only used as an adjective, but also as a substantive. The *autopistia* of Scripture has become one of the attributes or properties of Scripture, along with the *perspicuitas* and *sufficientia*. In Whitaker's theology the *autopistia* is the most central attribute of Scripture because it expresses its authority, as the title of his *Duplicatio* shows. This formalization of the *autopistia* of Scripture as a synonym for its authority carries the term away from its original meaning. Whitaker says that it is possible to demonstrate the *autopistia* of Scripture.
2. We have seen an emphasis on the authority of Scripture *quoad nos*. The term αὐτόπιστος is not used to express what Scripture is in itself, but why it has authority for us. Stapleton and the other Roman Catholic opponents admitted that Scripture has authority in and of itself, but they denied that it could have authority for us without the authority of the church. According to Whitaker, the testimony of the church is useful to

---

119 "Nam de quo nemo dubitet, id αὐτόπιστον esse necesse est: de scripturis autem quibusdam, iis nempe quae certo Canonicae vocantur, nunquam dubitatum fuit: sunt illae igitur scripturae αὐτόπιστοι." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 241b.

120 "Hoc quidem a te verissime responsum est, atque ad Scripturarum demonstranda αὐτοπιστίαν plurimum facit." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 2, 366b.

move us to accept Scripture and to confirm its authority, but only the testimony of the Spirit can persuade us that Scripture is αὐτόπιστος; Whitaker prefers the term *persuasio* to denote true faith.

3. The controversy with Rome places the use of αὐτόπιστος in the much wider range of the questions of the determination of the canon and the authentic version of Scripture. Thus αὐτόπιστος becomes a synonym for authentic and is applied to the original Hebrew and Greek text of Scripture. The Roman Catholic appeal to the authority of the Septuagint and the Vulgate seems to lead to a rejection of the authority of these ancient versions in Reformed orthodoxy. The term αὐτόπιστος is not primarily used for the faith of believers that acquiesce in Scripture but to safeguard the original and authentic text of Scripture.

4. Regarding the determination of the canon, Whitaker says that the ancient church has accepted Scripture as canonical because of its *autopistia*. The canonical books of Scripture are not made authoritative through the determination of the church. On the contrary, the church accepts them, because the Spirit has shown the church that they are self-convincing. The same Spirit now shows this to believers and consequently the authority of the church is only a secondary help to establish the canon.

5. Finally, we have found that the terms *externum* and *internum* are not primarily related to Word and Spirit, but to the institutional testimony of the church and the personal testimony of the Spirit. The *testimonium* is so strongly related to Scripture that it is called *non externum* because it is found in Scripture itself; the *testimonium* is received from the *doctrina* of Scripture. For Whitaker the *testimonium* is not only *internum* in the hearts of believers but also *internum* in the text of Scripture. In this way he keeps *autopistia* and *testimonium* very close together. The *testimonium* of the Spirit makes the *autopistia* of Scripture so clear to believers that they accept Scripture on its own account.

Whitaker chooses the three offices of Christ to classify his disputations, and places the authority of Scripture in the context the prophetic office of Christ. Calvin discussed the authority of Scripture in the first part of the *Institutes* in the context of the knowledge of God. He did not feel completely comfortable with this position because the authority of Scripture and the *testimonium* belong to soteriology. Whitaker dismisses Bellarmine for discussing the authority of Scripture in the prolegomena, but does not openly criticize Calvin for doing the same.

Whitaker also connects the evidences to the *testimonium* in a more detailed way than Calvin. In the *Institutes* Calvin mentions evidences for the authority of Scripture and says that he would be able to demonstrate the divine origin of Scripture. Nevertheless, the *testimonium* is necessary to accept this authority with the certainty that is essential to saving faith. Calvin does not connect the evidences to the *testimonium*, because he is speaking to two different fronts. Whitaker says that the *testimonium* gives power (*vis*) to the evidences; in the *Duplicatio* he even goes a step further and says that there are many things that demonstrate the *autopistia* of Scripture.

Finally, Whitaker does not completely reject the authority and the testimony of the church, but emphasizes the private *testimonium* of the Spirit so much, that he leaves the church as an arbitrary extra witness. He tends to diminish the authority of the church, while for Calvin the church remained an important external means (*medium externum*)

for the acceptance of Scripture. Maybe Stapleton is right when he accuses Whitaker of deviating from Calvin at this point. Whitaker takes a more subjective position than Calvin. For Whitaker the church is helpful in this respect, but it is not really necessary. This shift in emphasis may be due to the fact that he is only facing one front, while Calvin is always kept in balance by his polemics against the spiritualists of the Radical Reformation and needs the testimony of the church to avoid their subjectivism.

4.3 Franciscus Junius (1545-1602)

We will now turn to the question of how the concept of the *autopistia* of Scripture was influenced by the institutionalization of theology in the academic setting of the Reformed universities, by analyzing the work of Francicus Junius, a Reformed professor at Heidelberg and Leiden, who was one of the most influential theologians of the early orthodox period. Of course Whitaker was also an academic theologian, but his work is characterized by his anti-Catholic polemics, while Junius's discussion of the authority of Scripture stands in the context of a complete system of theology conveyed in the *disputationes* held under his responsibility. We will analyze these disputations to study the influence of the academic context on the Reformed concept of the *autopistia* of Scripture. A fifteen-year-old student in Lyon he was influenced by the reading of one of Cicero's works and seduced to what he called "atheism." Back home he had severe spiritual struggles, took his father's New Testament, opened it at random, and read John 1.

> I read part of the chapter and while I was reading I was so moved, that suddenly I sensed the divinity (*divinitas*) of the argument and the majesty (*maiestas*) and authority (*auctoritas*) of the written Word, that largely surpassed all the torrents of human eloquence. My body shivered, my heart was perplexed, and I was so affected the whole day that it even seemed uncertain to me who I was.[121]

The Latin terms in this conversion narrative return in Junius's disputations on the authority of Scripture, thus reflecting the experience of the *autopistia* of Scripture in his own spiritual life. As an Old Testament scholar he wrote commentaries on several books of the Bible and translated and annotated the whole Old Testament in Latin together with Immanuel Tremellius (1510-1580).[122] Junius made some critical remarks in his exegetical works; he had reservations about the authorship of Second Peter and the letters of John.[123]

---

121 "Lego partem capitis, & ita commoveor legens, ut repente divinitatem argumenti, & scripti maiestatem auctoritatemque senserim longo intervallo omnibus eloquentiae humanae fluminibus praeeuntem. Horrebat corpus, stupebat animus, & totum illum diem sic afficiebar, ut qui essem, ipse mihi incertus videre esse." F. Junius, *Opera theologica, dvobvs tomis, ordine commodissimo, nempe Exegetica primo, Elenctica altero, comprehensa, et nunc primùm digesta*, ed. P. Merula, vol. 1, Geneva 1607, 10. Cf. F. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, ed. A. Kuyper, Amsterdam 1882, 18. Sixteen years later he wrote to Ludwig von Wittgenstein about this conversion experience. G.A. Benrath, 'Franciscus Junius, ein Schüler Calvins, Pfarrer in Otterberg (1580-1582),' *Ebernburg-Hefte* 29 (1995), 371-383, 378.

122 I. Tremellius and F. Junius, *Testamenti Veteris Biblia sacra sive Libri Canonici priscae Judaeorum ecclesiae a Deo traditi*, Frankfurt 1579, 5 vol.

123 F.W. Cuno, *Franciscus Junius der Ältere, Professor der Theologie und Pastor (1545-1602): sein Leben und Wirken, seine Schriften und Briefe*, Amsterdam 1891, 218.

Junius is important for the *autopistia* of Scripture, because the prolegomena of his system were very influential. Junius introduced the distinction between *theologia archetypa*, the infinite knowledge God has of himself and the *theologia ectypa*, the finite knowledge of God in the mind of creatures, in Reformed theology.[124] Junius's distinctions influenced Lutheran orthodoxy via John Gerhard (1585-1637).[125] Gerhard was the first theologian among Lutherans to discuss the prolegomena in detail, introducing the term *principium cognoscendi* for Scripture into Lutheran orthodoxy, and the first to use the term αὐτόπιστος to define the *principium*, possibly under Junius's influence.[126] Gerard related the *autopistia* of Scripture to its inspiration.[127]
The disputation was one of the forms of scholastic public education; the presiding *magister* stated a subject (*quaestio*) in the form of theses and one of the students, the appointed *respondens*, had to answer the objections that were brought forward against the *theses*. The minutes, providing a summary of the discussion and not a verbatim report, were often published together with the conclusion of the professor.[128] The disputations of the presiding professor gave an official and academic statement of the Reformed faith and, consequently, have more weight than the opinion of an individual author. In many cases the disputations were included in the posthumous publication of the professor's works. Junius's *Opera Theologica* contain two series of disputations; one held in Heidelberg under the title *Theses Theologicae Heydelbergensis* and one from Leiden, the *Theses Theologicae Leydenses*. The first series opens with the following disputations: (1) On the Definition of Theology, (2) On the Definition and

---

124 In his *De theologia vera* (1594) Junius first made this distinction, derived from the medieval prolegomena of Duns Scotus. He divided the *theologia ectypa* in *theologia unionis* (the knowledge that Christ has of God), *theologia visionis* (the knowledge that the angels and saints in heaven have of God) and *theologia viatorum* (the knowledge that Christians have of God during their pilgrimage). Althaus, *Prinzipien*, 230-231. Cf. Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 221-222; Muller, *Dictionary*, 299-301. Cf. C. De Jonge, *De irenische ecclesiologie van Franciscus Junius (1545-1602): onderzoek naar de plaats van het geschrift 'Le Paisible Chrestien' (1593) in zijn theologisch denken*, [Leiden] [1980], 51-57.

125 R.D. Preus, *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism: A Study of Theological Prolegomena*, vol. 1, Saint Louis 1970, 112-114. Cf. Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 113-114, 224.

126 For the use of the term *autopistia* in Lutheran theology, see H.F.R.S. Echternach, 'Die Lehre von der Autopistie der Heiligen Schrift,' *Evangelisch-lutherische Kirchenzeitung* 6 (1952), 87-89, 101-103, 117-120. Idem, 'The Lutheran Doctrine of the Autopistia of Holy Scripture,' *Concordia Theological Monthly* 23 (1952), 255-265. Bilaterale Arbeitsgruppe der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz und der Kirchenleitung der Vereinigten Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands, *Communio Sanctorum: Die Kirche als Gemeinschaft der Heiligen*, Frankfurt [etc.] 2000. "Lutheraner glauben, daß die Heilige Schrift aufgrund der Zusage Gottes selbst die Kraft hat, die Wahrheit Gottes zur Geltung zu bringen und sich auszulegen (Autopistie). In der katholischen Kirche ist die Authentizität und Irrtumslosigkeit des kirchlichen Lehramtes selber Gegenstand des Glaubens."

127 "Quia est θεόπνευστος, divina inspiratione edita ac promulgate, ideo est αὐτόπιστος, τὸ πὶστον ἀφ ' ἑαυτῆς ἔχουσα." J. Gerhard, *Loci theologici cum pro adstruenda veritate, tum pro destruenda quorumvis contradicentium falsitate per theses nervose solide et copiose explicate*, ed. J.F. Cotta, vol. 2, Tubingen 1762-1787, 36. Cf. In scientiis humanis habentur quaedam principia αὐτόπιστα & ἀναπόδεικτα certissima & indemonstrabilia, quae non dependent ex aliis, sed alia ex ipsis. Gerhard, *Loci* 2, 40-41. Cf. Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 116.

128 Cf. Van Asselt and Rouwendal, *Inleiding*, 57.

Material of Scripture, (3) On the Form of Scripture, (4) On the Efficient Cause of Scripture, (5) On the Purpose of Scripture, (6) On the Authority of Scripture (7) On the Authority of Scripture that does not Depend on the Church (8) On the Canon (9) On the Interpretation of Scripture, and (10) On Traditions.

Junius structured the doctrine of Scripture in a scholastic form according to the four Aristotelian causes. Aristotle had distinguished four different causes: the efficient cause (*causa efficiens*), the material cause (*causa materialis*), the formal cause (*causa formalis*), and the final cause (*causa finalis*). This distinction is essential for understanding how scholasticism as a method provided a model for structuring theological discussions.[129]

The term αὐτόπιστος does not occur in the Heidelberg theses, although Junius deals with questions about the authority of Scripture and the church. He says that "the authority of the church is secondary; it does not establish the divine authority of Scripture – for only God does that – but it witnesses to it."[130]

The disputations of the second series are much longer; the titles of the first five disputations are: (1) On True Theology, (2) On Holy Scripture, (3) Elenctic Theses on Holy Scripture, (4) On the Authority of Holy Scripture, and (5) On the Authority and the Perfection of the Word of God. The disputations are not published in the same sequence in which they have been held, and therefore they sometimes overlap each other. In both series the *locus de Scriptura* receives a place between the opening disputation on the nature of theology and the discussion of the essence and attributes of God. This arrangement might have been from Junius himself, but this is not certain because the *Opera Theologica* were published after his death.[131]

4.3.1 *De Sacra Scriptura*

The second disputation of the *Theses Theologicae Leydenses* is titled *De Sacra Scriptura*.[132] Junius says that the consideration of Holy Scripture is of the greatest importance among the theological questions and that many controversies are implicated in it.[133] One of these controversies regards the *authoritas* of Scripture. Junius follows the four Aristotelian causes and proves that the material, the formal, the efficient and the final causes of Scripture are all divine. The goal (*finis*) of Scripture is the glory of God and the benefit of the elect in the conformation with God that emerges from the

---

129 Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 238. Just for example, when a child builds a tower of blocks, the child is the efficient cause, the blocks are the material cause, the idea of a tower in the mind of the child is the formal cause, and the tower is the final cause.

130 "Auctoritas Ecclesiae est secundaria, non ad statuendum (hoc enim Dei solius est) sed ad testificandum diuinam auctoritatem Scripturae." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1765. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 305.

131 Van Asselt seems to overlook the fact that the arrangement of the *loci* is probably not from Junius. Van Asselt and Rouwendal, *Inleiding*, 106. Cf. Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 113-114.

132 It was not possible to trace the original copy of this disputation and therefore the date and the name of the responding student remain obscure. Cf. De Jonge, *Irenische ecclesiologie*, 219.

133 "Sacrae Scripturae consideratio uti inter disquisitiones Theologicas maxime est momenti, ita pluribus hodie controversiis implicita." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1593-1594. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 106.

communication of his Word and the internal operation of the Spirit.[134] This leads to the conclusion that "the authority of Scripture is above all exception and its perfection is incomparable."[135] The authority of Scripture is perfect in itself and irresistible.

> It is in no way necessary either that the authority of the church confirms the authority of Scripture for us or that the decrees of the councils establish it; the calling of both is much more to hand on and proclaim the authority with which God himself has clothed Scripture.[136]

Scripture is the indubitable rule of everything concerning our faith and life.[137] Because the canon is the rule of faith it must be certain; the deuterocanonical books do not meet this condition because they lack the divine *materia* and *forma*.

> And such is the truly divine canon, that consists of those books that God has written through his servants who were enabled (ἱκανωθέντας) by himself; it has τὸ αὐτόπιστον as a property of the fourth mode (*proprium quarto modo*) and it binds the faith, not because it is defined by the church, but because it is given and sealed by God himself.[138]

Junius does not say that Scripture is αὐτόπιστος, but that it has τὸ αὐτόπιστον; the adjective is changed into a substantive. *Proprium quarto modo* indicates the strictest meaning of the term *proprium* and implies that the property belongs always and exclusively to all the members of a certain class.[139] That Scripture has τὸ αὐτόπιστον means that it always and only and in every respect is self-convincing or has the characteristic of self-convincingness.

In this *disputatio* the evidences for the authority of Scripture are only listed. The *maiestas* of Scripture shines forth from the arrangement of the events and the harmony of the several parts. The church testifies to it, accepting God as the author of Scripture.

---

134 "Secundarius vero finis est electorum bonum, quod consistit in conformatione nostri cum Deo, quae ex communicatione verbi & interna Spiritus operatione existit." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1595. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 107.

135 "Authoritas Scripturae omni exceptione maior, & perfectio incomparabilis." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1595. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 107.

136 "Ita ut nullo modo sit necessarium ut taut Ecclesiae auctoritas eam nobis commendet, aut conciliorum decreta stabiliant, quorum utrorumque munus est auctoritatem a Deo inditam tradere & propagare." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1595. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 107. Cf. Th. L. Haitjema, 'De Asser Synode en het Schriftgezag,' *Onder eigen vaandel: Drie-maandelijksch theologisch tijdschrift* 1 (1926), 290.

137 Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1595. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 107.

138 "Atque hic vere divinus est canon, es iis libris solummodo constans, quos Deus per servos suos ab ipso ἱκανωθέντας scripsit: Hic habet τὸ αὐτόπιστον proprie quarto modo, & obstringit fidem, nec ab Ecclesia definitus, sed a Deo ipso traditus & obsignatus est." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1595. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 108. The Greek word ἱκανωθέντας comes from ἱκανόω, which means to enable or to give a mandate.

139 The expression *proprium quarto modo* stems from scholastic philosophy, where four senses or modes of the word *proprium* are distinguished. A *proprium* is either (1) a characteristic of a species which belongs to all members of the species but not *only* to them, or (2) a characteristic that belongs only to the members of a species but not to all of them, or (3) a characteristic that belongs to all the members of a species and only to them, but not always. The strictest sense (4) of the word refers to a characteristic which always and only belongs to all the members of a species. P. Eisenberg, 'How to Understand "De Intellectus Emendatione",' *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 9 (1971), 171-192, 181, n. 17. The use of this expression was not accidental. In his series of *Animadversiones* against Bellermine's *De verbo scripto et non scripto*, Junius writes: "Divinus ille canon habet το αὐτόπιστον proprie quarto modo (ut ita loquamur) & obstringit fidem." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 2, 417.

Believers all agree on it (*consensus piorum*), even though they differ in other things. "Beyond contradiction, however, is the *testimonium* of the Holy Spirit, who works faith in the hearts of believers, that Holy Scripture has flowed from God its author."[140] The other testimonies are clear, but they cannot move us unless God directs our hearts to apprehend and believe them. Scripture is as a spiritual sun and no sound person can deny that it is clear *per se*. "But its clarity is not discerned except by those of whom the eyes are illuminated by the internal light of the Holy Spirit."[141]

Junius was involved in the editing of the final edition of the *Belgic Confession* (Antwerp, 1566).[142] Therefore this remark may shed some light on the interpretation of this confession. As we have seen in our first chapter its text was changed; the edition of Antwerp (1566) has: "And also that they are approved by themselves, for even the blind themselves are able to sense that the things predicted in them do happen." There were several possible answers to the question who were meant by the blind. It could be unbelievers who have no excuse, it could be the Jews, and the expression could be a general metaphor. Junius's remarks point in the direction that the *Belgic Confession* intends that blind unbelievers are left without excuse because everyone will acknowledge that the sun shines, although the blind do not see it.

4.3.2 *De Authoritate Sacrae Scripturae*

The fourth disputation deals with the authority of Scripture under the title *De Authoritate Sacrae Scripturae*.[143] It opens with the comment that Scripture, which is the means by which God communicates with us, has to be beyond all doubt; the authority of Scripture is a logical necessity. "In order that its certainty (*certitudo*) and αὐτοπιστία be rightly secured to human souls, first of all it must be fixed that it is divine in itself (*in se*), next that it is really confirmed as divine in us (*in nobis*)."[144] The thesis closes with the remark that "if the foundation of the church is the doctrine of the apostles and prophets, then its certainty (*certitudo*) and steadfastness must be established by itself and before the church that is built on it."[145] The certainty of faith is at stake from the beginning to the end.

---

140 "Omni vero exceptione maius est singulare testimonium Spiritus Sancti, qui in cordibus fidelium fidem facit Scripturam sacram a Deo authore emanasse." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1595. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 107. We skip the third disputation of the *Theses Theologicae Leydenses* because Junius does not use the term αὐτόπιστος in it and much of it corresponds with the other disputations.

141 "Sed ea claritas non videtur nisi ab iis quorum oculi interna luce Spiritus S. sunt illuminati." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1596. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 109. Cf. Haitjema, 'Asser Synode,' 299.

142 Bakhuizen van den Brink, *Belijdenisgeschriften*, 17. Cf. Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 154.

143 The original copy of the *disputatio* shows that the disputation was held on February 11, 1598 and that Jacobus Montanus, a student from Antwerpen was the *respondens*. F. Junius and J. Montanus, *Disputationum theologicarum repetitarum quarta, de authoritate Sacrae Scripturae*, Leiden 1598.

144 "Ut vero certitudo eius & αὐτοπιστία hominum pectoribus commodius asseratur, primo constare debet illam in se divinam esse, deinde vero in nobis divinam confirmari." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1602. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 115.

145 "Si fundamentum ecclesiae est Prophetica & Apostolica doctrina, necesse est ut eius certitudo & firmitas per se ante constet, quam ecclesiae, quae illi superstructa est." Junius and Montanus,

The relationship of the *testimonium* and the evidences is different than in the second thesis; apparently the students had some liberty in their approach. First it is demonstrated that the divinity of the *materia*, *forma*, *causa efficiens*, and *finis* of Scripture establish the *certitudo* of Scripture *in seipsa*. Then the thesis continues: "Now we have to see how that which is sure in itself, can be sure for us and how we are certainly persuaded that all [the Scriptures] come from God."[146] The demonstration of the authority of Scripture for us is divided into two parts: (1) *a Domino* and (2) *ab Ecclesia*. The first is divided into (1.1) the work of the Spirit, who seals the certainty of Scripture in the hearts by his supernatural light and (1.2) "the second testimony, Scripture itself, that carries clear marks (*notae*) before itself and presenting them to those of whom the eyes of the mind are enlightened by its supernatural light."[147] The *testimonium* of the Spirit and the *testimonium* of Scripture are kept very close together, for the light that Scripture carries with itself is seen through the illumination of the Spirit. These two testimonies are sufficient, but certain arguments (*argumenta*) can be added, by which the authority of Scripture is confirmed. The thesis divides them into (a) *argumenta insita* and (b) *argumenta adsita*. The inherent arguments are divided in (a.a) a material argument, the heavenly doctrine of Scripture, and (a.b) formal arguments. The arguments *a forma* again are divided in (a.b.a) *a forma interna*, which is the fulfillment of the prophecies, and (a.b.b) *a forma externa*, the style and structure of the words. Then the thesis mentions three *argumenta adsita* or *testimonia adsita*: (b.a) the antiquity of Scripture, (b.b) the invincible strength of its truth, and (b.c) the *consensus piorum*. After the *argumenta* the disputation mentions a *testimonium ministeriale* of the church. This ministerial witness does not give Scripture authority but it only acknowledges and confirms its authority for us.

It was a common scholastic method to divide a subject into basic elements and show how they were interrelated. The fulfillment of the prophecies, for example, was a different kind of argument than the antiquity of Scripture. More important is the distinction between the *testimonia* and the *argumenta*. In the second disputation it seemed as if the *testimonium* of the Spirit was the *primus inter pares* of the evidences. Here the *testimonium* of the Spirit is closely related to the *testimonium* of Scripture.

De authoritate Sacrae Scripturae, 23. For some reason this final paragraph is missing in Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 117.

146 "Nunc videndum, qua ratione, quae in se certa est, nobis certa esse possit, nosque certo persuadeamur haec omnia a Deo profecta esse." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1602. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 116.

147 "Alterum vero testimonium est Scriptura ipsa, quae luculentas notas prae se fert, & confert iis, quorum oculi mentis luce supernaturali sunt illustrati." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1602. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 116. Repeated subdivision of a subject into two parts to reduce it to its basic components (bifurcation) became a common method in scholasticism under influence of Ramus, but the use of this method does not automatically imply Ramist influence, because his opponents also used it. According to De Jonge, there are no traces of Ramist philosophy in Junius's theology. De Jonge, *Irenische ecclesiologie*, 260, n. 23. In recent publications on Ramus and his influence it is emphasized that his philosophy cannot be clearly defined. The idea that Ramism was an anti-scholastic alternative to Aristotelianism is a simplification. C. Strohm, 'Theologie und Zeitgeist: Beobachtungen zum Siegeszug der Methode des Petrus Ramus am Beginn der Moderne,' *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 110 (1999), 352-371.

Both are kept separate from the intrinsic and extrinsic arguments for Scripture and from the ministerial *testimonium* of the church. It is remarkable that the word *testimonium* is used for the work of the Spirit, for Scripture itself, for the authority of the church, and for the evidences at the same time.

4.3.3 *De Verbi Dei Auctoritate & Perfectione*

The fifth disputation of the *Theses Theologicae Leydenses* deals with the authority and perfection of Scripture.[148] The term αὐτόπιστος is not used here, but the disputation deals with the relationship between the evidences and the *testimonium* and also distinguishes between a *testimonium internum* and a *testimonium externum*. The disputation opens with the remark that *verbum Dei* does not stand for Christ, the eternal Word of God, or the *Logos*, but for the external inspired Word.[149] After distinguishing the apocrypha from the canonical books, Junius says of the latter that their *authoritas* is beyond question, that they are infallible, and that their perfection is so sublime that they contain everything necessary for saving faith and a life to the honor of God. Then he proves the authority of Scripture by testimonies and arguments.

> The testimonies are either internal or external. The *internum testimonium* that exceeds all other authority and without which all the other testimonies and arguments will be of no weight or importance for us (*apud nos*), is the Holy Spirit speaking to our hearts and testifying to our spirits that these books of Holy Scripture are θεοπνεύστος, that is dictated by Him.[150]

The *externum testimonium* is threefold: The first external testimony is Scripture itself or rather God who speaks to us in Scripture and asserts its divine authority.[151] The second is that of the prophets and apostles who have handed over to the church what they received from the Lord. The third is the church that gives a constant and perpetual consent to Scripture. This third *externum testimonium* is restricted. Just as Scripture is canonical and authentic in itself (*in se*), it also appears to be so to us (*nobis*), and the *testimonium* of the church is mute and invalid without the testimony of the Spirit.[152] The phraseology in the disputation is almost literally the same as Whitaker's *status*

---

148 The original disputation was held on April 5, 1601; an English student, Daniel Castellanus from Canterbury, was the *respondens*. Cf. F. Junius, L. Trelcatius, and F. Gomarus, *Disputationes theologicae XXIV*, Leiden 1601-1602, [2].

149 "VERBUM Dei intelligimus non Verbum aeternum Filium aeterni Patris, nempe λόγον ὐφιστάμενον sed Verbum externum à Deo sanctis, & certis hominibus inspiratum." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1603. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 117.

150 "Testimonia sunt aut interna aut externa. *Internum* testimonium omni alia authoritate praestantius, & sine quo reliqua omnia testimonia & argumenta nullius, apud nos, ponderis aut momenti futura essent, est Spiritus sancti intus animum nostrum alloquentis & hos S. Scripturae libros θεοπνεύστους, id est, à se dictatos esse, spiritui nostro testantis & quasi obsignantis." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1604. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 117-118.

151 "*Externum* Testimonium est, 1. Ipsius S. Scripturae, seu potius Dei nobis in S. Scriptura loquentis, & se eius authorem esse asserentis." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1604. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 118. The references to 2 Tim. 3,16; 2 Peter 1,21; Is. 58,14 and Ezech. 12,25,28 show that Junius means that Scripture claims to be the Word of God.

152 "vt quemadmodum S. Scriptura in se est canonica atque authentica, sic nobis quoque videatur; & sine quo Ecclesiae testimonium mutum prorsus atque inualidum esse censemus." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1604,. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 118.

controversionis in his *Disputatio*; it is probably copied.[153] Through the internal *testimonium* believers not only are persuaded that everything in the Scriptures is dictated by God, but they also are enabled to discern these books from the false and counterfeit books by a spiritual judgment; the *testimonium* of the Spirit enables the Christian to know which books are canonical.

After the *testimonia* the thesis mentions eleven arguments "from which the authority of these Scriptures also can be concluded."[154] Among these are some of Calvin's arguments, such as the heavenliness of its doctrine, the unity of its parts, and its antiquity. But Junius also mentions the fact that the Scriptures alone exhibit liberation from sin and death.[155] He even mentions the severe punishment of the enemies of Scripture such as Pharaoh and Ahab and the Roman emperors Nero and Domitian.[156]

> Although all these arguments bind and force our judgment and strongly prove that Scripture is truly divine, still they absolutely cannot persuade us firmly of this, unless the *testimonium* of the Holy Spirit comes with them. That alone gives these arguments power (*vis*) and not only forces and presses us, like them, but also awakens our whole mind to assent and fills our hearts with wonderful assurance (πληροφορία) and causes us to embrace Holy Scripture as truly θεόπνευστος.[157]

What is said of the *argumenta* can be applied to the *testimonia externa* as well; only the Holy Spirit can give us the full assurance of the divine origin and authority of Scripture. Just like Whitaker, Junius connects the evidences with the *testimonium*, by saying that the *testimonium* gives power (*vis*) to the evidences.[158] Junius divides the *testimonia* into the internal *testimonium* of the Spirit and the external *testimonia* of the text of Scripture,

---

153 "ut quemadmodum Scriptura est in se Canonica atque authentica, sic nobis quoque videatur, & sine qua testimonium Ecclesiae mutum atque invalidum est." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 315a. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 280. It is also possible that both depend on a third source.

154 "*Argumenta* porro ex quibus etiam de huius Scripturae auctoritate concludi potest." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1604. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 118.

155 "quòd sola liberationem à peccato & morte ostendat." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1604. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 118.

156 "Denique quòd eius contemptores atrociter à Deo puniti sunt, vt Pharao, Achab: Iezabel, Sennacherib, Antiochus, Herodes, Nero, Domitianus, &c." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1604. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 118.

157 "Quae omnia argumenta, licet iudicium nostrum constringant & cogant, & Scripturam hanc verè Diuinam esse validè euincant; tamen nunquam firmiter id nobis persuadere possunt, nisi accedat Spiritus Sancti testimonium, qui solus illis argumentis vim addit; nec tantùm cogit & premit, vt illa, sed etiam totam mentem ad assentiendum excitat, & animos nostros mirificâ quâdam πληροφορίᾳ complet, facítque vt S. Scripturam, tanquam vere θεόπνευστον amplectamur." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1604-1605. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 118. The term πληροφορία is used in the New Testament, e.g. in 1 Thess. 1,5.

158 Again there is a remarkable resemblance with Whitaker's *Disputatio*. "Illud vero quando accedit, mirifica quadam πληροφορία animos nostros complet, confirmat, facitque ut scripturam libentissime amplectamur, & superioribus illis argumentis vim addit." Whitaker, *Opera Theologica* 1, 319a. Cf. Whitaker, *Disputation*, 295. Probably the English student Castellanus had read Whitaker as a preparation for his disputation.

the authors of Scripture, and the church; for Junius the Word is *externum* and the Spirit is *internum*.[159]

4.3.4 *De Verbo Dei Scripto*

One other disputation held under Junius's supervision deserves to be mentioned here, the *Disputatio theologica de Verbo Dei Scripto*, which was structured according to the Aristotelian method of the causes.[160] In the *causa efficiens* a definition of inspiration is given. God has spoken through the prophets and "afterwards has written his Word, partly immediately by his own finger, partly mediately, dictating through his Spirit to Moses and the other prophets and holy men as instruments the texts he willed to be written down."[161] The second cause is a *causa impulsiva*, namely the benevolence of God; God has graciously revealed his Word to us for our wellbeing, because without Scripture the purity of the doctrine is in danger. The material cause of Scripture is the *res divinae*: God and everything ordained by him.

Then the disputation turns to the canon. "Next, the canon of Holy Scripture is the *doctrina* comprehended in both Testaments and now it is handed on to the church, to be the only certain and perfect rule of faith and our life."[162] Three criteria for the canonical books are mentioned: They must be written by the prophets or apostles, they must be written in Hebrew or Greek, and they must be approved by Christ or his apostles and also accepted and recognized by the Christian and Apostolic church. The apocryphal books do not meet these criteria and are not in complete agreement with the canon: "They are not αὐτόπιστος and therefore they cannot be publicly propagated in the church to confirm and establish the dogmas of faith, although in the meanwhile they can be used privately for edification."[163] Then the thesis discusses the *causa formalis* and *causa finalis* of Scripture. Its form is twofold: internal and external.

> The internal form is the divine, just, perfect, and holy truth that in this living Word can be communicated to human beings, and its report divinely impressed in the holy Scriptures. Therefore we should hold nothing to be truly and savingly divine that has not been confirmed by God in holy Scripture, which is therefore called αὐτόπιστος.[164]

---

159 In his disputation on the divine call (*De vocatione*) Junius distinguishes the common *vocatio externa* and the particular *vocatio interna*. Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1680. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 206.

160 For some reason it is not included in the collection of the *Opera Theologica*. We only have the original separate publication of the disputation. It was held on January 26, 1600; Symeon Guilielmius from Rotterdam was the *respondens*. F. Junius and S. Guilielmius, *Disputatio theologica de Verbo Dei Scripto*, Leiden 1600.

161 "postea Verbum suum, partim *immediate* digito suo conscripsit; partim *mediate*, eodem Spiritu dictante, primum a Mose, tum ab aliis Prophetis virisque sanctis, tanquam instruments, literis consignari voluit." Junius, Guilielmius, *De Verbo Dei scripto*, [1].

162 "Ceterum *Canon S. Scripturae* est doctrina utriusque Testamenti libris compraehensa, ad hoc Ecclesiae tradita, ut sola certa, & perfecta sit regula fidei & vitae nostrae." Junius, Guilielmius, *De Verbo Dei scripto*, [2].

163 "eoque non esse αὐτόπιστοι, ac propterea publice in Ecclesia ad fiei dogma constituendum & stabiliendum non posse proferri, posse interea privatis ad aedificationem proponi." Junius and Guilielmius, *De Verbo Dei scripto*, [2].

164 "*Interna*, est divina veritas, justa, perfecta, sancta, quae in hac vita sermone est communicabilis cum homine, & relatio eius divinitus impressa in Saripturis sacris, adeo ut nihil sit divine

The internal form is the self-convincing truth communicated in the living Word and impressed in the report of Scripture. The external form is the verbal expression (*oratio*) of this truth. The final cause of Scripture ultimately is God's glory and, secondarily, the gathering of the church to eternal salvation.

The *disputatio* also discusses some of the properties of Scripture, such as its *auctoritas*, its *perfectio*, and its *puritas*. The authenticity of the Latin Vulgate as stated by the Council of Trent is rejected, because this translation does not have enough authority of itself.[165] "Holy Scripture, however, written in Hebrew in the Old Testament and in Greek in the New is inspired, self-convincing, and therefore infallible (θεόπνευστος, αὐτόπιστος, eoque ἀναμάρτητος) and in no wise corrupt."[166] The adjective αὐτόπιστος is used in the context of the canonicity of the Scriptures and the authenticity of the original languages. Only the Hebrew and Greek Bible have the ultimate authority.

4.3.5 Summarizing Remarks

A few remarks on Junius's position may illustrate the influence of the academic setting on the concept of the *autopistia* of Scripture.

1. The *locus de Scriptura* is placed after the disputation on the nature of theology and before the disputations on God. Although it is not certain that this arrangement stems from Junius, he paid special attention to theology as a science in the prolegomena of his system and introduced the distinction between *theologia archetypa* and *theologia ectypa* in Protestant theology. One would expect that the term αὐτόπιστος would occur in the disputations on theology, but Junius uses it in several ways in his disputations on Scripture. We will have to look carefully at the further development of Reformed orthodoxy to see if this place in the system was maintained.
2. Junius not only uses the adjective αὐτόπιστος but also the substantive τὸ αὐτόπιστον; this reminds us of the use of ἀυτοπιστία by Whitaker. In scholastic terminology αὐτόπιστος is formalized into αὐτοπιστία and even called a *proprium* or essential attribute of Scripture. The shift to a substantive indicates that *autopistia* has become one of the attributes of Scripture. In the case of Junius the self-convincingness of Scripture is presupposed; because the canon as the rule of faith must be certain, the canonical books must necessarily be self-convincing. That Scripture has τὸ αὐτόπιστον means that it always and only and in every respect is self-convincing or has the *proprium* of self-convincingness.
3. Junius uses the term αὐτόπιστος to determine the canon, the apocryphal books are not αὐτόπιστος, and for the original Hebrew and Greek version of Scripture, the Vulgate is not αὐτόπιστος. This brings the meaning of the term αὐτόπιστος closer to authentic than to self-convincing. In other words the term does not refer to the acceptance of

---

veritatis atque salutaris tenendum a nobis, quod non habeatur in S. Scriptura a Deo consignatum; ideoque αὐτόπιστος vocatur." Junius and Guilielmius, *De Verbo Dei scripto*, [3].

165 "Vulgatem vero Latinem, quam Patres Tridentini pro authentica jubent haberi, pro ea non agnoscimus, cum nec fidem aut authoritatem ex se habeat sibi sufficientem." Junius and Guilielmius, *De Verbo Dei scripto*, [6].

166 "Sacra autem Scriptura, Hebraice in Veteri Testamento, & Graece in Novo conscripta, sit θεόπνευστος, αὐτόπιστος, eoque ἀναμάρτητος, & nullo modo corrupta." Junius and Guilielmius, *De Verbo Dei scripto*, [6].

Scripture by believers, but to the inspiration of Scripture and the original text in which it resulted.

4. The relationship between the evidences and the testimonium is explained in various ways. In the second disputation the evidences for the authority of Scripture are listed; the *testimonium* is greater than all the other testimonies, but still it is one of them. In the fourth disputation the *testimonium* of the Spirit is related closely to the *maiestas* or *testimonium* of Scripture; the light that Scripture carries with itself is seen through the illumination of the Spirit. These two *testimonia* are distinguished from the intrinsic and extrinsic arguments and from the ministerial *testimonium* of the church. The word *testimonium* is not used exclusively for the work of the Spirit. In the fifth thesis the *testimonia* are divided into internal and external and distinguished from the arguments. It is clear that the issue was not yet settled and that there were various ways of interpreting the relationship between the evidences for the authority of Scripture and the *testimonium* of the Spirit. The authority of the church is not denied, but is always subjected to the testimony of the Spirit, even in the determination of the canon.

5. We have found the distinction between a *testimonium internum* and three *testimonia externa*. The first is that of the Holy Spirit speaking to our hearts and the others are that of Holy Scripture itself, that of the Prophets and Apostles and that of the church. Junius seems to go a step further than Whitaker, for whom *externum* versus *internum* primarily referred to the contrast between the church and the believer. Junius also uses the word-pair for the relationship between Word and Spirit. The use of the terms, however, is too complicated to be explained as objective versus subjective. In the disputation *De Verbo Dei scripto* he distinguishes between an internal and external form of the Word. The *forma interna* is the self-convincing truth, whereas the *forma externa* is the verbal expression of the truth; *internus* sometimes refers to the revealed truth and not to the believer.

4.4 *Internum* and *Externum*

The word-pair *externum* and *internum* is becoming increasingly important in this study. In Whitaker's discussion with the Counter-Reformation the *testimonium internum* of the Spirit is mentioned next to the external testimonies (*externa testimonia*). The *testimonium internum* is closely related to Scripture, because it is received through the *doctrina* of Scripture. For Whitaker *testimonium internum* and *testimonium externum* mostly do not stand for the Spirit and the Word, but for the Spirit and the church. Junius distinguishes between a *testimonium internum* and *testimonia externa*; the first is that of the Holy Spirit speaking to our hearts and the others are that of Holy Scripture itself, that of the prophets and apostles, and that of the church. It would be very interesting to study the development of the combination *externum* and *internum*, but a detailed examination is not possible in the context of this study.

Sometimes other words are used to express the relationship between Word and Spirit. In his *Compendium Theologiae Christianae* Johannes Wollebius (1586-1629) distinguishes between the principal *testimonium* of the Spirit and the ministerial *testimonium* of the church and then makes a distinction between two sides of the

testimonium of the Spirit: an outward (*foris*) side in Scripture itself and an inward (*intus*) side in the hearts of believers.[167]

4.4.1 Heppe and Muller

Heppe states that the Reformed orthodox opinion that the canonical Scriptures not only contain, but are God's written Word, is a deviation of the Reformation. He adds that *verbum internum* and *verbum externum* took the place of the former distinction between *verbum* ἄγραφον, the Word of God in its original revelation, and *verbum* ἔγγραφον, the recording of that Word in Scripture.[168] Heppe suggests that there is a relationship, but does not go into detail; he only expresses his regret that Scripture in its written form was identified with the Word of God.

In his volume on *Holy Scripture* Muller criticizes Heppe at this point. He denies that Christ as the living Word is emphasized at the cost of Scripture in the Reformation and that Scripture is emphasized at the cost of the living Word in Reformed orthodoxy.[169] The changes in the use of the terms can better be understood in terms of the separation of the various theological topics within the doctrine of Scripture. Muller discusses various distinctions extensively. The most basic one is that between Christ as the essential and eternal Word (*Logos*) of God and the various forms of revelation. *Verbum* ἄγραφον and *verbum* ἔγγραφον refer to the historical path of revelation; the Word that is now written in Scripture first had an unwritten or "enunciative" form.[170] This replaced the Catholic concept of tradition as the authoritative *verbum* ἄγραφον next to Scripture. The distinction between unwritten and written Word refers to a historical dimension, while that between the *verbum internum* and *externum* "binds Word and Spirit together by distinguishing between the historical external prophetic office of Christ as Word and the ongoing internal teaching office of Christ by means of his Spirit."[171] Muller correctly states that both word-pairs refer to different spheres, but he does not explain where the combination *externum* and *internum* comes from.

In his volume on the *Prolegomena to Theology* Muller mentions the distinction between the immanent Word (λόγος ἐνδιάθετος) and the enunciative Word (λόγος προφόρικος). This also might have influenced the use of *internum* and *externum*.

> 'The word of man,' argues Junius, 'is multiplex': there is the innate or indwelling word, called *logos emphytos* by the fathers, which is the intellect itself; then there is the implanted or ratiocinated word, the *sermo inditus* or *logos endiathetos,* which resides in the mind of creatures in accordance with their rational capacity; and, third, there is the *sermo enunciativus*

---

167 "IX. Testimonium autem doc duplex, principale & ministeriale. Principale est testimonium Spiritus sancti, foris, in seipsa Scriptura, intus vero in corde ac mente hominis fidelis ab ipso illuminati, loquentis, eique Scripturae divinitatem persuadentis. Ministeriale vero testimonium est testimonium Ecclesiae." J. Wollebius, *Compendium theologiae Christianae,* Amsterdam 1655, 3-4. Wollebius does not use the term αὐτόπιστος but he says: "Just like people in the schools do not dispute against those who deny the *principia* of everything, so those who deny the *principia* of the Christian religion must also not be counted worthy of hearing." Wollebius, *Compendium*, 3.

168 Heppe, *Dogmatik*, 16. Cf. Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 15.

169 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 185-186.

170 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 197.

171 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 201.

or *logos prophorikos,* the word sent forth or enunciated, which is the outward communication of a word known inwardly to the intellect.[172]

Applied analogically to the Word of God the *logos emphytos* corresponds with Christ as the essential Word, the *logos endiathetos* corresponds with the Word effectuated or brought into existence by the Spirit in the human subject, while the *logos prophorikos* corresponds with the Word that flows from God in an external existence. Junius does not use the terms *internum* and *externum* in this respect.

4.4.2 Three Parallel Distinctions

The theology of Johann Heinrich Alsted (1588-1638), a pupil of Amandus Polanus von Polansdorf (1561-1610), serves to illustrate the different combinations of words that may have influenced each other. First of all, the *Logos* inherent in God (λόγος ἐνδιάθετος) and the *Logos* emanating from God (λόγος προφόρικος) are applied to revelation: the Word of God sent forth to the minds of the authors of Scripture (*verbum* προφόρικος) and the Word of God implanted in their minds (*verbum* ἐνδιάθετος).[173] Alsted, who was influenced by Petrus Ramus (1515-1572), distinguishes between the enunciated Word (*verbum enuntiatum* or προφόρικος) and the inspired Word (*verbum inspiratum* or ἐνδιάθετος).[174] As examples of the *verbum inspiratum* he mentions dreams and visions; the *verbum enuntiatum* is the voice of God that was audible for the prophets and apostles. According to Alsted, the *verbum inspiratum* or ἐνδιάθετος is received intrinsically and the *verbum enuntiatum* or προφόρικος extrinsically.[175]

The second distinction, originally stemming from Roman Catholic theology, between the written (ἔγγραφον) and unwritten (ἄγραφον) Word, stands for Scripture and tradition. This distinction is copied by Protestant theologians, but the meaning shifts, because the authority of tradition as a source next to Scripture is rejected. Instead of the distinction of Scripture and tradition, comes a chronological or historical distinction between the Word of God as it has been revealed to the authors before writing it down (*verbum* ἄγραφον) and the written Word of God in Scripture (*verbum* ἔγγραφον).[176]

---

172 Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 243. Cf. Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1411. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 88. Cf. Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 239.

173 Cf. Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 442. The *logos endiathetos* and the *logos prophorikos* go back via Philo to the Stoics; the first corresponded with reason in man and the second with the spoken word as the revelation of thought. Cf. M. Pohlenz, 'Die Begründung der abendländischen Sprachlehre durch die Stoa,' in M. Pohlenz, *Kleine Schriften*, vol. 1, Hildesheim 1965, 79–86. Cf. A. Kamesar, 'The Logos Endiathetos and the Logos Prophorikos in Allegorical Interpretation: Philo and the D-Scholia to the Iliad,' *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 44 (2004), 163–181.

174 J.H. Alsted, *Theologica didactica, exhibens locos communes theologicos methodo scholastica*, Hanau 1627, 8-9. The *sermo Dei* flows from God in two modes either as *verbum internum* or as *verbum externum*. Cf. J.H. Alsted, *Praecognitorum Theologicorum libri duo: Naturam Theologiae explicantes, & rationem studii illius plenissime monstrantes*, Frankfurt 1614, 119. For the Ramist influence on Alsted cf. Strohm, 'Theologie und Zeitgeist,' 366-368.

175 "Et hoc sensu quidem illum vocant ἐν διάθετον, quia reipitur intrinsece, hunc προφορικὸν, quia recipitur extrinsece." Alsted, *Praecognitorum Theologicorum* 1, 119.

176 Thus Francis Turretin and Leonardus Rijssen (1636-1695) write that the distinction of a *verbum* ἄγραφον and *verbum* ἔγγραφον is not a division of a genus into species, as the Papists would have it, but of the subject into its accidents; the same Word that once was *non scriptum* now is

Alsted says: "*verbum Dei externum* is ἔνγραφον or ἄγραφον, that is written or non-written."[177] This illustrates that Heppe is wrong in stating that the distinction of the *verbum internum* and *externum* replaces the older distinction ἄγραφον and ἔνγραφον; both stand on a different level. The enunciative Word (λόγος προφόρικος) was divided into the *verbum* ἄγραφον and the *verbum* ἔγγραφον.[178] John Owen (1616-1683) writes: "Just as the Word of God is ἐνδιάθετον or προφορικόν, so that in turn is ἄγραφον or ἔγγραφον."[179]

The third distinction refers to the species of the Word of God: *verbum internum* and *verbum externum*. Alsted says: "The Word of God in species is internal or external."[180] The Word of God as it is inspired to the writer is the *verbum internum* while the Word of God as it is expressed by the writer is the *verbum externum*; therefore the *verbum internum* is principal and the *verbum externum* is instrumental.[181] For Alsted the distinction *internum* and *externum* runs parallel to ἐνδιάθετος and προφόρικος. The *verbum internum* is the internal communication of theology to the heart; the eye of the mind is illuminated and given spiritual light.[182] Alsted does not want to press the distinction too far. The external and internal Word should not be separated.[183]

Finally these distinctions are applied from the realm of revelation to the realm of faith. The *verbum internum* that once was inspired in the hearts and minds of the authors of Scripture must also enter into the minds and hearts of the readers of Scripture. The *verbum internum* "is the internal light by which the eye of our mind is enlightened,

---

scriptum. Cf. Heppe, *Dogmatik*, 16. Cf. Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 14-15. Cf. Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 197.

177 "Verbum *Dei externum* est ἔγγραφον vel ἄγραφον, id est scriptum vel non-scriptum." J.H. Alsted, *Encyclopaedia*, Herborn 1630, 2, 1575.

178 Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 266.

179 "Verbum autem Dei cum sit ἐνδιάθετον vel προφορικόν, hocque iterum est ἄγραφον vel ἔγγραφον." J. Owen, *The Works of John Owen*, ed. W.H. Goold, London 1850-1853, vol. 17, 37. Cf. J. Owen, *Biblical Theology or the Nature, Origin, Development and Study of Theological Truth in Six Books*, trans. S.P. Westcott, Morgan (Pa.) 1994, 17. The *autopistia* of Scripture in the theology of John Owen deserves further study, especially because he takes a position on the authority of Scripture between the subjectivism of the Quakers on the one hand and the objectivism and rationalism in the Church of England on the other. This tension appears in another tract of Owen on the subject, titled *The Reason of Faith* in which he explains the grounds whereon Scripture is believed to be the Word of God. Cf. W.H. Goold, 'Prefatory Note,' in Owen, *Works* 4, [4]. Owen also uses αὐτόπιστος in his Latin works Owen, *Works* 17, 34, 37. Cf. Owen, *Biblical Theology*, 12, 16.

180 "Verbum Dei in specie est internum vel externum." Alsted, *Theologica didactica,* 8. Cf. Alsted, *Encyclopaediae* 2, 1575.

181 "Verbum Dei internum est principale, externum instrumentale. Alsted, *Theologica didactica,* 9. Cf. Solent quidam verbum Dei internum vocare principale, & verbum externum instrumentale […] sic ut Deus & per verbum internum nos doceat principaliter, & per verbum externum instrumentaliter." Alsted, *Praecognitorum Theologicorum* 1, 118.

182 "Verbum Dei internum est, quo Deus hominibus intus Theologiam communicat, oculis mentis illorum illustratis, & luce spirituali cognitionis salvifice accensa." Alsted, *Praecognitorum Theologicorum* 1, 119.

183 "Externum verbum ab interno non est separandum, sed coniunctum cum eo esse necessum est, ut efficax & salutare sit." Alsted, *Praecognitorum Theologicorum* 1, 122.

while the *verbum externum* is the outward lamp that is lighted."[184] The distinction is even applied to Scripture itself. The *Scriptura interna* is the immediate writing of the Spirit in the hearts of the children of God predestinated to eternal life. The *Scriptura externa* is written by prophets and apostles to transmit the doctrine of heavenly wisdom to posterity. This *Scriptura externa* we generally call *sacra Scriptura*.[185] "*Scriptura externa* without *interna* is not profitable to salvation, for if *Scriptura externa* is separated from *interna* as the superior light, there can be no saving faith in us, because the Holy Spirit kindles saving faith through the Word as through an instrument."[186] The original *verbum internum* in the heart and mind of the writer has become a *verbum externum* in Scripture and this *verbum externum* again must become a *verbum internum* in the heart of a believer through the work of the Spirit.

4.4.3 A *Principium Internum*?

Muller goes one step further and says that Alsted and Johannes Maccovius (1578-1644) call the inwardly known Word of God the *principium internum* of theology.[187] Alsted, however, does not use the term *principium internum*, but *verbum internum* and he does not draw the conclusion that this internal *verbum* or *Scriptura* or *testimonium* is a *principium internum* of theology that corresponds with Scripture as the *principium externum*. Contrariwise, he expressly says that the *verbum externum* (*Dominus dixit* or *Deus dixit*) is the *principium unicum* of our theology, the principle that resolves all dogmatic statements.[188]

Maccovius identifies the *principium internum* of theology as the *verbum Dei*, but not as the inwardly known Word of God as Muller concludes. For Maccovius the term *internum* refers to the fourfold causality. The use of the word-pair in scholasticism is complicated and cannot be interpreted simplistically in a subject-object scheme. The material cause and the formal cause are classified as the *causae internae*, while the efficient cause and the final cause are the *causae externae*. This subdivision of the four causes goes back to Duns Scotus.[189] Maccovius calls God the *principium externum* of theology, because he is the *causa efficiens* and the *causa finalis* of theology: he calls the Word of God the *principium internum* of theology, because it is the *causa formalis* and the *causa materialis* of theology. Theology has God as its source and end, Scripture as

---

184 "Verbum enim internum est afflatus divinus, & lumen internum quo oculi mentis illustrantur, Esa.59.v.21. Act.5.v.32. 1.Cor.2.v.10.11.12.13. Verbum autem externum est lucerna foris accensa." Alsted, *Theologica didactica*, 9. The texts from Scripture that he refers to, speak of the work of the Spirit in the hearts of believers.

185 Alsted, *Praecognitorum Theologicorum* 1, 124.

186 "Scriptura externa sine interna non prodest nobis ad salutem. Si enim Scriptura externa separetur ab interna, tanquam lumine superiore, nulla in nobis potest esse fides salvifica. Ratio, quia Spiritus sanctus accendit fidem salvificam, per verbum, tanquum instrumentum." Alsted, *Praecognitorum Theologicorum* 1, 124. Cf. Polansdorf, *Syntagma theologiae Christianae*, 17.

187 Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 442, n. 147.

188 Alsted, *Praecognitorum Theologicorum* 1, 125. Cf. Polansdorf, *Syntagma Theologiae Christianae*, 18. "Scriptura Sacra est principium religionis divinae: Ergo ipsa sibi testimonium abunde perhibet quod sit divina. Nam principia sunt αὐτόπιστα, & habent in se certam rationem quae illis fidem facere possit."

189 Wieland, 'Prinzip II Mittelalter,' 1352.

its rule and content.[190] This is something different than the internal Word of God as a subjective principle of theology.

The combination is also used by Junius in such a sense that it can hardly be identified with objective and subjective. "Theology is communicated to us through in two modes, by nature and grace. The former as internal principle of communication; the latter as external principle. For this reason the first is called natural theology, the second supernatural."[191] Here nature is the *principium internum* and grace is the *principium externum* and not vice versa. The *principium internum* is inherent in nature itself, while the *principium externum* comes from outside of nature.[192] *Internum* and *externum* mean intrinsic and extrinsic. These examples show how complicated the use of the word-pair is and how a simplistic interpretation from a modern perspective in terms of object and subject can easily lead to misunderstanding.

Although Alsted does not use the term *principium internum* he does emphasize the necessity of the *verbum internum* and the *Scriptura internum*. In his discussion of the *verbum externum*, Alsted states that the canonical books are the first and ultimate *principium cognoscendi* in theology.[193] Muller's conclusion that Alsted and Maccovius spoke of the internal Word (*verbum internum*) or the *testimonium* of the Spirit as a subjective principle (*principium internum*) of theology is disputable. In his volume on Scripture, Muller asserts that faith is a *principium internum* of theology in Reformed orthodoxy. This conclusion is based on Petrus van Mastricht (1630-1706), but Muller seems to overlook the fact that Mastricht discusses faith as the first locus of his theological system and not as a part of the prolegomena. Mastricht does not use *principium internum* for faith; Scripture is the only *principium* of theology.[194] In the further analysis of the *autopistia* of Scripture we will take notice of the terms *internum* and *externum*.

---

190 J. Maccovius, *Loci communes theologici*, Franeker 1650, 3-5, 10.

191 "Est igitur duplex Theologiae communicandae modus, Natura & gratia: illa, velut internum principium communicationis; haec, velut principium externum illius, ex quo sit ut Theologia una dicatur naturalis, & Supernaturalis altera." Junius, *Opera Theologica* 1, 1390. Cf. Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, 63.

192 Junius does not confine natural theology to the internal operation of the innate principles, as Platt wrongly concludes. Platt's mistake is due to his interpretation of the word-pair *externum-internum* in an object-subject scheme. J.E. Platt, *Reformed Thought and Scholasticism: The Arguments for the Existence of God in Dutch Theology, 1575-1650*, Leiden 1982, 135-136. Cf. Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 261.

193 "Libri Canonici sunt principium cognoscendi primum & ultimum in sacra Theologia." Alsted, *Theologica didactica,* 12.

194 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 291-294. Cf. P. Van Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia*, Amsterdam 1682-1687, I.ii, II.i. Neele follows Muller in characterizing faith as *principium cognoscendi internum* in Van Mastricht's theology. A.C. Neele, *The Art of Living to God: A Study of Method and Piety in the Theoretico-practica Theologia of Petrus van Mastricht (1630-2706)*, [Pretoria] [2005], 75, 107, He is more accurate when he states that "Mastricht identifies Scripture as *principium*, received inwardly by faith at the inception of spiritual life." Neele, *Art of Living to God*, 98.

4.5 The Arminian Controversy

The third aspect of Reformed orthodoxy that may have influenced the concept of *autopistia* regards internal conflicts. The first of the two cases that we will discuss is the conflict with the Arminians who have been accused by the Reformed of a looser view of Scripture because of denying that its infallibility extends to all parts of Scripture.

Jacobus Arminius (1560-1609) uses the term αὐτόπιστος to reject the binding authority of the Reformed confessions like the *Belgic Confession* and the *Heidelberg Catechism* and advocates the liberty to examine the confessions by the Scriptures. In a certain sense the *Belgic Confession* gives the room to do so; for it says that we must not consider human writings – no matter how holy their authors may have been – equal to the divine writings.[195] According to the Contra-Remonstrants, the rejection of the binding authority of the confessions indicates the rejection of essential Reformed doctrines. Arminius, on the other hand, says that it is tyrannical to bind the conscience to human writings like the Reformed confessions. It is remarkable that both parties use the term αὐτόπιστος to express their feeling. Arminius says: "No writing composed by men – by one man, by a few men, or by many – with the exception of Scripture – is either αὐτόπιστον or ἀξιόπιστον and therefore is not exempted from an examination by means of the Scriptures."[196] Scripture is the only *norma* of the truth "from itself, in itself and through itself" and it is erroneous to say "that they are indeed the rule, but only when understood according to the *Belgic Confession* or explained by the *Heidelberg Catechism*."[197]

4.5.1 Reactions from Franciscus Gomarus and Festus Hommius

Arminius's opponent Franciscus Gomarus (1563-1641) also uses the term αὐτόπιστος. According to Gomarus, the theology of the pilgrims (*theologia viatorum*) is imperfect in relation to the heavenly knowledge of God, but perfect in relation to its goal. This knowledge comes from God and is ἀψευδὴς και αὐτόπιστος.[198] In the disputation on Scripture (*De scriptura sacra*) Gomarus says that only the original Greek and Hebrew writings are authentic and αὐτόπιστος and that all versions ought to be corrected according to the divine language.[199] After the time of the apostles the immediate revelation of the doctrine of salvation has come to an end and the canon has become the only *principium* αὐτόπιστος of Christian theology.[200]

---

195 *Confessio Belgica*, art. 7.

196 "III Nullum scriptum ab hominibus, vel uno, vel paucis, vel multis conscriptum (praeter istam scripturam) esse αὐτόπιστον vel ἀξίοπιστον, ideoque nec examini, per scripturas faciendo, exemptum." J. Arminius, *Opera theologica,* Frankfurt 1635, 775. Cf. J. Arminius, *The works of James Arminius*, vol. 2, Auburn (NY) 1853, 479.

197 "II Scripturam esse normam omnis veritatis Divinae, ex se, in se, per se, & perperam dici, normam esse quidem, sed intellectam secundum sensum confessionem Belgicarum Ecclesiarum, vel *Heydelbergensis* Catechismi explicatam." Arminius, *Opera*, 775. Cf. Arminius, *Works* 2, 479.

198 "LII. Estque vel adspirata divinitus: eoque ἀψευδὴς και αὐτόπιστος vel humanitas acquisita." F. Gomarus, *Opera Theologica Omnia*, vol. 2, Amsterdam 1664, 2-3.

199 Gomarus, *Opera* 2, 4.

200 "Totus Canon [...] & post Apostolos, deficiente doctrinae salutaris revelatione immediate, cognitionis *theologiae Christianae principium organicum* αὐτόπιστον est, atque *unicum*: ex

The term αὐτόπιστος gains a different meaning in a different context. For Arminius the *autopistia* of Scripture safeguards the liberty of the biblical exegete and theologian over against the authority of the human confessions. For Gomarus the *autopistia* of Scripture safeguards the purity of the original text over against human corruption. Arminius seems to come close to Calvin's intention to liberate Scripture from the human authority of the *magisterium* of the church, but his appeal to the *autopistia* of Scripture in fact serves the purpose of personal liberty from the church and its confessions. For Gomarus the *autopistia* of Scripture corrects this liberty.

The *autopistia* of Scripture remained an issue in the controversy after the death of Arminius. Festus Hommius (1576-1642), the secretary of the synod, published a version of the *Belgic Confession*, demonstrating article by article at which points the Remonstrants disagreed.[201] After the third article, on the written Word of God, Hommius states: "They seem to teach against this article that the prophets and apostles who wrote Holy Scripture not always and everywhere acted by the Holy Spirit but in some things could err." [202] Hommius explicitly says that some of Remonstrants doubted the αὐτοπιστία of Scripture.[203] In his *Disputationes theologicae* Hommius writes that the Word of God is the true *principium* of religion, αὐτόπιστος and ἀνεξέταστος (without investigation).[204] Hommius also distinguishes the *autopistia* from the *axiopistia* of Scripture. Scripture is not only ἀξιόπιστος, but also αὐτόπιστος.[205] It is not clear if this is intended as a correction of Arminius who placed both terms next to each other, for as we have seen this was also the case in some orthodox Reformed works. The emphasis on the distinction between both terms can be the result of the desire to stress that Scripture is meant to counterbalance our human liberty. Scripture is worthy of our trust, but also convinces us of its trustworthiness of itself.

---

quo, oritur primo, & in quod, ultimo resolvitur. Cujus auctori DEO, sit GLORIA." Gomarus, *Opera* 2, 5. Gomarus does not use the term αὐτόπιστος in his extensive work *De sacra scriptura*. Gomarus, *Opera* 2, 174-201.

201 F. Hommius, *Specimen controversiarvm Belgicarvm, seu Confessio ecclesiarvm reformatarvm in Belgio*, Leiden 1618. This work was designed for the foreign delegates of the Synod of Dort. Platt, *Reformed Thought and Scholasticism*, 111.

202 "Contra hunc Articulum doceri videtur. 1. Prophetas & Apostolos S. Scripturae Scriptores in scribendo non semper, vel ubique, actos a Spiritu S. sed in nonnullis potuisse errare." F. Hommius, *Specimen controversiarvm Belgicarvm, seu Confessio ecclesiarvm reformatarvm in Belgio*, Leiden 1618, 11. Hommius refers to the work of Faustus Socinus that was published and edited by Conrad Vorstius. Cf. F. Socinus, *De auctoritate S. Scripturae; opusculum his temporibus nostris utilissimum; Quem ad modum intelligi potest ex praecipuis rerum, que in ipso tractantur capitibus*, Steinfurt 1611.

203 "P. CUPUS affirmavit Ioanni Taurino, esse inter REMONSTRANTES, qui dubitent de αὐτοπιστία S. Scripturae." Hommius, *Specimen*, 12. Petrus Cupus (1580-1646) was a Remonstrant pastor in Woerden and Johannes Taurinus (1587-1637) was a Remonstrant pastor in Delft. In his *Praefatio* Hommius distinguishes between the authority of Scripture and of the confessions. Only Scripture is without errors and of a self-convincing and unexaminable authority (*auctoritas* αὐτόπιστος καί ἀνεξέταστος). Hommius, *Specimen*, 12.

204 "Hoc verbum unicum est Religionis verae principium, αὐτόπιστον και ἀνεξέταστον." F. Hommius, *LXX disputationes theologicae adversus pontificios*, Lugduni Batavorum [Leiden] 1614, I.i.

205 "sed plane divinam & non tantum ἀξιόπιστον, sed etiam αὐτόπιστον." Hommius, *Disputationes theologicae*, II.ii.

The influence of the Arminian controversy on the concept of the authority of Scripture may have been a larger emphasis on the purity of the text and the larger cautiousness against the use of the *autopistia* of Scripture to contradict the Reformed confessions. We will now turn to a summary of Reformed theology that was published shortly after this controversy to check this possible influence.

4.5.2 The *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (1625)

The *Synopsis of Purer Theology* was used for many years as an introduction to Reformed dogmatics for the theological students at Leiden University. The authors or rather the responsible teachers of the disputations were four professors at Leiden. Johann Polyander (1568-1646) was originally a Walloon pastor who had succeeded Gomarus at Leiden in 1611 and was a member of the Synod of Dort. The three others – Andreas Rivetus (1572-1651), Antonius Thysius (1565-1640), and Anthonius Walaeus (1573-1639) – were appointed as professors after this synod. The *Synopsis* was published shortly after the controversy and characterized by a positive style and a moderate position.[206]

The four disputations on the doctrine of Scripture follow the disputation on the nature of theology and precede the disputations on the attributes of God and on the Trinity. The sequence of the 52 disputations resembles the sequence of Junius's *Theses Theologicae* and is probably influenced by it. The disputations are all divided into theses, according to the scholastic method. In the first disputation on *Theologia*, Polyander deals with the common divisions in *theologia archetypa* and *theologia ectypa*. He says that natural theology is either intrinsic as it is written in the hearts of all people, or extrinsic as a result of the contemplation of creation.[207] The instrumental cause (*causa instrumentalis*) of theology is the Word of God as it is brought forth by the mouth of divinely inspired humans and recorded in holy books. The mode of revelation of *theologia* is subdivided by some in *internum* or ἐνδιάθετον – merely by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit – and *externum* or προφορικόν – when certain organs or means are used by God.[208] This confirms our former conclusion that the word-pair *externum* and *internum* developed from the twofold mode of revelation. Polyander also discusses the common questions whether theology is a *scientia* or *sapientia*; he does not make an exclusive decision, but leaves both possibilities open.

The Necessity and Authority of Scripture

The second disputation, by Walaeus, on "The Necessity and Authority of Scripture" opens with the statement that Scripture is the *principium* and *fundamentum* of all Christian doctrines.[209] Scripture is the divine instrument by which God has delivered the *doctrina* of salvation to us through the prophets, apostles, and evangelists, who were God's secretaries (*actuarios*).[210] Walaeus defends the *necessitas* of Scripture against the Roman Catholics – especially the Jesuits – who teach that the Scriptures do not belong to the being but to the well being of the church and against the Libertines who discredit

206 Van Asselt and Rouwendal, *Inleiding*, 125.
207 *Synopsis*, i.8.
208 *Synopsis*, i.15.
209 *Synopsis*, ii.1.
210 *Synopsis*, ii.3.

Scripture in order to adhere to extra-scriptural revelations of the Spirit. Then he continues with the remark that "we must further explain where its authority depends upon, or to speak clearer, how it is established for us that it is divine and αὐτόπιστος."[211]

Walaeus mentions two different kinds of opponents: the profane people and enemies of the church who deny the divinity of Scripture altogether and, secondly, the Roman Catholic theologians who ground its authority solely on the testimony of their church.[212] There are two contexts in which the discussion of the final ground of the authority of Scripture is important. First Walaeus deals with the skeptics.

"Regarding those that doubt the divine nature of the whole Holy Scripture: because they miss the Spirit of Christ, they cannot be convinced by the *testimonium* of the Holy Spirit that is stronger than all arguments."[213] Therefore other weapons must be used against them either to draw them slowly to the obedience of Christ or to condemn them for their unwillingness. Walaeus mentions three kinds of arguments.[214] He takes the first kind from the *criteria* or *notae* by which the trustworthiness and truth of any historical report is asserted, for instance that the authors are trustworthy persons or eyewitnesses and not subject to bribery. These *criteria* are abundantly present in Scripture more than in any other, human, writings. He takes the second kind from the *notae* of the true religion that is revealed in the Scriptures. In the Christian religion the true God is acknowledged and worshiped and the method (*ratio*) through which sinful humans can be reconciled with God is revealed. "The third and most important kind of arguments is taken from the sure *notae* of the divine character that God has been pleased to show forth peculiarly in Holy Scripture."[215] Thus Walaeus draws three concentric circles: the marks of truth in general, the marks of religious truth, and the marks of Scripture. Elaborating on the third he says that for those whose eyes are opened by the Spirit of God the divine character of Scripture is clear in all places. Some passages, however, clearly manifest God as Author to all people and not only to believers. The *notae* that Walaeus mentions are: (1) the miracles that have accompanied the Word of God; (2) the content of Scripture under which Walaeus arranges the *dogmata* of Scripture for example the doctrine of the Trinity, the *prophetiae* of Scripture for example of the coming of the Messiah, and the *promissiones* of Scripture to those who believe in Christ and of which the true believers feel the effect;[216] (3) the form (*forma*) of Scripture, the

---

211 "deinceps nobis explicandum, unde ejus auctoritats pendeat, vel ut clarius loquamur, unde nobis constet, eam esse divinam, et αὐτόπιστον." *Synopsis*, ii.11. Cf. Samuel Maresius (1599-1673) who speaks of arguments by which the αὐτοπιστία of Scripture is confirmed and established. "argumenta quibus αὐτοπιστία Scripturarum confirmatur atque constat eas comprobationem ejus in seipsis habere." S. Maresius, *Foederatum Belgium Orthodoxum; sive Confessionis ecclesiarum Belgicarum exegesis, quâ illius veritas ex Dei verbo & antiquitate catholica asseritur, & adversus oppositos errores vindicatur*, Groningen 1652, 87. Cf. Platt, *Reformed Thought and Scholasticism*, 115.

212 *Synopsis*, ii.11.

213 "Quod eos attinet, qui totius S. Scripturae divinitatem in dubium vocant, cum illi Spiritu Christi adhuc sint vacui, ex Spiritus Sancti testimonio, quod omnibus argumentis est validius, convinci non possunt." *Synopsis*, ii.12.

214 *Synopsis*, ii.13-ii.28.

215 "Tertium vero argumenti genus et praecipuum petitur a certis divinitatis notis, quas Deus in S. Scriptura peculiariter exstare voluit." *Synopsis*, 2.21.

216 *Synopsis*, ii.23.

consistency of all the doctrines and its goal (*finis*) in the glory of God and the salvation of humans. Next comes (4) the divine effect of Scripture: the lies of Satan disappear, wherever the Word of God enters in, and (5) the additional circumstances (*adjuncta*) – for instance the antiquity of Scripture – close the row of the *notae* of Scripture as *argumentum* for its authority over against unbelievers. Walaeus trusts that all those who undertake the serious reading and meditating of Scripture with a sincere heart will experience the divine character of these books.[217]

Walaeus makes a distinction between the *testimonium* of the Spirit for believers and detailed argumentation for unbelievers. Through this argumentation he explains the foundation of the authority of Scripture and shows why it is divine and αὐτόπιστος for us. The *autopistia* of Scripture forms the "objective" and demonstrable side of the medal, while the *testimonium* is reserved for the "subjective" side. At the background of this detailed argumentation stands the Arminian controversy. Walaeus explicitly warns against the heresy of Socinus – and some other Christians – who taught that the authors of Scripture could have erred on minor points.[218] There is no doubt that he had the Arminians in mind with the "other Christians."

Walaeus is much briefer in refuting the Roman Catholic position that the church has more authority than Scripture or that the authority of Scripture *quoad nos* depends exclusively on the testimony of the church.[219] He is willing to acknowledge the task of the church to vindicate the divine character of Scripture against human attacks but this task is only a service (*ministerium*). The authority of Scripture must be greater than the authority of the church, because the church can err, while Scripture cannot.

> And also because the testimony (*testimonium*) of the Holy Spirit, that all true sheep of Christ have in common (John 10), and the divine signs (*notae*) that display themselves in holy Scripture are of much greater authority and weight also for us (*quoad nos*) than merely the testimony of the church, for this testimony is only a human persuasion, while the Holy Spirit engenders saving and divine faith in our hearts through those divine signs (*notae*).[220]

The last clause is of importance for the relation between the *testimonium* and the evidences. In the detailed argumentation it seems as if Walaeus makes a sharp distinction between the *testimonium* and the *notae*, but here he says that the Spirit works faith through the divine *notae* of Scripture. As we have seen, Whitaker says that the *testimonium* gives power (*vis*) to the evidences and Junius that the *testimonium* is one of the evidences, though it is greater than the others. The way in which Walaeus expresses himself indicates a development in Reformed orthodoxy at this point.

The Canon as the Self-Convincing Witness and Judge

The third *disputatio*, by Thysius, deals with the canon. God in his providence has watched over the selection and preservation – out of all that was divinely spoken and

---

217 *Synopsis*, ii.27.

218 *Synopsis*, ii.28.

219 *Synopsis*, ii.29.

220 "denique quia Spiritus Sancti testimonium, quod omnibus veris Christi ovibus commune est, Joh. 10. item notae illae divinae, quae in Sacra Scriptura se produnt, majoris multo sint auctoritatis et ponderis, etiam quoad nos, quam solum Ecclesiae testimonium, cum Ecclesiae hoc testimonium persuasionem non nisi humanam; Spiritus Sanctus autem, per Scripturae illas divinas notas, fidem salvificam et divinam animis nostris ingeneret." *Synopsis*, ii.31.

written – of those books that would become a canon or rule for the whole church.[221] God's original revelation was broader than the present canon. Dealing with the writing down (*scriptio*) of Scripture he says that the *causa efficiens* of this writing is the Triune God who uses human instruments. "The mode of writing (*modus scriptionis*) was thus: God inspired and dictated to the writers as real secretaries who wrote according to a certain formula or assisted and guided them as investigators and authors."[222] There were differences between Moses, who received the words of God *expressis verbis*, and Luke who composed his gospel. The human writers were not passive in the process of writing, but used their mind and memory and wrote in diverse styles and arrangements. Nevertheless, they were constantly superintended by the Spirit, "who so guided and ruled them, that he preserved them everywhere from any error in mind, memory, language, and pen."[223] Thysius also discusses the authenticity of the text:

> Moreover, that edition of Scripture is to be reckoned as authentic that is written with the hand of the author (αὐτογράφως), that is first and originally brought forth though divine authority, which is the archetype (ἀρχέτυπον) itself or its transcript (ἀπόγραφον), which is the copy.[224]

The authors of the *Synopsis* are aware of the distinction between the autographs and the copies of Scripture, but do not deal with the questions of textual criticism. They seem to assume that the copies faithfully represent the original reading. Regarding the translations, Thysius says that only the original or autographic writings are authentic, but the translations are also the Word of God as far as they are accurate.[225] Still it is wrong to declare the Septuagint or the Vulgate authentic.

In discussing the canon Thysius acknowledges that some of the books were intended for general use in the church and others – like the epistles – for a particular use, but also these were conserved and communicated to others by the extra-ordinary providence of God, who knew what was good for the church.[226] The acceptance of the canonical books was not a voluntary, but a necessary act.[227] This acceptance took place at the time when the church was still able to judge about them with certainty and rested either on the ordinary witness of the author and of other faithful witnesses of its authenticity or on the extraordinary judgment of the prophets, at the time when the gift of prophecy still

---

221 *Synopsis*, iii.1.

222 "Modus scriptionis hic fuit: modo Deus inspirantis et dictantis, Scriptores vero amanuensium, et ad certam formulam scribentium, Exod. 34, 27.28. Apoc. 2, 1. etc. ; modo assistentis et dirigentis, Matth. 22, 43. Hebr. 1, 1, ipsi vero, commentantium et auctorum rationem habuerunt, Luc. 1, 1.3." *Synopsis*, iii.7.

223 "praesidente tamen perpetuo Spiritu S., qui ita eos egit et rexit, ut ab omni errore mentis, memoriae, linguae et calami, ubique praeservarentur, 2 Sam. 23, 1.2. 1 Cor. 7,25.40." *Synopsis*, iii.7.

224 "Authentica porro Scripturae editio ea censenda est, quae αὐτογράφως, id est, primitus et originaliter, divina auctoritate est edita: quae est ἀρχέτυπον ipsum, Deut. 31,9.24.26. 2 Reg. 22,8.13. 2 Paral. 34,14., aut ejus ἀπόγραφον id est exeplar, Deut. 17,18." *Synopsis*, iii.10.

225 *Synopsis*, iii.11.

226 *Synopsis*, iii.13.

227 "idque non libero aliquo Ecclesiae actu, sed necessaria susceptione." *Synopsis*, iii.13.

functioned in the church.[228] This is the reason why the canonicity of some books was doubted by some, after the time of the apostles and prophets had ceased.[229]

Thysius gives five reasons why the apocrypha are to be rejected: (1) they were not brought forth by the prophetic Spirit, because they were written at a time when the prophetic gift had ceased, (2) they were not placed in the ark or next to the ark of Moses,[230] (3) they were not written in Hebrew nor accepted by the Jews, (4) they were not acknowledged but held as counterfeit by Christ, the apostles, and the early church and were later only accepted with difficulty and to a certain extant, and (5) they taught fables and absurd things that did not correspond with Scripture.[231]

After having discussed how the canon was accepted by the early church Thysius concludes:

> This Scripture alone is the principle (*principium*) from which and the substance (*materia*) out of which all saving truth is to be deduced, the canon and norm by which every true and so every false doctrine of things divine must be measured. Therefore it is a witness and self-convincing (αὐτόπιστος) and irrefragable judge that has its own evidence, by which every controversy raised about divine things should be judged.[232]

In his discussion of the canon Thysius does not refer to the *autopistia* of Scripture or to the *testimonium* of the Spirit, but to God's providence and to the prophetic gift of judgment in the early church. Once the canon is established it must necessarily be a witness and a self-convincing witness (*testis*) and judge (*judex*). These juridical metaphors not only remind us of the terminology in the *Institutes* but also imply that the *autopistia* of Scripture refers to the hermeneutical principle that Scripture is its own interpreter (*Scriptura sui ipsius interpres*). Thysius continues:

> The criterion then or the judicial rule can be summarized in the axioms: (1) Whatever is contained in it or agrees with it either expressly or by a valid inference, is true doctrine. (2) What disagrees with it must necessarily be false. (3) Whatever is not contained in it, although it does not plainly disagree with it is not a doctrine necessary to salvation.[233]

The *autopistia* of Scripture is the axiom of these axioms. Scripture must necessarily be αὐτόπιστος in order to be the final judge of every theological controversy.

---

228 *Synopsis*, iii.14.

229 *Synopsis*, iii.15.

230 Thysius refers to Deut. 31 and to Epiphanius of Salamis (c. 315- 403) who says that the Wisdom of Solomon and Jesus Sirach are helpful and useful, but were not kept in the Ark of the Covenant. Epiphanius, *De mensuribus et ponderibus*, 4, *PG* 43:244. Cf. *Synopsis*, iii.38.

231 *Synopsis*, iii.38.

232 "XVIII. Proinde sola haec Scriptura, Principium a quo; et Materia ex qua omnis salutaris veritas deducenda; Canon et Norma, ad quam exigenda omnis vera, adeoque et falsa de rebus divinis doctrina, Esai. 8, 20. Luc. 16, 29. Act. 17, 10.11. Testis denique et Judex αὐτόπιστος; et irrefragabilis, sua scilicet evidentia, a quo judicanda omnis, quae de rebus divinis agitatur, controversia, Joh. 5, 39, 45." *Synopsis*, iii.18. Cf. Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 21.

233 "XIX Κριτήριον autem, seu Norma judicii, hisce axiomatic comprehenditur. 1. Quicquid ea continetur, aut cum ea vel expresse, vel firma consequentia consentit, verum dogma est. 2. Quod dissentit, falsum esse necesse est. 3. Quicquid autem ea non continetur, quamvis simpliciter ab ea non dissentiat, non est necessarium ad salutem dogma." *Synopsis*, iii.19. Cf. Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 21.

4.5.3 Summarizing Remarks

The emphasises in the *Synopsis* confirm our impression that the Arminian controversy influenced the Reformed concept of the authority of Scripture. Although Arminius is not mentioned in the disputations on Scripture, still the Reformed position is fenced off against Socinus and "some other Christians" who rejected the infallibility of Scripture. Probably the careful definition of inspiration must also be read in the light of this controversy. The *autopistia* of Scripture must safeguard Reformed doctrine and therefore it is not interpreted in the sense of the certainty of the individual believer regarding Scripture, but as a general characteristic of Scripture, that can be proved to unbelievers by a detailed argumentation.

The evidences of Scripture are the means by which the Spirit works. Waleaus calls the arguments *notae* or *criteria* of Scripture and says that the Spirit works faith through the divine *notae* of Scripture. For Whitaker and Junius the Spirit gives power (*vis*) to the arguments, but here the Spirit works through the arguments.

The authenticity of the original text seems to become more important in the context of the Arminian controversy. Thysius makes a distinction between the autographs and the copies of Scripture; both are authentic as long as the copies are faithful. Although the translations are the Word of God as far as they are accurate, they are not to be held as authentic.

The *autopistia* of Scripture is not the foundation of the canon, but rather a logically necessary characteristic of the canon. Thysius says that Scripture is the *principium* of truth, and the canon and norm of doctrine, and that it therefore is αὐτόπιστος as a witness and judge. This is in line with Junius's writings, and is probably due to the connection with the scholastic technical term *principium*. The way in which the *autopistia* of Scripture functions in the *Synopsis* as a logical necessity flows from the structure introduced by Junius in which the discussion of the nature of theology precedes the discussion of Scripture. At this point we disagree with Muller, who says:

> The Reformers' clear sense of the self-authenticating character of Scripture – the a priori character of Scripture as a self-evidencing norm – flowed directly into the orthodox identification of Scripture as the *principium cognoscendi theologiae*: *principia*, of their very nature, stand prior to and provide the grounds for a form of knowledge.[234]

There is continuity in the use of the terms, but there is no immediate connection between the self-convincing character of Scripture in the Reformation and the Reformed orthodox identification of Scripture as the *principium cognoscendi theologiae*.

4.6 Francis Turretin (1623-1687)

The second important controversy within the Reformed ranks was occasioned by the theological faculty of Saumur where Moïse Amyraut (1594-1664) taught hypothetic universalism and Louis Cappel (1585-1658) expressed his opinion that the vocalization of the Old Testament originated from the Masoretes and did not belong to the inspired text. The theologians of Saumur considered themselves orthodox, but contemporary Reformed theologians found the implications of their hermeneutics dangerous for the Reformed doctrine of the authority of Scripture.[235]

---

234 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 162.
235 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 124.

One of the Reformed theologians who was deeply involved in the Amyrauldian controversy was Francis Turretin. He completed his studies at Geneva in 1644 and made a study trip to Leiden, Utrecht, Paris, and Saumur. He served the Italian congregation in Geneva as a pastor and later combined his pastoral care for the Italians with a professorial chair until his death in 1687. He was one of the most influential theologians supporting the *Formula Consensus Helvetica* (1675). His *Institutio theologiae elencticae* consists of three volumes, originally published between 1679 and 1685. Although the debate with Saumur had already ended at the time when Turretin wrote this work, we have chosen the *Institutio*, because it gives a summary of the Reformed orthodox reaction to the conflict with Saumur in the context of a complete theological system.

4.6.1 *Principium Externum* and *Principium Internum*

In the first locus, "On Theology," Turretin deals with several topics that are commonly discussed at the beginning of a theological system. One of his questions is whether theology is theoretical or practical.[236] Turretin concludes that theology is theoretico-practical. One of the proofs for this mixed character of theology is that both Word and Spirit have a theoretical and a practical side. The Word teaches the things that have to be done (the law) and the things that have to be believed (the gospel) and the Spirit likewise is both the Spirit of truth and of sanctification. In this context Turretin calls he Word the *principium externum* and the Spirit the *principium internum* of theology.[237]

The next question is whether human reason is the principle and rule by which the doctrines of the Christian religion and theology ought to be measured. Turretin denies this against the Socinians. Turretin probably follows one of the disputations of Voetius in the way he develops his answer, as we will see. It is possible that he also derives the distinction *principium externum* and *principium internum* from him. Turretin makes a distinction between reason taken subjectively as one of the faculties of the soul or objectively as the natural light that is given to us. He says: "The *principium* that comes into question here must be first and αὐτόπιστος and all the truths and articles of faith must be primarily deduced from it and ultimately resolved by it."[238] The question is not whether reason is the instrument by which (*instrumentum quo*) or the medium through which (*medium per quod*) we can be drawn to faith; reason can be both. But the question is whether it is the first principle from which (*principium ex quo*) the doctrines of faith are proved or the foundation upon which (*fundamentum quo*) they are built; this is denied by Turretin.[239]

---

236 With his characterization of theology as theoretical and practical, contemplative and active, Turretin represented the general orthodox Reformed position. Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 352.

237 F. Turretin, *Institutio theologiae elencticae: Editio nova*, Geneva 1688-1689, I.vii.6. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 21-22.

238 "Principium de quo hic quaeritur debet esse primum & αὐτόπιστον ex quoprimo educuntur, & in quod ultimo resolvuntur omnes fidei veritates & articuli." Turretin, *Institutio*, I.viii.1. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 24.

239 Turretin, *Institutio*, I.viii.4. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 24. There are three main authorities for Turretin: the Word of God, the tradition of the church and human reason. Only Scripture has absolute authority; the other two have relative authority. E.P. Meijering, *Reformierte Scholastik und patristische Theologie: die Bedeutung des Väterbeweises in der Institutio Theologiae*

In the formal introduction on theology as a science the term αὐτόπιστος has a technical function and is used to define a *principium*. Now the *autopistia* of Scripture as a logical necessity precedes the actual discussion of the authority of Scripture. It is already clear in the prolegomena that Scripture must be αὐτόπιστος, because it is the *principium* of theology. This shift of the *autopistia* from the doctrine of Scripture to the discussion of theology as a science is foreshadowed by the introduction of a separate *locus* "On Theology" by Junius and by the discussion of the canon in the *Synopsis*, where the *autopistia* of Scripture is seen as a logically necessary characteristic of Scripture.

4.6.2 Scripture Proved by the *Notae*

The concept of the *autopistia* of Scripture is developed in the second locus titled "On Holy Scriptures." The Word of God is the sole *principium* of theology and therefore the question concerning its *necessitas* comes before all other things.[240] Next Turretin deals with the *authoritas* of Scripture. The authority of Scripture depends on its origin; because it is from God it must be authentic and divine. There is a controversy regarding the authority of Scripture, not only with the atheists and the heathen for whom Scripture is just like any other book, but also with those Christians who make its authority depend upon the testimony of the church at least as far as we are concerned (*quoad nos*). "As to the former class, the question is whether holy Scripture is truly αὐτόπιστος and divine."[241] The discussion with Rome, however, regards the question how we can know that it is divine or upon which testimony our faith in its authenticity rests.

Dealing with the atheists and skeptics, Turretin says that Scripture proves itself to be divine, when it calls itself God-inspired. This argument, however, cannot be used against those who reject Scripture altogether; therefore Scripture also shows itself to be divine through the marks (*notae*) God has impressed on it.[242] Turretin mentions external marks such as (1) its antiquity, (2) its duration and preservation, (3) the sincerity of its writers, and (4) some adjuncts, like the martyrs, who sealed it with their blood, the testimony of adversaries, and the *consensus* of all Christians on the authority of Scripture although they differ in many other things.[243] He also mentions internal marks, which are more significant: (1) the content (*materia*) of Scripture, (2) its style, (3) its form especially the harmony between the Testaments and between the individual books, (4) its goal in the glory of God and the salvation of humanity, and (5) its effect as a two-edged sword that pierces the soul and generates faith in the minds of hearers.[244] These marks confirm and assist faith, for although faith does not rest on demonstration, it can be supported by arguments, especially at its beginning. Before we can believe, the divine authority of the witness whom we believe must be established. The testimony of a witness is not trustworthy (ἀξίοπιστος), if suitable reasons of believing him are

---

Elencticae F. Turrettins, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Gotteslehre und Christologie, Nieuwkoop 1991, 21.

240 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.i.1. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 55.

241 "Quoad illos, Quaeritur, An Scriptura Sacra sit vere αὐτόπιστος & divina?" Turretin, *Institutio*, II.iv.1 Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 62.

242 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.iv.6. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 63.

243 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.iv.8. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 63.

244 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.iv.9. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 63-64.

lacking.[245] Thus Scripture demonstrates itself as divine to atheists and skeptics, but also believers are supported by the *notae* of the divine authority of Scripture. According to Turretin, there are suitable reasons to trust the witness of Scripture.

After dealing with some seeming contradictions in Scripture in the fifth question, Turretin turns to the Roman Catholics in the sixth question, discussing how the divine authority of the Scriptures becomes known to us. Turretin denies that the authority of Scripture depends on the testimony of the church either in itself (*in se*) or for us (*quoad nos*). Scripture cannot be authentic in itself without also being it for us, because the same arguments which prove its authority in itself ought to induce us to assent to it.[246] Turretin does not deny that the testimony of the church has value, but maintains that Scripture primarily and principally is to be believed on account of itself or of its *notae* and not on account of the church.

The debate with Rome concerns the *argumentum* that the Spirit uses to convince us of the truth of Scripture. It is either the immediate argument of the testimony (*testimonium*) of the church or the rational argument based on the marks (*notae*) of Scripture itself.[247] A threefold question can arise about the divinity of Scripture,

> the first, concerning the argument on account of which (*argumentum propter quod*) I believe; the second, concerning the principle (*principium*) or efficient cause through which (*causa efficiens a qua*) I am led to believe; the third, concerning the means and instrument through which (*medium* & *instrumentum per quod*) I believe.[248]

For Turretin Scripture with its *notae* is the argument on account of which we believe; the Holy Spirit is the efficient cause and principle from which we are led to believe and the church is the instrument and means through which we believe. If the question is why we believe Scripture to be divine, Turretin answers: "on account of the Scripture itself which by its marks proves itself to be such."[249] But if we are asked where this faith comes from, it is from the Holy Spirit who produces it in us; finally, if we are asked by what means or instrument we believe it, it is through the church, by which God delivers Scripture to us. In the meantime the *notae* of the divinity of Scripture from the discussion with the atheists and skeptics appear to be of importance for believers also. They do not only confirm them and assist them at the first beginning, but the *notae* are most fundamental *argumentum propter quod* for their faith. They believe Scripture on account of the fact that Scripture demonstrates itself to be divine through these *notae*.

Turretin underlines that the authority of Scripture does not depend on the testimony of the church and refers to the text already used by Calvin (Eph. 2,20). The church is founded on Scripture and not the other way around. He illustrates this primary authority of Scripture with the *principia* of science, which are known through themselves. Basil the Great says that "it is necessary that the first principles of every science should be

---

245 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.iv.13. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 64-65.

246 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.vi.3. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 86-87.

247 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.vi.5. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 87.

248 "Prima de *argumento propter quod* credo. Secunda de principio seu *causa efficiens a qua* ad credendum adducor. Tertia de *medio* & *instrumento per quod* credo." Turretin, *Institutio*, II.vi.6. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 87.

249 "propter ipsam Scripturam quae se talem per notas demonstrat." Turretin, *Institutio*, II.vi.6. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 87. Cf. Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 369.

self-evident (ἀνεξετάστος)."[250] Turretin argues that if God has stamped such marks upon all *principia* that they can be known at once by all, he must have also placed them upon Scripture as the sacred *principium* that is necessary for our salvation. The *autopistia* of Scripture is logically necessary because Scripture is the *principium* of theology. This in turn serves as an argument to prove that Scripture does not depend on the church, but is known by its own *notae*. In other words the *autopistia* of Scripture proves that the authority of Scripture is demonstrated by its own *notae*.

A little later Turretin refers to Aristotle who says that there are certain axioms that do not have an external reason for their truth: "They are not only αὐτόπιστος, but cannot be seriously denied by anyone of a sound mind. Therefore, since Scripture is the first principle and primary and infallible truth, is it strange to say that it can be proved by itself?"[251] Turretin accuses the Roman Catholics of circular reasoning, when they prove Scripture by the church and the church by Scripture. If we ask why they believe the witness of Scripture regarding the infallibility of the church to be αὐτόπιστος, they reply that the church has made them sure of it.[252] Turretin gives some examples of the *autopistia* of Scripture; as light is immediately known by its own brightness, food by its peculiar sweetness and an odor by its fragrance, so Scripture may easily be distinguished of itself by a believer. These analogies remind us of Calvin's *Institutes*, but there is a shift of emphasis. For Calvin, Scripture can be proved by its evidences to unbelievers, but believers accept it as αὐτόπιστος – independent of proofs and demonstrations – through the *testimonium* of the Spirit. For Turretin believers accept Scripture because it proves itself to be divine by its own *notae* and the Spirit is the efficient cause of this faith that rests upon the marks of Scripture.

4.6.3 The Authentic Text

After discussing the canon (questions seven and eight) and the apocrypha (question nine) Turretin turns to questions about the integrity of the text. The tenth question is whether the original texts of the Old and New Testaments have come to us pure and uncorrupted. Turretin affirms this against the Roman Catholics. He explains that by "original texts" he does not mean the original writings (*autographa*) from the hands of the authors, but the copies (*apographa*), which record for us the Word of God in the same words into which the sacred writers committed it under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit.[253] Turretin acknowledges the importance of textual criticism; the variant readings in the Greek and Hebrew copies witness to the fact that errors have crept into many codices, through the effect of time, the carelessness of copyists or the malice of Jews and heretics. Turretin and the Reformed orthodox in general, however,

---

250 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.vi.11. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 89. We discussed this passage from Basil in § 3.3.1. Cf. *PG* 30:104-105.

251 "id est, quod non modo est αὐτόπιστον, verum a nemine serio negari potest qui modo sit rationis compos. Cum ergo Scriptura sit primum Principium, & prima & infallibilis Veritas, quid mirum si per se ipsam probari dicatur?" Turretin, *Institutio*, II.vi.18. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 91. He refers to the *Posterior Analytics*, although, as we have seen, Aristotle does not use the term αὐτόπιστος.

252 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.vi.24. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 92-93.

253 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.x.2. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 106.

believed that the original text can always be restored by a collation of the manuscripts.[254]

The issue with Rome regards the question whether the original text has been so corrupted that it can no longer be held as the judge of controversies and the norm by which all versions without exception are to be judged.[255] The Council of Trent had pronounced the normative status of the Vulgate and had declared that it should be owned as authentic (*authentica*).[256] The Reformed orthodox rejected this position and declared that only the original text was authentic.

Turretin gives seven arguments for the pure preservation of the text: (1) the providence of God does not allow that the books in which the doctrine of salvation is preserved have been corrupted; (2) the faithfulness of the church and (3) the great and superstitious care of the Jews for the manuscripts have preserved Scripture. Turretin mentions (4) the Masoretes who counted and recorded in writing, all variations in pointing and writing of the verses and words and even of individual letters; he refers to (5) the large number of copies, and asserts (6) that if the sources were corrupted, it was done either before Christ – which is impossible because Christ cannot have used corrupted books – or afterwards by the Jews – which is impossible, because the copies present among Christians make that useless and because there is no trace of such corruption. Finally, (7) he says that the Jews neither desired to corrupt the sources nor could have done so, due to the watchfulness of the Christians.[257] The difference between the Septuagint and the original text does not imply that the text is corrupt, but rather that the translation is defective.[258]

The *autopistia* and authenticity of Scripture are connected in Reformed orthodoxy. Turretin's eleventh question is whether the Hebrew version of the Old Testament and the Greek one of the New Testament are the only authentic versions and he affirms this against the Roman Catholics.[259] According to Turretin, an authentic writing is one of which we can be entirely sure that it has proceeded from the author whose name it bears and that everything is written just as he himself wished. The *autographa* are lost, but the *apographa* are sufficient to reconstruct the original text through textual criticism. Nevertheless, he reserves the *autopistia* for the *autographa*.[260] In this paragraph Turretin makes a distinction between primary and secondary authenticity. A document can be authentic either primarily and originally or secondarily and derivatively. "That writing is primarily authentic which is αὐτόπιστος and to which credit is and ought to be

254 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.xii.14. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 121. The critical establishment of the text of the Bible was understood by the Reformed orthodox as fundamental to the task of the exegete and theologian. Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 398.

255 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.x.3. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 106.

256 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 401-402.

257 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.x.5-7. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 107-108.

258 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.x.10. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 109.

259 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.xi. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 112.

260 Muller writes that Turretin and the other Reformed orthodox argued that the authenticity and infallibility of Scripture must be identified in and of the *apographa*, not in and of lost *autographa*. This is correct, but it can be added that for Turretin the *autopistia* belonged especially to the *autographa* and that exactly for that reason it must be possible to reconstruct them from the *apographa*. Cf. Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 415.

given on its own account."[261] The secondarily authentic writings are all the copies accurately and faithfully taken from the originals. The autographs of for instance Moses are primarily authentic and the accurate copies are secondarily authentic.

The question rises why Turretin reserves the *autopistia* for the lost *autographs*. Although he does not state this with so many words, the reason seems to be that the logically necessary *autopistia* of the *autographa* leads to the logically necessary authenticity of the *apographa*. In other words the copies must be reliable, because the original handwriting is the self-convincing foundation of our theology. The *autopistia* belongs to the *autographa* and for that reason it must necessarily be possible to reconstruct them from the *apographa*. The underlying assumption is that God in his providence must have superintended the accurate transmission of the text. God's *providentia* is the main argument for the integrity of the text.

Turretin also deals with several objections against the authenticity of the Hebrew and Greek texts. The variant readings that occur in the manuscripts do not destroy the authenticity of Scripture, because they are easily recognized and understood from the context or from the collation of the better manuscripts. Many are of such nature that, although they differ, yet they agree in meaning and the original text can always be restored by a collation of the various manuscripts.[262] The passages that are offered to prove that the text is defective, like the history of the adulteress (John 8), the Johannine Comma in 1 John 5,7, and the account of Christ's resurrection in Mark 16, are all regarded as original by Turretin.[263]

Some of his opponents refer to the vowel points, but, according to Turretin, these points are not merely a human innovation of the Masoretes, but have divine and infallible authority. The problem of the vowel points occupied the Protestant orthodox during the whole seventeenth century. In the polemical debate with the Counter-Reformation the textual issue became a doctrinal one, because the late dating of the vowel points justified the claim of Trent that the Vulgate was authentic.[264] According to Turretin, even if the points have been added at a late date, it does not follow that they are merely human, because the points do not express the judgment of the rabbis, but the accepted meaning of the text. Therefore even if the points are not part of the original with regard to their shape, they are with regard to their meaning.[265] The distinction between the points as such and the meaning of the points is echoed in the *Formula Consensus Helvetica* (1675), which says that the Hebrew original of the Old Testament is "not only in its consonants, but in its vowels – either the vowel points themselves, or

---

261 "Primario authenticum est id scriptum quod est αὐτόπιστον, cui sua per se fides constat, & cui ob seipsum plane creditur ac credi debet." Turretin, *Institutio*, II.xi.3. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 113.

262 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.xi.8. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 114.

263 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.xi.10. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 115. Turretin depended on secondary sources for this judgment. For the Johannine Comma he refers to Sixtus Senensis (1520-1569) who wrote that the Comma was present in all the Greek copies from the times of the apostles. Cf. Sisto da Siena, *Bibliotheca sancta*, vol. 2, Frankfurt 1575, 298. On the Johannine Comma in Reformed orthodoxy cf. Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 421-424.

264 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 406-407.

265 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.xi.11-12. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 115.

at least the power of the points – not only in its matter, but in its words, inspired by God."[266] The object of the *Formula* was to guard the authority and integrity of the original text and not to decide questions of grammar or textual criticism.[267]

4.6.4 Louis Cappel

In the twelfth question Turretin dealt with the internal Reformed controversy on textual criticism. Louis Cappel was of the opinion that the text of Scripture could be corrected by comparison with the old translations or by conjectural emendation. Cappel had studied theology at Sedan and Saumur, and Arabic at Oxford. At the age of twenty-eight he accepted the chair of Hebrew at Saumur, and twenty years afterwards was appointed professor of theology. In his anonymously published *Arcanum punctationis revelatum* he defended the view that the system of vowel points and accents did not date from Moses or from Ezra and the Great Synagogue, but had been inserted by the Masoretes no earlier than the fifth century.[268] In his *Critica sacra*, published in 1650, he used readings from the ancient translations and conjectural emendation to reconstruct the biblical text.[269]

To understand why Turretin and the other orthodox Reformed theologians rejected Cappel we will have to keep in mind that Cappel's views weakened the Reformed position in the debate with Roman Catholicism. For Turretin the authority of Scripture as the *principium* of theology falls away if the authenticity of the text is disputed. Scripture is αὐτόπιστος and therefore the authenticity of the text must stand. Turretin says that since the *authentia* of the sacred text is the primary foundation of faith, nothing is more important than to preserve it against all attacks of those who reject it or weaken it in any way.[270] He interprets the publications of his French colleague as an attack on the authority of Scripture, although he acknowledges that this is not Cappel's intention.[271]

Turretin does not want to bring the reputation of Cappel, "who in other ways deserves esteem from the church of God," into discredit, but he upholds the unimpaired

---

266 M.I. Klauber, 'The Helvetic Consensus Formula (1675): An introduction and Translation,' *Trinity Journal* 11 (1990), 103-123. Muller calls this expression "eminently cautious." Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 411.

267 Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom* 1, 487. The Formula was not intended as a new confession of faith, but as an explanatory appendix to the former confessions. Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom* 1, 486.

268 L. Cappel, *Arcanum punctationis revelatum, sive de punctorum vocalium et accentum apud Hebraeos vera et germana antiquitate*, Leiden 1624, 2 vol. Cf. Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom* 1, 479.

269 L. Cappel, *Critica sacra, sive de variis quae in sacris Veteris Testamenti libris occurrunt lectionibus*, Paris 1650. He had completed the manuscript in 1639, but it took some time to find a publisher. F.P. Van Stam, *The Controversy over the Theology of Saumur, 1635-1650: Disrupting Debates among the Huguenots in Complicated Circumstances* [Studies of the Institute Pierre Bayle, vol. 19], Amsterdam 1988, 257-261.

270 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.xii.1. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 116. In the opening paragraphs of his tract on *The Divine Original, Authority and Self-evidencing Light and Power of the Scriptures* John Owen asserts that "the whole Word of God, in every letter and tittle, as given from Him by inspiration, is preserved without corruption." Owen, *Works* 16, 301.

271 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.xii.18. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 122.

authenticity of the text of Scripture against those who adopt these new hypotheses or call them insignificant. Summarizing Cappel's teaching, Turretin says that, according to Cappel, the vowel points can be changed whenever their meaning is absurd, because they are merely human, and even the consonants may be changed if necessary. It is also lawful to follow the ancient translations, whether Greek, Aramaic, or Latin if they render a meaning that is equally good and appropriate or superior to the Hebrew manuscripts. If there is a weakness in the present reading and it is possible to find a more appropriate reading through the power of sound reason or by conjectural emendation, it is permissible to rephrase the Hebrew text.[272] Cappel teaches that the Hebrew manuscripts behind the Septuagint and other translations are different from those that have been preserved and therefore the authentic or original text must be gathered from a collation of all the Hebrew manuscripts and of the ancient translations.[273]

Turretin rejects this position, because from Cappel's hypothesis it follows that there is no authentic text in which we can rest with entire confidence. If all the discrepancies between the ancient versions and the present Hebrew text are variant readings of Hebrew manuscripts, why do the patristic or Jewish ancient writers not mention these manuscripts? Moreover, in this way the ancient translation are of the same significance as the original text; the Hebrew does not have more authority than the ancient translations except when it is found to be more appropriate and the Hebrew is subordinated to the translations when its reading is difficult. If the authentic reading of Scripture must be sought by comparison with the old translations and by our own judgment and critical ability, then the canon of authentic reading is merely what seems appropriate to us. Then the determination of the authentic reading will be the work of human reason and will (*arbitrium*) not of the Holy Spirit. Human reason will be placed in the citadel and regarded as the rule and *principium* of faith. If conjectural emendations can be made on the sacred text, this damages the certainty of the authentic text and makes everything doubtful and subjected to the judgment of every individual interpreter. Everyone will think that he can give good reasons for his emendations and there will be continual struggles and disputes among the commentators. This would take away the great difference between a human writing that is subject to error and the one that is divine and inspired. Finally, if the existing Hebrew text is given no primacy over the old translations then Protestants have struggled in vain against the Roman Catholics when they affirmed the sole authority of the existing Hebrew text.[274]

At this point two things can be concluded: Turretin did not reject textual criticism, but the use of non-Hebrew texts and of conjectural emendation. The Reformed orthodox in general accepted the establishment of the text of the Bible on the basis of a comparison of available codices, but not the emendation of the text in the original language on the basis either of pure conjecture or of the witness of the ancient translations; an emendation was not accepted if it was not confirmed by the text in the original languages.[275] Moreover, in Reformed orthodoxy the textual issue became a doctrinal issue due to the polemics against Rome. Turretin rejected Cappel's position,

---

272 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.xii.2. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 117.
273 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.xii.3. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 117-118.
274 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.xii.7-12. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 119-121.
275 Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 399.

because he was afraid that it would lead to uncertainty regarding the *principium* of theology. If Cappel's extreme views of textual emendation through conjecture were followed, the result could be that every scholar would create his own Bible. Reasoning from the *autopistia* of Scripture as a logical necessity, the authenticity of the text logically followed and therefore the system of Reformed theology was in danger if the domino stone of the integrity of the text toppled.

4.6.5 Contemporary Translations

In the thirteenth question Turretin discusses the relationship between the original text and the vernacular versions of Scripture. These translations are necessary because (1) people from all languages ought to read and contemplate the Scriptures; (2) the gospel is preached in all languages; (3) it has been the practice of the church to use them in their liturgical worship in the vernacular; (4) there are numerous Greek versions of the Old Testament. The translations are like streams that flow from the fountain of the original text; unlike the originals, they only have human authority, but they do not lack all authority. Turretin distinguishes between the divine authority of the *substantia* of the doctrine, which is the internal form of Scripture, and the divine authority of the exact words, the external form of Scripture, the *accidens* of writing. The original text has both authorities, while the translation only has the first.[276] The original is αὐτόπιστος, while the translation is not.[277]

Turretin uses the term αὐτόπιστος also in other chapters of his work. When he discusses the prophetic office of Christ he calls the *doctrina* of Christ αὐτόπιστος and divine.[278] In his ecclesiology he explains the difference between Scripture and confession. Confessions are not absolutely but only hypothetically necessary, for sometimes the church has been without confessions. Their authority is of great importance, but still sinks below the authority of the Scripture. "For the latter is a rule, but they are the thing ruled. It alone is self-convincing (αὐτόπιστος) with respect to words as well as to things, divine and infallible; they, as divine in things, still in words and manner of treatment are human writings."[279] Turretin says the same of the councils of the church; they are of great weight in the church, inasmuch as their judgment, although not αὐτόπιστος, is still public and proceeds with the authority granted by Christ.[280]

4.6.6 Summarizing Remarks

Although a more detailed study is necessary to do full justice to Turretin's concept of the authority of Scripture, it is possible to draw the following conclusions.

1. Turretin uses the term in the locus *De Theologia*, the formal introduction on theology as a science. The term αὐτόπιστος has a technical function and is used to define

---

276 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.xiii.14. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 125-126.

277 Turretin, *Institutio*, II.xiii.16. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 126.

278 "Eundem Verba Dei loqui & constat doctrinam αὐτόπιστον & divinam afferre censendum est." Turretin, *Institutio*, XIV.vii.16. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 126.

279 "nam ista Regula est, illae regularum; Ista sola αὐτόπιστος, & tam respectu verborum, quam rerum divina & infallibilis, Illae ut rebus diuinae, verbis tamen & tractandi modo humana scripta sunt." Turretin, *Institutio*, XVIII.xxx.9. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 3, 284.

280 Turretin, *Institutio*, XVIII.xxxiii.20. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 3, 311.

the *principia*. The *autopistia* of Scripture flows as a logical consequence from the fact that Scripture is the *principium* of theology. If God has made all *principia* of science self-convincing, he must have also made Scripture as the sacred *principium* of theology self-convincing. Turretin also uses the word-pair *externum* and *internum* for the relationship of Word and Spirit, possibly influenced by Voetius.

2. The evidences for the authority of Scripture are very important in his judgement. Scripture proves itself by the marks (*notae*) God has impressed on it. Faith does not rest on demonstration, but is supported by these arguments, because they show that the testimony of Scripture is trustworthy, especially to new believers. Turretin says that the *notae* of the divinity of Scripture demonstrate that it is divine. The Spirit primarily uses these marks and not the testimony of the church to assure believers of the divine origin of Scripture. There is in Reformed orthodoxy an increasingly apologetic emphasis on the objective *notae* of Scripture.[281]

3. When Turretin explains the interrelationship of the *testimonium* of the Spirit, the witness of the church, and the *notae* of Scripture he uses a helpful scholastic distinction. Scripture with its *notae* is the *argumentum propter quod* of faith, the Holy Spirit is the *principium* or *causa efficiens a qua* of faith, and the church is the *medium* and *instrumentum per quod* of faith. Turretin does not deny the value of the witness of the church, but maintains that Scripture principally should be believed on account of itself or of its *notae* and not on account of the church. The *autopistia* of Scripture is the main reason for Turretin to emphasize that Scripture proves itself by its own *notae*. We believe Scripture because it proves itself to be divine by its own *notae*. The Spirit is the efficient cause of this faith that rests upon the marks of Scripture and the church is only instrumental. The primacy of the *notae* of Scripture flows as a logical necessity from the *autopistia* of Scripture. Calvin accepted Scripture as αὐτόπιστος through the *testimonium* of the Spirit and trusted that he could prove the authority of Scripture through the evidences if necessary. Turretin accepts Scripture because of the evidences and proves that this is logically necessary from the *autopistia* of Scripture as the *principium* of theology.

4. Finally, in the internal Reformed debate on textual criticism in general and on the authenticity of the vowel points in particular, the *autopistia* of Scripture has shifted to the original text of the *autographa*. The copies must be reliable, because the originals are the foundation of our theology. Not that Turretin uses the term αὐτόπιστος exclusively for the originals, but the *autopistia* of Scripture as the ultimate source of authority logically leads to the authenticity and integrity of the copies of the text. God in his providence must have watched over the integrity of the text. Turretin acknowledges the importance of textual criticism, because errors have crept into many codices, but

---

281 Muller states against Rogers and McKim that "it is precisely the traditional, Aristotelian understanding of the nature of the first principle that bars any and all attempts to offer rational and empirical demonstration of the authority of Scripture." Muller, *PRRD* 2^2, 264. Cf. J.B. Rogers and D.K. McKim, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach*, San Francisco 1979, 205. Muller has a point, but he seems to harmonize the tension, because although the Reformed orthodox accepted that Scripture as *principium* was beyond demonstration, at the same time they offered a detailed demonstration of the authority of Scripture by the evidences. This tension is also present in Calvin's *Institutes*, but there Scripture is αὐτόπιστος for believers.

rejects the use of non-Hebrew texts and of conjectural emendation, because unlimited textual criticism can lead to uncertainty regarding the *principium* of theology and place the arbitrary conclusions of human reason in the citadel.

4.7 Gisbert Voetius (1589-1676)

The fourth aspect of Reformed orthodoxy that we will evaluate, regards the confrontation with early modernism and especially with the philosophy of René Descartes who took the self-evident proposition *ego cogito ergo sum* as his methodological starting point. That Descartes' philosophy implied a totally different view of authority and formed a threat for the Reformed orthodox concept of revelation was sharply analyzed by the leading Reformed theologians.[282] One of them was the Dutch theologian Gisbert Voetius. He studied theology at Leiden University, served several congregations, was a delegate at the Synod of Dort, and a professor of theology and Hebrew at the Illustrious School in Utrecht in 1634, a prolific writer, and a zealous polemicist against Roman Catholics, Arminians, Cocceians, and Socinians. He labelled Descartes a "subtle atheist," who claimed to prove God's existence but destroyed the foundations of faith.[283] According to Voetius, Descartes exchanged God's revelation in Scripture for human subjectivity, because his *cogito* was the principle of all science and the means of arriving at certainty about God.[284] It is interesting in the context of this study that Descartes started his philosophical considerations with the proposition that ideas we discern *clare et distincte*, are absolutely and undoubtedly true. It seems that the Reformed emphasis on the *autopistia* of Scripture stands over against the early modern emphasis on the autonomy of the human subject. Voetius criticized the Cartesian idea of a mechanical Universe, because he foresaw that the shifting conception of natural causality threatened the status of theology as a science, because it excluded an explanation of the relationship between God and creation in philosophical terms.[285] We will not discuss the controversy with Descartes in detail, but look at a few statements of Voetius on the authority of Scripture – using αὐτόπιστος as the key-term – and keep the controversy with Descartes in mind for our evaluation.

4.7.1 The *Syllabus Problematum Theologicorum*

Among Voetius's main works are the *Disputationes theologicae selectae* (1648-1669), the *Exercitia pietatis* (1664), and the *Politica ecclesiastica* (1663-1676). In 1643 he published his *Syllabus Problematum Theologicorum*, a survey for students of the whole field of Reformed dogmatics. In every locus of the system Voetius listed the

---

282 Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 70.

283 For brief biographical information cf. J.J.F.M. Bos, *The Correspondence between Descartes and Henricus Regius*, [Utrecht] 2002, 254-255. On Voetius's concept of Scripture cf. C. Graafland, 'Schriftleer en schriftverstaan in de Nadere Reformatie,' in T. Brienen [et al.], *Theologische aspecten van de Nadere Reformatie*, Zoetermeer 1993, 29-97, 35-40.

284 T.H.M. Verbeek, *Descartes and the Dutch: Early Reactions to Cartesian Philosophy, 1637-1650*, Carbondale 1992, 55. Voetius criticized Descartes' idea of God in several disputations titled 'De Atheismo,' *Disputationes Selectae* 1, 114-226. Cf. Van Asselt and Rouwendal, *Inleiding*, 123.

285 J.A. Van Ruler, *The Crisis of Causality: Voetius and Descartes on God, Nature and Change*, Leiden 1995, 303-319. Cf. Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 119-120.

quaestiones or *problemata* and gave a short answer: "yes," "no," "yes, with a distinction," or "no, with a distinction" and the students were supposed to consider the reasons for the answers given.[286]

In the *Syllabus* the divinity and authority of Scripture forms the first subject of the locus *De Principiis Christianorum Dogmatum*. This locus follows the loci *De Theologia* dealing with natural and supernatural theology and *De summo bono seu beatitudine*. The subjects that Voetius discusses under the heading of *De Principiis* are divided into primary and secondary *controversiae*. Some of the primary controversies regarding the authority of Scripture are with the enemies of the faith, others with the Roman Catholics and other heterodox persons.[287] The first is with the skeptics:

> Is there any certain principle of faith? We affirm this against the skeptics and deists.
> Is this [principle] the external Word of God or really only the internal? We affirm the first against the enthusiasts.
> Is Scripture divine or the Word of God and consequently of divine authority? We affirm.[288]

The first question identifies Scripture as the *principium* of faith against the skeptics and the second emphasizes that the external Word of God and not the Inner Light is the *principium* of faith. Voetius uses the word-pair *externum* and *internum* for Scripture, but stresses the external authority of Scripture; this authority is due to the divine origin of Scripture. The last question of the controversy with the skeptics regards the evidences of the authority of Scripture. "Can the divinity of Holy Scripture be proved to those who do not believe? We affirm with a distinction."[289] Voetius does not explain how this can be proved or which distinction should be made, for that was what the students were supposed to find out.

When Voetius discusses the controversy with the Roman Catholics he asks: "Does Scripture have authority, αὐτοπιστία, αὐθεντία in itself, through itself? We affirm."[290] This quotation shows that Voetius finds the term αὐτοπιστία important enough for his students to mention in this elementary summary of the Reformed dogmatics. It also shows that for Voetius the terms *authoritas*, αὐτοπιστία, and αὐθεντία stand very close to each other. The *autopistia* of Scripture stands between the authority and the authenticity of Scripture, the second and third term explain the first; the authority of Scripture consists of its *autopistia* and this *autopistia* is its authenticity *in se* and *per se*.

---

286 W.J. van Asselt and E. Dekker, eds., *De scholastieke Voetius: een luisteroefening aan de hand van Voetius' Disputationes Selectae*, Zoetermeer 1995, 19. Cf. A.J. Beck, 'Gisbertus Voetius (1589-1676): Basic Features of His Doctrine of God,' in *Reformation and Scholasticism*, ed. Van Asselt and Dekker, 205-226, 210, n. 14.

287 The *controversiae primi generis* are either *cum alienis a fide* or *cum Pontificiis, aliisque heterodoxis.* Voetius, *Syllabus problematum theologicorum: Quae pro re nata proponi aut perstringi solent in privatis publicisque disputationum, examinum, collationum, consultationum exercitiis*, Utrecht 1643, [21]-[22].

288 "An sit certum aliquod principium fidei? A.c. Scepticos, Deistas &c. An illud sit verbum Dei externum, an vero solum internum? A.pr.c. Enthus. An Scriptura sit divina seu verbum Dei, & per consequens habeat authoritatem divinam? A." Voetius, *Syllabus*, [21].

289 "An S. Scripturae divinitas probari possit iis, qui non credunt? A. cum D." Voetius, *Syllabus*, [21].

290 "An sit Scripturae authoritas, αὐτοπιστία, αὐθεντία in se, per se?" Affirm. Voetius, *Syllabus*, [22]. Cf. the expression "authentia scil. & αὐτοπιστία Scripturae." Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* V.ii.2.

The next question runs: "Does this [authority] become certainly known to us and how then and from whence? Is this either through the church, or through the Holy Spirit or through Holy Scripture or really through Scripture and the Holy Spirit? We affirm the last."[291] The authority of Scripture as the *principium fidei* can only be known to us through the cooperation of Word and Spirit.

The *Syllabus* shows that in the context of the seventeenth century the focus is shifting to other issues. Voetius for instance distinguishes between historical and normative authority, but denies that there is a distinction between historical and normative authenticity.[292] The question whether the authority and authenticity of Scripture extends to the vowel points is answered in the affirmative.[293] The *Syllabus* shows that Voetius held to a strict infallibility of Scripture and that his concept of inspiration comes very close to dictation. He denies that the authors wrote anything without the inspiration (*instinctus*) of the Holy Spirit and that they could err in anything.[294] The method, the mode of expression, and even the style of Scripture are not to be attributed to the human mind, but to the immediate and infallible revelation of the Holy Spirit.[295] This sounds stricter than what we have found in the *Synopsis*.

The term *testimonium* does not occur in the context of the authority of Scripture. In the chapter on the divinity and authority of Scripture, Scripture is simply stated as a *principium* of theology without reflection on the question how that authority is accepted by believers. Voetius does not deal with the relationship between the work of the Spirit and the authority of Scripture, or between *testimonium* and *autopistia*.

In the chapter on the *perspicuitas* of Scripture he does mention the work of the Spirit. "Can Scripture work faith and obedience in human beings without the internal illumination of the Holy Spirit and can it be heard, read, or understood fruitfully and savingly? We deny."[296] This shift of the work of the Spirit from the context of the authority of Scripture to the context of the perspicuity of Scripture is remarkable; it implies a shift in emphasis from the *testimonium* of the Spirit to Scripture to the *illuminatio* of the Spirit in the believer. The question is not on which foundation the authority of Scripture rests, but how Scripture is accepted in the right way. Does this indicate that Voetius separates the "objective" authority of Scripture from its "subjective" acceptation? We will have to look at his *Disputationes Selectae* before we can answer this question.

---

291 "An & quomodo & unde haec nobis certo innotescat? An ab Ecclesia, an a Spiritu S. an S. Scriptura, an vero Scriptura & Spiritu S.? A. post." Voetius, *Syllabus*, [22].

292 "An quicquid est authenticum authentia historie, sit authenticum authentia normae? N." Voetius, *Syllabus*, [23].

293 "An puncta vocalia in V.T. sint authenticae? A." Voetius, *Syllabus*, [23].

294 "An Scriptores sacri aliquando non scripserint instinctu Spiritus S.? N. An ergo errarint in quibusdam? N." Voetius, *Syllabus*, [22].

295 "An Methodus seu dipositio, exornatio, ἑρμένεια, phrasis & stylus Scripturae humano ingenio atque industriae sit attribuendis; an vero immediatae atque infallibili revelationi Spiritus Sancti? A. post." Voetius, *Syllabus*, [24].

296 "An Scriptura sine interna illuminatione Spiritus S. fidem & obedientiam in hominibus operari possit? Et An fructuose & salutariter audiri, legi, intelligive possit? N." Voetius, *Syllabus*, [30].

4.7.2 Faith and Human Reason

The first disputation in the collection *Disputationes theologicae selectae* deals with "Human Reason in Matters of Faith." According to Voetius, there is a controversy both with the Socinians who state that reason should be used to judge the articles of faith and with the Jesuits who state that reason should not be used because only the express words of Scripture count in the discussion between Rome and Reformation.[297] Voetius first makes a distinction between the objective and the subjective *ratio*. The first is the *ratio* in the abstract sense and the second is human reason as it is given in the image of God before the fall, as it is corrupted after the fall, as it is liberated through grace and finally as it is perfected in glory.[298] The question rises whether the *ratio* is a *principium* of faith. Voetius says:

> The *principium* of faith is twofold: either *out of which* or *externum* or *through which* or *by which* or *internum*. The first can also be called an objective *principium*, the second a formal *principium*. The first is the Word of God, the second the illumination of the Holy Spirit or the infusion of supernatural light into our mind. This external *principium* of faith must be first and αὐτόπιστος and all the truths, articles or conclusions of faith must be primarily deduced from it and ultimately resolved by it.[299]

Then Voetius states that human reason is "the receiving subject of faith" (*subjectum fidei recipiens*) or "the instrument and elicitive principle (*principium elicitivum*) of faith and active knowledge," because the proper place of faith is in the *ratio* and not in the other faculties of the human soul. Thus, according to Voetius, human reason in a certain sense is a *principium* of faith. The *principium externum* is Scripture and the *principium internum* is the illumination of the Spirit, but reason is the *principium elicitivum*, a scholastic technical term to denote by which principle conclusions are drawn out of other principles.[300] Voetius concludes: "Human reason as the *principium quod* draws the conclusions of faith from the unique *principium* of the infallible Scriptures."[301] The truths of faith transcend reason, but this is because human reason does not discern them unless it is enlightened. This does not mean, however, that they are against reason as such; they are so *per accidens* and not *per se*.

> In that respect therefore faith and our theology can be called completely reasonable not because it proves its truth a priori with necessary arguments to those who deny the *principia* of the

---

297 Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* I.1.1, I.1.4 Cf. the Dutch translation of this disputation in Van Asselt and Rouwendal, *Inleiding*, 184-200.

298 Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* I.1.2.

299 "III. Principium fidei duplex est, *ex quo* seu externum; & *quo* seu *per quod* sive internum. Illud posset dici principium objectivum; istud principium formale. Illud est verbum Dei: istud illuminatio Spir. S. seu lumen supernaturale menti nostrae infusum. Externum fidei principium, de quo hic quaeritur debet esse primum & αὐτόπιστον, ex quo primò educuntur & in quod ultimo resolvuntur omnes fidei veritates, articuli seu conclusiones." Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* I.1.2. In his references Voetius mentions Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* and Aquinas's, *Summa Theologiae* Cf. Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics* 2, 6, 10. Cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I, q.1, a.2.6.8.

300 Cf. Aquinas, *Scriptum super Sententiis* I, d.3, q.5, a.1, ad5.

301 "Haec tanquam *principium quod* conclusiones fidei ex unica infallibili scripturarum principio educit." Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* I.1.2. Muller gives some other examples for the discussion of reason, but he does not mention the idea of *ratio* as *principium elicitivum* or *principium quod*. Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 394-395. According to Muller, the idea that reason is a *principium cognoscendi theologiae* is a development in late orthodoxy. Muller, *PRRD* 1^2, 306.

> Christian religion, but because it proves its conclusions from the authority of Scripture by reasons deduced from Scripture to those who accept something of that what is divinely revealed.[302]

Then Voetius turns to the other side; although human reason is an elicitive *principium quod* of faith, it certainly is not a *principium quo* or *per quod* or *ex quo* of faith. Scripture is the source of faith and the illumination of the Spirit is the cause of faith, while reason is the receptive psychological faculty in which faith finds its proper place.[303] Sometimes Voetius calls the light of right reason or the capacity for argumentation the secondary *principium* of theology, while Scripture is the primary *principium*.[304] Reason is not the foundation or norm or source of faith for the doctrines of the Trinity, of original sin, of the God-man Christ, and his satisfaction cannot be deduced from reason. For matters of faith we depend only on Scripture and for the act of faith only on the illumination of the Spirit. Voetius lists nine arguments to prove this point against the Socinians, such as the blindness of the unregenerate, the mysteries of theology and the limitations of the knowledge of the regenerate. Again he refers to Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* and the commentaries on Aristotle. "Human reason is not prior to, better known than or clearer than faith, therefore it cannot be its *principium*."[305]

The term αὐτόπιστος is crucial in Voetius preliminary remarks on the function of human reason in theology. Reason as the *principium elicitivum* deduces the conclusions of faith from Scripture as the *principium externum* through the illumination of the Spirit as the *principium internum* of faith; only Scripture, the *principium externum* or *primarium*, is αὐτόπιστος. Voetius may have influenced Turretin at this point, but the interdependence of two texts is difficult to demonstrate.[306] Turretin does not use the term *principium elicitivum* for human reason.

---

302 "Hactenus ergo fides & Theologia nostra tota dici potest rationalis, non quod à priori veritatem suam rationibus necessariò demonstret apud negantes principia religionis Christianae; sed quod demonstret conclusiones ex authoritate scripturae, & rationibus ex scriptura deductis, apud eos qui aliquid concedunt eorum, quae divinitus revelata sunt." Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* I.1.2.

303 In scholasticism the *principium quo* is the basis for an event or effect, a causative principle, while the *principium quod* is a passive principle that is acted upon. Muller, *Dictionary*, 246.

304 Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* III.lxvii.4. Cf. Beck, 'Gisbertus Voetius,' 214, n. 26. In discussing the role of reason for theology Petrus Van Mastricht deals with the objection that the acknowledgement of the divine character of Scripture is based on reason. He replies that Scripture is known as divine from itself (*ex se*) and not from reason "just as the sun is known by its own light." Van Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia*, I,2,xxxiv. Cf. Neele, *Art of Living to God*, 101.

305 "Ratio humana non est prior notior, certior fidei; ergo non est ejus principium." Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* I.i.3.

306 Voetius has: "Externum fidei principium, de quo hic quaeritur debet esse primum & αὐτόπιστον, ex quo primò educuntur & in quod ultimo resolvuntur omnes fidei veritates, articuli seu conclusiones." Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* I.1.2. Turretin has: "Principium de quo hic quaeritur debet esse primum & αὐτόπιστον ex quoprimo educuntur, & in quod ultimo resolvuntur omnes fidei veritates & articuli." Turretin, *Institutio*, I.viii.1. Cf. Turretin, *Institutes* 1, 24.

4.7.3 Subjective and Objective Authority

In the arrangement of the subjects in the *Disputationes theologicae selectae* the disputation on "Human Reason in Matters of Faith" is followed by a disputation on "Scholastic Theology" and one on "The Extension of the Authority of Scripture."[307] This disputation deals primarily with the distinction between the historical and normative authority of Scripture and with the authority of the Masoretic text, which, according to Voetius, was rooted in the work of Ezra.[308] Voetius opens his discussion with the statement: "The divinity of Scripture or its divine and infallible truth and power with respect to us, is called authority or authenticity."[309] This underlines the fact that authority and authenticity stand close to each other as we have seen in the *Syllabus*. The fourth disputation on "The so-called Contradictions of Scripture" deals with some classic difficulties in the explanation of Scripture; next comes a disputation on the "Apostolic Creed" and then one on the "Church Fathers." The doctrine of the authority of Scripture does not receive as much attention as would be expected in the opening of a series on Reformed theology.

The fifth volume of the *Disputationes Selectae*, however, contains five disputations on Scripture (*Problemata aliquod de Scriptura*). The term αὐτόπιστος only occurs in one of them.[310] In the second of these five disputations, Voetius discusses the authority of Scripture. "For no other principle (*principium*) or external means can be imagined, by which it can be demonstrated a priori or with absolute certainty."[311] Although Voetius lists the αὐθεντία, αὐτοπιστία, ἀξιοπιστία, and *credibilitas* of Scripture, the term ἀξιοπιστία is preferred to αὐτοπιστία in the rest of the disputation.[312] The meaning of both terms is almost synonymous for Voetius, but he loses sight of the axiomatic character of αὐτόπιστος. "The ἀξιοπιστία and authority of revelation and of the divine Scripture so shine and gleam through themselves and from itself it showers such signs and tokens of its divinity at all sides [...] that it is impossible not to see it."[313] A little later he writes:

> Neither can any other *principium* or external means, besides Scripture, be given or invented that is prior, superior, more certain (either *in se* or *quoad nos*) and clear, that it be fit to demonstrate the authenticity and ἀξιοπιστία of Scripture so certainly and infallibly or that radiates light more evidently than Scripture does.[314]

---

307 "De quaestione hac: quousque se extendat Auctoritas Scripturae." Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* I.iii.

308 Muller, *PRRD* 2[2], 411.

309 "Divinitas Scripturae seu divina & infallibilitas ejus veritas ac potestas respectu nostril dicitur authoritas seu αὐθεντία." Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* I.iii.1.

310 The disputation deals with the foundation of the authority of Scripture. "Unde sit & dependeat autoritas Scripturae?" Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* V.ii.

311 "Nullum enim alliud principium, aut medium externum hic fingi potest, per quod a priori aut certo certitudo & autoritas illa demonstretur." Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* V.ii.1.

312 Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* V.ii.1.

313 "sic revelationis & scripturae divinae ἀξιοπιστία, & authoritas per se lucet & radiat, & signa ac notas divinitatis undique ex se fundit [...] ut non possint non videre." Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* V.ii.1.

314 "Nec ullum aliud principium aut medium externum, a scriptura distinctum, eaque prius, superius, (sive in se sive quo ad nos) certius ac notius dari aut excogitari posse, quod aptum

Voetius distinguishes between the objective and subjective authority of Scripture and reserves the *axiopistia* for the first. The objective and subjective authority of Scripture are inseparable and the objective certainty of Scripture is guaranteed by the inspiration of Scripture while the subjective certainty is guaranteed by the illumination of the Spirit:

> Just as the objective certainty of the authority of Scripture is nothing, unless it is inserted and engrafted by God alone as the real author of Scripture, so also the subjective certainty or the formal concept of the authority of Scripture is nothing for us, unless we are inwardly illuminated and persuaded by God through the Holy Spirit. As Scripture itself, as the *principium externum* radiates by its own light, (without the intervening of any other *principium* or means of demonstration or conviction), is by itself and in itself ἀξιόπιστος or credible – so the Holy Spirit is the *internum*, supreme, first, independent *principium*, actually opening and illuminating the eyes of our mind, effectually persuading us of the credible authority of Scripture, from it, along with it and through it, so that being drawn we run, and being passively convicted within we acquiesce.[315]

The objective certainty is a result of the *autopistia* – or in the words of Voetius the *axiopistia in se* – of Scripture and the subjective certainty is the result of the *illuminatio* of the Spirit that causes us to find rest (*acquiescere*) in Scripture. Both sides are connected because Voetius says that the Spirit works from Scripture, along with Scripture and through Scripture, nevertheless, the Holy Spirit as the *principium internum* is called supreme, first, independent compared with Scripture as the *principium externum*.

For this statement Voetius refers to the testimonies of Scripture.[316] He also says that only God is able to work in the mind and will of human beings; the external principle as such is not able to effectuate sure faith and the true reception of the authority of Scripture and therefore the internal persuasion of the Spirit is necessary.[317] If Scripture depends on the authority of the church this results in circular reasoning, for then the church is trustworthy (ἀξίοπιστος) because Scripture says so and Scripture is trustworthy (ἀξίοπιστος) because the church says so.[318] Finally, it follows from the

---

natum sit nobis scripturae authentiam & ἀξιοπιστίαν certo atque infallibiliter demonstrare, aut evidentiori lumine radiare, quam scriptura radiat." Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* V.ii.1.

315 "Ut certitudo objectiva autoritatis scripturae nulla est, nisi a solo Deo scripturae autore ipsi indita atque insita: sic certitudo ejusdem subjectiva, seu conceptus formalis autoritatis scripturae nobis nullus est nisi a Deo interius per spiritum sanctum illuminante ac persuadente. Ut enim ipsa scriptura tanquam principium externum proprio lumine radians (nullo alieno interveniente tanquam principio aut medio demonstrationis aut convictionis) per se & in se ἀξιόπιστον seu credibile est, & aptum natum active convincere, uon minus quam lumen solis per se & ex se visibile est seu aptum natum illuminare: sic Spiritus Sanctus, est internum, supremum, primum, independens principium actualiter mentis nostrae oculos apierens atque illuminans, & credibilem scripturae autoritatem ex ea cum ae per eandem efficaciter persuadens, sic ut nos tracti curramus, & passive in nobis convicti acquiescamus." Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* V.ii.2. We discussed this quotation above in our summary of Heppe, Cf. Heppe, *Dogmatik*, 22. Cf. Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 25-26.

316 Voetius refers to 1 Cor. 2,12, 1 John 2,27 and John 16,13; 6,44,46.

317 Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* V.ii.2.

318 "Quare credis ecclesiae aut Papae testanti de autoritate scripturae? Quia scriptura dicit Papae aut ecclesiae testimonium esse ἀξίοπιστον? Et quare credis scripturae tanquam ἀξίοπιστοι? Quia Papa aut ecclesia dicit scripturam esse ἀξίοπιστον." Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* V.ii.2.

doctrine of grace that the assent to the authority of Scripture is a result of the grace of the Spirit either regenerating and sanctifying or illuminating in a common way.[319]

4.7.4 Summarizing Remarks

For Voetius *autopistia* is a theological "technical term"; it stands between the authority and the authenticity of Scripture. The authority of Scripture consists in its *autopistia* and this *autopistia* consists in its authenticity *in se* and *per se*. Sometimes he prefers the term *axiopistia* to *autopistia*. This place between authority and authenticity illustrates that the meaning of the term is formalized; it does not denote the way in which Scripture is accepted through the work of the Spirit, but is an attribute of Scripture. Moreover, in the *Disputationes Selectae* the term αὐτόπιστος has shifted from the doctrine of Scripture to the field of the *principia* of theology and is used for the differences between the several *principia*.

In Voetius's *Syllabus* the *testimonium* is not discussed in the context of the authority of Scripture, but Scripture is simply called the *principium* of theology without reflection on the question how its authority is accepted by believers. The *illuminatio* of the Spirit finds its place in the context of the *perspicuitas*. The shift in emphasis from the *testimonium* of the Spirit to the *illuminatio* of the Spirit indicates a shift from the "objective" authority of Scripture to the "subjective" acceptance of this authority.

Voetius also calls human reason (*ratio*) a *principium* of faith, although merely an elicitive principle. Faith transcends reason, because reason does not discern the truths of faith unless it is enlightened, but these truths are not against reason.

Voetius seems to go beyond the representatives of early orthodoxy on some points. His definition of inspiration is stricter than that of the *Synopsis* in that Voetius not only denies that the authors of Scripture could err in anything, but also attributes the method, the mode of expression, and the style of Scripture to the immediate and infallible revelation of the Holy Spirit. This stricter view may partly be due to the new controversies within Protestantism for instance on the vowel points of the Masoretic text, but it can also be a symptom of a desire to safeguard the authority of Scripture against the developing critical attitude.

Finally Voetius not only distinguishes between a *verbum externum* and a *verbum internum*, but also calls Scripture the *principium externum* of faith and the illumination of the Holy Spirit or the infusion of supernatural light into our mind the *principium internum* of faith. He repeats this in one of his disputations on Scripture; Scripture is the *principium externum* and the Holy Spirit is the *principium internum*. This *principium internum* is even called supreme, first, independent compared with Scripture. Both *principia* guarantee the objective and subjective authority of Scripture. Only the *principium externum* is αὐτόπιστος. The objective certainty is a result of the *autopistia* of Scripture and the subjective certainty is the result of the illumination of the Spirit. The application of the terms *externum* and *internum* to the *principia* of faith seems to be a new development compared with early orthodoxy, where the term *principium* was reserved for Scripture and not used for the *verbum internum*.

---

319 "necessario sequitur, ultimam analysin hujus assensus de autoritate scripturae esse in gratiam spiritus sive regenerantis & sanctificantis, siva ad minimum communiori auxilio illuminantis." Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* V.ii.2.

The question whether the conflict with Cartesian philosophy influenced Voetius in his tendency to distinguish between Word and Spirit as objective and subjective principles of faith and theology can only be answered in a more detailed study. Voetius may have emphasized the objectivity of the authority of Scripture to counterbalance the contemporary subjective tendency. He makes a sharper distinction between *externum* and *internum* than his orthodox Reformed predecessors and applies the terminology to the *principia* of faith. The *autopistia* of Scripture and the *testimonium* of the Spirit that were so closely related for Calvin, are separated, or at least sharply divided by Voetius. The *autopistia* of Scripture is a given fact that can be proved objectively, while the *testimonium* is interpreted as a subjective illumination of the Spirit. Perhaps Voetius has internalized more of the Cartesian philosophy than he would be willing to admit. Both Descartes and Voetius stand on the brink of early modernity, which is characterized by the discovery of the human subject. In the dichotomy of subject and object Descartes jumps into the subjectivity of his *ego cogito ergo sum* while Voetius clings to the old certainty of the *autopistia* of Scripture as the *principium externum* of faith. To safeguard this certainty he interprets it objectively.

4.8 Conclusions and Theological Considerations

In this chapter we have analyzed the development of Reformed theology in an hermeneutical way. This implies a rejection of the separation of the historical and theological approaches. Our historical interests, for instance in the combination *externum-internum*, are related to our theological quest for the ground of the certainty of faith. The hermeneutical approach should make us careful not to step in the trap of drawing prejudiced historical conclusions or presenting an over-simplification of the complicated historical development. The concentration on the term αὐτόπιστος helps avoiding the confusion of different aspects of theology with different stages of a historical development.

We evaluated four aspects of the theological development of Reformed orthodoxy. First of all we looked at the influence of the developing debate with the Roman Catholicism of the Counter-Reformation. We found that the *autopistia* of Scripture was essential for the position of William Whitaker in this debate. The polemical context influenced the meaning and the use of αὐτόπιστος. The term was not only used as an adjective, but also as a substantive and so the *autopistia* of Scripture became one of the attributes of Scripture. The second aspect was the institutionalization of Reformed orthodoxy at the universities. We saw what happened to the *autopistia* of Scripture in the sphere of the academic education in the example of Franciscus Junius. The shift from the adjective to the substantive *autopistia* was formalized in his theology through the use of the scholastic and Aristotelian distinction of the four causes. We also saw that in the several disputations the relationship between the evidences and the *testimonium* was explained in various ways. Moreover, the innovative discussion of *theologia* in his prolegomena created a structure that led to a shift of the *autopistia* from the doctrine of Scripture to the discussion of the nature and *principia* of theology. Junius discussed *autopistia* in the disputations on Scripture, but in later Reformed theological systems the term moved to the introductory disputation on theology. The discussion of *theologia* as a science created a place in the theological system for the *autopistia* of Scripture as a logical necessity rather than a confessional statement. All sciences have self-convincing

principia, therefore if theology is a science and if Scripture is the *principium* of theology, Scripture must necessarily be αὐτόπιστος. Thirdly we studied the influence of two internal controversies: the Arminian Controvery and the reaction of Francis Turretin to the theology of Saumur. Although both Arminius and Gomarus used the term αὐτόπιστος, they had a different intention. The term gained a different meaning in a different context. For Arminius the *autopistia* of Scripture safeguarded individual liberty. For Gomarus the *autopistia* of Scripture safeguarded Scripture against human corruption. Likewise in the *Synopsis of Purer Theology* the *autopistia* of Scripture safeguarded the Reformed doctrines and therefore it was interpreted as a general characteristic of Scripture that could be proved to unbelievers by a detailed argumentation; even the faith of believers was seen as a result of the *notae* or *criteria*. In his reaction to Louis Cappel Turretin connected the *autopistia* of Scripture especially to the original text of the *autographa*. The *autopistia* of Scripture as the ultimate source of authority logically led to the integrity of the copies of the text, which God in his *providence* must have guarded. The fourth aspect lay in the context of the early Enlightenment. Gisbert Voetius used *autopistia* as a theological "technical term," but preferred *axiopistia*. The emerging Enlightenment may have influenced Voetius when he called human reason a *principium* of faith, although it only was an elicitive principle. The distinction between Scripture as the *principium externum* of faith and the illumination of the Spirit as the *principium internum* of faith ran parallel to the emphasis on the human subject in early modernity. Voetius emphasized the objectivity of the authority of Scripture to counterbalance the contemporary subjective tendency, but in his rejection of subjectivism he made a sharper distinction between *externum* and *internum* than Reformed orthodox authors before him.

Although this summary is oversimplified, it shows how theological and historical contexts influenced the meaning and use of αὐτόπιστος. The shifts were rather differences in nuance than radical changes, for often the previous uses of the term still occurred in the later writings. Nevertheless, the use of αὐτόπιστος illustrates a changing concept of the authority of Scripture.

Calvin introduced the term αὐτόπιστος as a confessional statement; in the polemic with Rome *autopistia* became an attribute of Scripture; in the academic setting the *autopistia* gained the status of a logical necessity for the *principium* of the theological science; in the Arminian Controversy the objective aspect of the *autopistia* was emphasized over against subjectivist abuse of the term; in the controversy with Saumur the term was connected to the autographic text of Scripture; and, finally, in the confrontation with the emerging Enlightenment the *autopistia* of Scripture counterbalanced the autonomy of human reason.

The *externum-internum* terminology also begs for a theological evaluation. Calvin does not speak of a *testimonium internum* as the subjective counterpart of the external authority of Scripture. In early Reformed orthodoxy the two terms refer to the church as the external means of grace and to the Spirit as the internal author of grace. Whitaker uses the word-couple in connection with *testimonium* for the institutional testimony of the church and the personal testimony of the Spirit. Junius divides the *testimonia* into the internal *testimonium* of the Spirit and the external *testimonia* of Scripture and the church. For Alsted the distinction *verbum internum* and *verbum externum* runs parallel to the inspired *verbum* (ἐνδιάθετος) and the enunciated *verbum* (προφόρικος). He divides

the second into the written *verbum* (ἔγγραφον) and the unwritten *verbum* (ἄγραφον) and then applies the distinction to the realm of faith. The *verbum internum* once in the heart of the authors of Scripture has become a *verbum externum* in Scripture and this *verbum externum* again becomes a *verbum internum* in the hearts of believers through the Spirit. The *verbum internum* is the *testimonium internum*.

In early Reformed orthodoxy the term *principium* is reserved for Scripture. The high orthodox Reformed theologians Voetius and Turretin call Scripture the *principium externum* of faith and the illumination of the Holy Spirit the *principium internum* of faith, but only Scripture is αὐτόπιστος.

Our historical research leads to six fields of interest for our theological evaluation; in the final chapter these issues will be discussed and related to Calvin's concept of the authority of Scripture and to the theological positions of Benjamin B. Warfield and Herman Bavinck.

1. Calvin places the authority of Scripture at the beginning of the *Institutes* as a prolegomenon. Nevertheless, he states that the proper place to deal with the *testimonium* of the Spirit is in soteriology. Most Reformed orthodox writers deal with Scripture in one of the first *loci* of the theological system, following Calvin's decision. Usually Scripture comes after the discussion of the nature of theology and before the discussion of the existence and attributes of God. We have seen that the *autopistia* of Scripture shifts from its original place in the *locus* "On Scripture" to the first *locus* "On Theology." This goes together with the transformation from a confessional statement into a logical starting point of theology. This leads to the question whether this development is inherent in the decision of Calvin to place the authority of Scripture at the beginning of the *Institutes.* Some early orthodox Reformed writers dealt with Scripture in the context of ecclesiology, because the doctrine of Scripture was dominated by the polemic against Rome. Whitaker placed the authority of Scripture in the context of the prophetic office of Christ. This begs for a theological evaluation and for a consideration of the implications of transferring it to Pneumatology or Christology.

2. We will have to look at the definition of the *autopistia* of Scripture. We have seen that in Reformed orthodoxy the adjective αὐτόπιστος is transformed into a substantive, ἀυτοπιστία or τὸ αὐτόπιστον, and this shift indicates that *autopistia* has become one of the attributes of Scripture. Moreover, the term is primarily used in the context of the *principia* of theology. The *autopistia* of Scripture follows logically from the fact that Scripture is the *principium* of theology; it is understood as a logical necessity. There is no unbroken line from the self-convincing sense of Scripture in the Reformation to the Reformed orthodox identification of Scripture as the *principium cognoscendi theologiae*. There is continuity, but the differences between both concepts of *autopistia* may not be harmonized and the development from a confessional statement to a logical necessity may not be overlooked. We will have to take this development into account for our theological definition of the *autopistia* of Scripture.

3. We are interested in how the *autopistia*, the *testimonium*, and the evidences are exactly interrelated. The relationship between the evidences and the *testimonium* is explained in various ways by the different authors and sometimes even by the same author as in the case of Junius. In Reformed orthodoxy there is an increasing apologetic emphasis on the objective *notae* of Scripture. Next to this increasing emphasis on the

objective side stands a tendency to connect the *testimonium* of the Spirit with the evidences as the means by which the Spirit demonstrates the *autopistia* of Scripture to believers. The Spirit gives power (*vis*) to the arguments or even works faith through the divine *notae* of Scripture.

4. The term αὐτόπιστος in Reformed orthodoxy stands in the wide range of the questions of determining the canon as well as settling the authenticity and integrity of the text. Only the original Hebrew and Greek texts are αὐτόπιστος and not the ancient translations. Turretin acknowledges the importance of textual criticism, but rejects the use of the Septuagint and of conjectural emendation, because this leads to uncertainty. We will have to face the theological question what happens to the *autopistia* of Scripture if the integrity of the text topples and consider how the *autopistia* of Scripture is related to textual criticism.

5. There is an inherent tension in Reformed orthodoxy between an appreciation of reason as natural gift or even as the main faculty of the soul and a depreciation of reason as a potential enemy of faith and an instrument of human *hubris*. Thysius states that whatever is contained in Scripture either expressly or by a valid inference is true doctrine; everything that can be logically derived from Scripture is true. Turretin, however, warns against the danger of placing human reason in the citadel by allowing conjectural emendation of the text. Reason is not a guide to the truth, but a guide from the truth of Scripture to Christian doctrine and practice. The same tension appears when the *notae* of Scripture are rejected as the foundation of faith, but accepted as conclusive for unbelievers and as the means by which the Spirit convinces believers. There is an inherent tension in Reformed theology at this point.

6. The use of *externum* and *internum* is very complex. The way in which the meaning of this distinction has shifted during this period seems to be interrelated with the rise of early modernity. The historical question concerning how the subject-object dichotomy has influenced the relationship between the authority of Scripture and the work of the Spirit has only been touched on and is not yet fully discussed in this study. Still the impression arises that the interpretation of the *autopistia* as an objective characteristic of Scripture and of the *testimonium* as a subjective reality in the individual is influenced by the early modern emphasis on the individual human subject.