

IN TRANSLATIÖNE

Johannes Wollebius' *Præcognita* of Christian Theology from *Compendium Theologiæ Christianæ*

INTRODUCTION

Johannes Wollebius (1586–1629) was a professor of theology in early seventeenth century Switzerland. Together with Johann Heinrich Heidegger (1633–1698) and Francis Turretin (1632–1687), Wollebius was one of the most important Swiss theologians in the period of High Orthodoxy.¹ Having studied under Amandus Polanus (1561–1610) and succeeded Johann Grynaeus (1540–1617), he wrote his *Compendium Christianæ Theologiæ* based largely on Polanus' larger *Syntagma*.² Polanus published his *Syntagma* in 1609. Wollebius' work appeared only seventeen years later in 1626. Wollebius' work excelled his mentor's in popularity, going through nine Latin editions by 1655 as well as an English translation by Alexander Ross in 1650.³

Wollebius' text enjoyed a long life and extensive influence. It began to displace Ames' *Medulla* as a primary text at Harvard.⁴ Together with Ames' text, it was written into the constitution of Yale University.⁵ In the eighteenth century, Yale students gathered every Saturday to recite the Westminster Confession of Faith, and to discuss Wollebius, Ames, or another approved system of divinity.⁶ Wollebius' theological

textbook became standard reading in theological training on both sides of the Atlantic for two centuries. Though he is no longer a familiar name among most theological students, Wollebius provides an important window into the development of the theological methodology of Reformed orthodoxy. His work is a concise and precise summary of the best of Reformed orthodox theology up to his time, especially via Polanus.

The Westminster Standards would later mirror much of the language of Wollebius' *Compendium*. While this does not necessarily point to direct dependence on Wollebius, it provides a window into understanding better the historical context of these standards. Among other factors, these things make Wollebius' text to be virtually an ideal introduction to Reformed orthodox theology.

The footnotes attached to this translation of the *Præcognita* of Christian Theology which prefaces Wollebius' *Compendium* serve as historical annotations. This material is limited to the period of Reformed orthodoxy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The translator selected enough material from other authors to present a sense of the trajectory of Reformed theology, without annotating or explaining every line in Wollebius' text. In particular, he included references to other authors where there may have been some diversity within the reformed tradition. The work is also limited in that there are very few references to non-Reformed authors, which would require more extensive analysis than footnotes allow. The translator has cited a few key secondary texts in order to clarify context, definitions of terms, and to promote further study.

RYAN M. MCGRAW

THE TRANSLATOR: Translation and Annotations by Ryan M. McGraw. Ryan McGraw is Associate Professor of Systematic Theology at Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary and Research Fellow for the University of the Free State as well as the Puritan Studies Program.

1. W. J. van Asselt et al., *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, trans. Albert Gootjes (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011), 153. Van Asselt mistakenly lists Turretin's years as 1586–1629. This is clearly a typographical error that involves transposing Wollebius' dates next to Turretin's name.

2. Amandus Polanus was professor of Old Testament at Basel. When he died of the plague in 1610, the university offered his position to the elder Johannes Buxtorf, but Buxtorf declined the offer. Stephen G. Burnett, *From Christian Hebraism to Jewish Studies: Johannes Buxtorf (1564–1629) and Hebrew Learning in the Seventeenth Century*, *Studies in the History of Christian Thought* (Leiden: Brill, 1996).

3. The edition used for this translation is, Johannes Wollebius, *Compendium Theologiæ Christianæ, Editio Ultima Prioribus Multo Correctior*, 9th ed. (Cantabrigiæ, 1655). Ross's work is, *The Abridgment*

of Christian Divinitie so Exactly and Methodically Compiled That It Leads Us as It Were by the Hand to the Reading of the Holy Scriptures, Ordering of Common-Places, Understanding of Controversies, Clearing of Some Cases of Conscience: By John Wollebius; Faithfully Translated into English by Alexander Ross (London: Printed by T. Mabb for Joseph Nevill and are to be sold at his shop, 1650).

4. Amy Plantinga Pauw, *"The Supreme Harmony of All": The Trinitarian Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 2002), 61.

5. One author notes, "Wollebius's book was of such importance," Samuel Johnson (Class of 1714) noted sarcastically, that it was "considered with equal or greater veneration than the Bible itself." http://archives.yalealumnimagazine.com/issues/o1_03/seal.html. Accessed April 8, 2015, 11:18am.

6. Brooks Mather Kelley, *Yale: A History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 80. It is ironic that the author referred to Wollebius' text as "difficult," given its brevity and simplicity compared to other Reformed scholastic systems.

PRÆCOGNITA

1 THE PRÆCOGNITA⁷ OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY⁸

Christian theology is the doctrine of the knowledge and worship of God, to His own glory, and to our salvation.⁹

1.1 RULES (CANONES):¹⁰ THE NATURE AND DEFINITIONS OF THEOLOGY¹¹

I. The word Theology¹² is taken diversely.¹³ In this place, it is understood as referring to the knowledge of God, which the Christian man is able to acquire in this life by the Word of God.¹⁴

The word Theology, which is also called *katakresikos* by the Gentiles, by whom theology is usurped, is threefold [in meaning]: Poetica or fabulosa; Philosophical or natural; and that which is called sacred (or politike), by which it was made

7. This term refers to those things that need to be known ahead of time before studying a subject. Because this is a technical term, the translator opted to keep it in the translated text. Muller does not treat "præcognita" in his Dictionary.

8. This is page 1 in the original text (see footnote 3).

9. William Ames began his work on the system of theology with the later famous definition, "Theologia est doctrina Dei vivendi." William Ames, *Medulla S.S. Theologiæ, in Fine Adjuncta Est Disputatio De Fidei Divinæ Veritate. Editio Tertia Priori Longe Correctior* (Apud Robertum Allottum: Londini, 1629), 1. Maastricht subsumed the work of the Spirit under the work of Christ in this definition, which allowed him to incorporate an explicitly experimental element into his definition (pp. 4–6). John Owen similarly argued that true theology entails the personal knowledge of God through union with Christ. John Owen, *Theologoumena Pantodapa, Sive, De Natura, Ortu Progressu, Et Studio Veræ Theologiæ, Libri Sex Quibus Etiam Origines & Processus Veri & Falsi Cultus Religiosi, Casus & Instauraciones Ecclesiæ Illustiores Ab Ipsius Rerum Primordiis, Enarrantur* (Oxonix: Excudebat Hen. Hall, impensis Tho. Robinson, 1661), lib. VI, cap. VI, 488. At the same time, theology is a spiritual gift from the Holy Spirit (lib. VI, cap. VI, 489). Polanus, who was Wollebius' predecessor, began his work by stating that the sum of the theology of which he wrote could be summarized in our Lord Jesus Christ. He immediately demonstrated how this consideration inescapably involved the Father and the Spirit as well. Amandus Polanus, *Syntagma Theologiæ Christianæ Ab Amando Polano a Polansdorf: Juxta Leges Ordinis Methodici Conformatum, Atque in Libros Decem Digestum Jamque Demum in Unum Volumen Compactum ... Novissime Emendatum* (Hanovix, 1610), 1.

10. Ross has "rules" throughout his translation. Cloppenburg clearly uses *canon* as "rule" when he referred to Scripture as the single rule (*canon unicus est*) of Christian theology. *Exercitationes Super Locos Communes Theologicos* (Franekeræ, 1653), [14]. Cloppenburg's work lacks pagination.

11. I have added descriptive subtitles to the "canones" for the purposes of organization and clarity. They are not part of the original Latin text.

12. Ross adds, "or divinity" (*Abridgment*, p. 1).

13. Johannes Cloppenburg represents the standard Medieval and Reformed scholastic distinctions of theology by dividing them into

possible [for them] to confine the people within their duty, by some religious exercise.¹⁵ But theology as it is properly (vere) called, is *archetypal*, or *ectypal*.¹⁶ Archetypal [theology] is that knowledge by which God knows himself, which things do not differ in themselves from the divine essence.¹⁷ Ectypal [theology] is a certain likeness (*effigies*) of archetypal [theology], which is primarily known in Christ the God-man,¹⁸ but [is known] secondarily in Christ's members. But while some of Christ's members are militant on earth, [the theology] of those who are triumphant [in heaven] is called *theologia beatorum*; [the theology] of those who are militant [on earth] is called *theologia viatorum*.

II. Theology, in this place, is not considered as residing in a habit of the intellect, but in a system of precepts,¹⁹ which is therefore also defined by doctrine.

As it is comprehended within precepts, theology differs from the habits²⁰ of theology, as an efficient cause differs from its effect. But, it is asked, if theology is considered as an

archetypal, ectypal, heavenly angelic, and the theology of vision (for the glorified saints in heaven). Johannes Cloppenburg, *Exercitationes Super Locos Communes Theologicos* (Franekeræ, 1653), [10–11].

14. Muller breaks the common Scholastic and Reformed use of *theologia* into four parts: 1. Divine revelation as given in Scripture. 2. The knowledge the believers hold by faith, as derived from Scripture. 3. Science or wisdom constructed from Scripture in order to explicate or defend the faith. 4. God's self-knowledge, which is the *archetype* of all true knowledge of God. Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1985), 298–299.

15. Ross adds, "be what it will" (*Abridgment*, p. 2). Wollebius severely abbreviates Polanus' treatment of these divisions. Polanus, *Syntagma Theologiæ Christianæ*, 3–5.

16. I have chosen to transliterate the Latin terms here due to their technical significance for theology. Muller, *DLGTT*: "theologia archetypa:" "the infinite knowledge of God known only to himself, which is the archetype or ultimate pattern for all true theology" (299–300). "Theologia ectypa:" "All true finite theology, defined as a reflection of the divine archetype" (300). Wollebius has reduced Polanus' three chapters on this subject to a few lines. Polanus, *Syntagma Theologiæ Christianæ*, 5–14 (chapters two through four).

17. By contrast, Cloppenburg argued that this standard definition of *theologia archetypa* was unwise (*imprudenter*) because it confused archetypal and ectypal theology. He explained that God's self-knowledge was merely the application of his infinite wisdom, which belongs to ectypal rather than archetypal theology. Instead, he redefined *theologia archetypa* in terms of, "that doctrine to be learned by us, determined in God's mind from eternity, and determined by the will of God by his free choice" (*Doctrina nobis discenda, in menta divino ab æterno præfinita, voluntarius Dei decernentis liber arbitrio*). Cloppenburg, *Exercitationes*, [10]. This is an interesting divergence from the standard use of terms as represented by Wollebius.

18. Greek: theanthropos. Ross has, "our mediator" (*Abridgment*, 2).

19. Page 2 in the original text (see footnote 3).

20. Rather than referring to a practice acquired by repetition, in a scholastic context, a *habitus* connoted a disposition or "spiritual capacity." See Muller, *DLGTT*, 134. For further explanation of habits and acts in Reformed soteriology, see J. V. Fesko, *The Theology of the*

intellectual habit, to which of the intellectual habits should it be assigned?²¹ Surely there is no other definition, which if we take it up alone and in itself, that is narrower than that [which relates to the thing here defined]. For *intelligence* [is the habit that] apprehends foundational principles;²² *knowledge*²³ [is the habit] that demonstrates conclusions drawn from foundational principles; and *wisdom*²⁴ [is the habit] that emerges from intelligence and knowledge. These are merely contemplative habits. But *prudence* is an active habit, leading the mind into action.²⁵ *Art* is also a habit that arises from the effective use of right reason.²⁶ Theology consists partly in contemplation, and partly in action.²⁷ Therefore, theology is *wisdom* and *prudence*.²⁸ It is *wisdom* insofar as it apprehends

foundational principles²⁹ through the divine illumination of the intellect,³⁰ and through knowledge demonstrates the conclusions drawn from them. But it is *prudence* insofar as it directs a man's actions in his life.³¹

III. God is the foundational principle³² of theology in relation to being; but the Word of God [is the foundational principle of theology] in relation to knowledge.³³

IV. Prior to the time of Moses, the Word of God was first unwritten. But according to the wise counsel of God, it was written from the time of Moses. He willed it to be sealed³⁴ through Prophets and Apostles.

The Papiſts, in order that they might obtrude their traditions³⁵ in the place of the written Word of God, say that

Westminster Standards: Historical Context and Theological Insights (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014), 260–264; Christopher Cleveland, *Thomism in John Owen* (Farnham, Surrey, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2013), 69–120.

21. This is a reference to Aristotelian categories.

22. Principia.

23. In contrast to Post-Enlightenment Reformed theology, most Reformed orthodox authors denied that theology was a science on the ground that science referred to knowledge derived from principles common to man and agreed upon by reason. As we will see below, theology involved ſpiritual wisdom. See Owen, *Theologoumena Pantodapa*, ib. I, cap. II, 5–6. Aquinas denied, in one sense, that theology was a science, on precisely the same grounds stated by Owen: “Videtur quod sacra doctrina non sit scientia. Omnis enim scientia procedit ex principiis per se notis. Sed sacra doctrina procedit ex articulis fidei, qui non sunt per se noti, cum non ab omnibus concedantur, non enim omnium est fides, ut dicitur II Thessalon. III. Non igitur sacra doctrina est scientia.” Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* (corpusthomicum.org, n.d.), Q. 1, Article 2. However, he immediately added that theology may be considered to be a superior science based on revelation from God. “Et hoc modo sacra doctrina est scientia, quia procedit ex principiis notis lumine superioris scientiæ, quæ scilicet est scientia Dei et beatorum.” Similarly, Ames wrote, “Fidem dico, non scientiam, non opinionem, quas inter consistit fides intinque reducta. . . . Non scientia, quia non ex principiorum et causarum evidentia certa, sed ex autoritate et apsideia dicentis.” William Ames, *Disceptatio Scholastica De Circulo Pontificio Et Eorum Omnium Akatalepsia, Qui in Scripturis Non Acquiescunt. Item Ejusdem Disquisitiones Theologicæ De Lumine Naturæ Et Gratix, Præparatione Peccatoris Ad Controversiam, Adoratione Christi Mediatoris. Ac Denique Orationes Duæ, Antehac Non Editæ, Quibus Subiecta Est D. Esteji De Certitudine Salutis* (Amſtelodami: Janssonius, 1658). This material is partially cited from Ryan M. McGraw, “A Heavenly Directory:” *Trinitarian Piety, Public Worship, and a Reassessment of John Owen's Theology*, Reformed Historical Theology (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014), 41. Elsewhere, Owen was willing to refer to theology as a science under appropriate qualifications: “Divine knowledge is like a practical science; the end of all whose principles and theorems is in their practice; take that away and it is of no use.” John Owen, *Hebrews, The Works of John Owen, D.D.*, ed. William H. Goold, 24 vols. (Edinburgh: Johnſtone & Hunter, 1850), 21:18.

24. Sapientia

25. Muller, *DLGTT*: “the form of knowledge (See *cognitio, notitia*)

that guides practical judgment by means of universal principles of conduct and action” (252).

26. Recte ratione

27. Medieval theology debated the questions whether theology was theoretical, practical, or some combination of the two. Most Reformed authors desired to retain a heavy emphasis on the practical side of theology without neglecting its theoretical aspects. See Muller, *PRRD*, 1:333–354. This concern is related to why Reformed authors rejected the idea that theology was, strictly speaking, a science. For a Reformed summary of these debates with a defense of a practical bent in theology, see Johannes Hoornbeeck, *Theologia Practica Pars 1, 2 vols.* (Francofurti & Lipsiæ: Bailliar, 1698), 5–6.

28. Polanus described true theology as, “*sapientia rerum divinarum*.” Polanus, *Syntagma Theologiæ Christianæ*, 7–8. He cited both Aquinas and John Dunns Scotus as making the same assertion. Cloppenburg likewise defined theology partly as religion, which is ſpiritual wisdom revealed by God in covenant that stimulates the conscience to the holy worship of God (*Religio est sapientia ſpiritualis, secundum Dei in fœdere revealum notitia, stimulans conscientiam ad Deum sancte collendam*). Cloppenburg, *Exercitationes*, [11].

29. Principia.

30. *Intelligentiam*. Wollebius is arguing that theology begins with the divine illumination of the habit, or faculty, of intelligence. Wisdom thus envelops *intelligentia* and *scientia*. This implies that effectual calling and regeneration are the foundation of theological science. Science is only one component of true theology. The post-Enlightenment tendency in Reformed theology to define theology as a science represents a shift away from the more comprehensive definition of theology in Reformed orthodoxy. Though stated in scholastic terms, Wollebius's definition of theology explains why *praxis* and personal experience are integral to true theology.

31. *Animum hominis*. Ross translates this as “the mind of man” (*Abridgment*, p. 3). This reflects the prevailing idea of the time that ſpiritual transformation in the study of theology began in the mind. Compare to Owen, *Theologoumena Pantodapa*, 487, who describes theology as involving, “*mentis hominis per Spiritum Sanctum renati*.”

32. Principium.

33. Polanus placed ſpecial stress at this point on the Decalogue, since this is the part of the Word of God that teaches us most directly how to worship and to love God, both directly and through loving our neighbor. Polanus, *Syntagma Theologiæ Christianæ*, 9.

34. Ross has, “sealed and confirmed” (*Abridgment*, p. 3), but the original has *consignari*.

35. Ross adds, “unwritten” (*Abridgment*, p. 4).

Scripture came only on fortuitous occasions.³⁶ But truly, the many written commands given by the Prophets and Apostles cry out against this [error]. Ex. 17:14; 34:27; Deut. 31:19; Isa. 8:1; 30:8; Jer. 20:2; Hab. 2:2; Rev. 1:11, 19; 14:13; 19:9; 21:9. The testimony of the Apostles to the effect that they proclaimed nothing that was said or written by human counsel cries out [against this error].³⁷ John 20:31: "These things are written, in order that you might believe," etc. Rom. 15:4: "Those things which were written before, were written for our instruction,³⁸ so that through the patience and consolation of the Scriptures we might have hope." 1 Cor. 10:11: "These things are written, for our admonition." 2 Tim. 3:16: "The entirety of Scripture³⁹ was inspired by God," etc. 2 Pet. 1:20–21: "So that you might know first of all, that no prophecy of Scripture is of personal explanation. For the prophets of old were not carried aloft by the desires of men, but holy men of God spoke as they were acted upon by the Holy Spirit." Finally, these precepts cry out [against their traditions], by which [precepts] we are sent to the written Word in matters of salvation. Is. 8:20: "To the law and to the testimony ..." John. 5:39: "Search the Scriptures."

V. Therefore, we do not acknowledge any other theological *principium* than the written Word of God.⁴⁰

VI. The divine origin and authorship of Sacred Scripture is, beyond all controversy, an accepted *principium* among all Christians.

VII. Therefore, the question, "Whether Scripture, or the

Holy Bible, is the Word of God? is unworthy of a Christian man.⁴¹

For, as in the schools⁴² there is no disputing with one who denies *principia*, so we ought to judge it unfitting for one who denies this *principium* of the Christian Religion to be heard.⁴³

VIII. The true question is this: "By what testimony is the divinity of Sacred Scripture made known to us?"⁴⁴ [This question] is asked among Christians for the purposes of instruction only, and not to seduce others or to cavil.

IX. But this testimony is twofold: principal and ministerial. The principal testimony is⁴⁵ the testimony of the Holy Spirit; externally, in Scripture itself, but internally in the hearts and minds of faithful men, being illuminated by Himself, speaking and persuading them of the divinity of the Scriptures.⁴⁶ But the testimony of the church is the ministerial testimony.

Outwardly, the Holy Spirit testifies in the Scriptures themselves concerning the divine origin and authority of the Word in phrases such as these: "The Word of the Lord," "Thus says Jehovah," "Jesus says," "The entirety of Scripture is divinely inspired." 2 Tim. 3:16. "Holy men spoke as they were acted upon by the Holy Spirit." But inwardly, He persuades the hearts of the faithful of the divinity of Scripture, insofar a man previously invokes Him in order that He might open his eyes in the reading of the Scriptures, and illumine his mind, in order to understand the wonders⁴⁷ of God and to acknowledge the voice of the Spirit of God sounding in the Scriptures.⁴⁸

36. One of the standard Reformed defenses of the divine origin and exclusive authority of Scripture against Roman Catholicism was William Whitaker, *Disputatio De Sacra Scriptura: Contra Hujus Temporis Papiſtas, Inprimis Robertum Bellarminum & Thomam Stapletonum, Sex Quæſtionibus Propoſita Et Tractata* (Herbornæ Nassoviorum: Ex officina Christophori Corvini, 1600). For an English translation, see William Whitaker, *A Disputation on Holy Scripture: Against the Papiſts, Eſpecially Bellarmine and Stapleton*, trans. William Fitzgerald (Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria, 2000).

37. Page 3 in the original text (see footnote 3).

38. Ad noſtram doctŕinam. Bible citations here are English translations of Wollebius's Latin text.

39. Tota Scriptura

40. Volume 2 of Muller's *PRRD* is dedicated exclusively to this theme. Its subtitle illustrates Wollebius' point: "Holy Scripture: The Cognitive Foundation of Theology." For a briefer treatment of this subject, see John V. Fesko, "The Doctrine of Scripture in Reformed Orthodoxy," in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. H. J. Selderhuis, vol. 40, Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 429–64.

41. Ross appears to transform this entire sentence into a question requiring an answer, rather than a statement that it is improper to ask the question at all (*Abridgment*, p. 5). This may be a typo in the text by misplacing the question mark.

42. Scholis.

43. The Reformed orthodox were willing to argue from reason to some extent regarding the existence and attributes of God, but they made the authority of Scripture rest upon divine testimony alone. This is why the Westminster Larger Catechism, for example, rests upon

the internal testimony of the Scriptures coupled with the internal witness of the Holy Spirit for proving that the Bible is the Word of God. Dewey Wallace demonstrates that Reformed authors began to shift away from this stance towards historical testimonies and natural theology with later High Orthodox figures, such as Richard Baxter, William Bates, and John Howe. Dewey D. Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660–1714: Variety, Persistence, and Transformation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), chapter 5. This methodological shift did not become widely accepted until the eighteenth century, in which Prolegomena shifted to apologetic concerns more than the nature of theology and the character of the theologian. Muller, *PRRD*, 1:132–133; and especially 306–307.

44. The question is not whether the Bible is the Word of God, but how we know that it is the Word of God. The divinity of Scripture is presupposed, but it must nevertheless be known. This question is rooted in faith. The prior question that Wollebius forbade was rooted in skepticism.

45. Page 4 in the original text (see footnote 3).

46. The Westminster Larger Catechism's summary of this question is almost identical to Wollebius's statement: "The Scriptures manifest themselves to be the Word of God, by their majesty and purity; by the consent of all the parts and scope of the whole, which is to give all glory to God; by their light and power to convince and convert sinners, to comfort and build up believers unto salvation: but the Spirit of God bearing witness by and with the Scriptures in the heart of man, is alone able fully to convince it that they are the Word of God" (Westminster Larger Catechism, 4).

47. Mirabilia

48. WCF 1.10: "The supreme judge by which all controversies are

The Papiſts urge the teſtimony of the church alone, which they make to be of ſuch a nature, that they contend that the authority of the entirety of Scripture hangs on the church. And they cry that it is for this reaſon only that we have the Word of God, on account of the teſtimony of the church. This is ſurely not only to make [the church] to teſtify concerning the divinity of Scripture, but to make herſelf to be divine. But we are firmly perſuaded by the teſtimony of the Holy Spirit alone concerning the divinity of Scripture, which we prove by theſe arguments: 1. He by whom the Scriptures were written down,⁴⁹ by his teſtimony the Scriptures are moſt firmly eſtabliſhed. For everyone knows his own handwriting⁵⁰ beſt and he beſt knows his own proper ſtyle. But the Scriptures were alſo written down by the inſpiration of the Holy Spirit. 2 Tim. 3:16; 2 Pet. 1:20–21. Therefore, etc.⁵¹ 2. He who is promiſed to the faithful in a near conjunction⁵² with the Scriptures, is the firmeſt teſtimony concerning the Scriptures. But the Holy Spirit is alſo promiſed to the faithful in ſuch a near conjunction with the Scriptures. Is. 59:21: “My Spirit who is in you, and my word which is in your mouth, ſhall not depart out of your mouth.” Therefore, etc. 3. The authority of Scripture is eſtabliſhed only by the teſtimony of Him without whoſe illumination no one ſees the wonders⁵³ of Scripture.⁵⁴ But without the illumination of the Holy Spirit, no one ſees the wonders of Scripture. Ps. 119:18: “Open my eyes, in order that I might ſee wonders⁵⁵ from your law.” Therefore, etc. 4. He whoſe office it is to lead us into all truth, his teſtimony alſo makes known the truth that Scripture is the Word of God. But the office of the Holy Spirit is, “to lead us into all truth.” John 16:13. Therefore, etc.

The⁵⁶ teſtimony of the church ſhould ſtill be held to, nevertheless, it ſhould be accepted only as that of a miniſter of

to be determined ... can be no other than the Holy Spirit ſpeaking in the Scripture.”

49. Exarate

50. Manus

51. Wollebius leaves the conclusions to his ſyllogiſm unexpressed, aſſuming that his readers knew their proper form. The major propoſition here is, “The author of Scripture is beſt able to teſtify to their origin.” The minor premiſe is, “The Holy Spirit is the author of Scripture.” In a valid ſyllogiſm, the conclusion to this argument muſt be, “The Holy Spirit is beſt able to teſtify to the origin of Scripture.” In this kind of argumentation, if the premiſes are true, and the ſyllogiſm is valid by having a proper form, then the conclusion muſt of neceſſity be true. I will leave theſe conclusions unexpressed in the remainder of the translation, juſt as they appear in the original text.

52. Individuo nexu

53. Mirabilia.

54. Page 5 in the original text (ſee footnote 3). A more literal translation would be, “He without whoſe illumination no one ſees the wonders of Scripture, by his teſtimony alone is the authority of Scripture eſtabliſhed.”

55. Mirabilia. Wollebius likely choſe this term throughout his

God. However, it is falſe that the authority of Scripture is made to ſtand and to depend upon [the teſtimony of the church]. For what is more abſurd than making the words of the Maſter⁵⁷ depend upon the ſervant, the letters of a parent upon a meſſenger,⁵⁸ the commands of a magiſtrate upon a typographer⁵⁹ in order to have his authority, and alſo for the rule to depend upon that which is regulated.⁶⁰ We know, “that to the church are committed the things ſpoken by God.” Rom. 3:2.⁶¹ And the ſame to be “the pillar and ſtability of the truth.” 1 Tim. 3:15. But as it is abſurdly⁶² ſaid that the candle has its light from the candelabra on which it ſtands, ſo likewiſe is the authority of Scripture ſtupidly⁶³ transferred to the church. The teſtimony of the church prevails with thoſe who are ſtill ignorant and who have not yet “received the ſincere milk of the Word, nor have grown up by it.” 1 Pet. 2:2.⁶⁴ But the teſtimony of Scripture and of the Holy Spirit is firm and efficacious to thoſe who themſelves have taſted the pleaſantneſs of the divine oracles. For juſt as he who has taſted honey itſelf knows far more certainly the ſweetneſs of honey than he who believes the ſpeech and teſtimony of another about it, ſo he who has himſelf taſted their pleaſantneſs knows much more certainly the Sacred writings to be the Word of God than he who believes only what the church has ſaid concerning theſe things. The Samaritans firſt believed the teſtimony of the woman concerning Chriſt, but when they had heard from Chriſt Himſelf, they ſaid to the woman, “We no longer believe on account of your words, for we have heard for ourſelves and we know this man to be the Savior of the world and the Chriſt.” John 4:42. So he who, reading and rereading the Scriptures, implores the help of the Holy Spirit,⁶⁵ ultimately ſays, “I now no longer believe the Sacred writings to be divine becauſe of the teſtimony of the church, but I have

treatment here becauſe of its uſe in the Latin translation of Scripture. He aſſumes here that the Holy Spirit is that perſon in the Godhead in particular who opens the eyes to underſtand Scripture. Later in the body of his work dealing with the Trinity, Wollebius makes the order of operations among the divine perſons clearer.

56. This paragraph break is not in the original text. I have added it for clarity, ſince Wollebius’s outlined points are now concluded and he returns to the other part of his original ſubject.

57. Patrifamilias.

58. Ross translates: “or the father’s letters to receive credit from the foot poſt” (*Abridgment*, p. 7). A *Tabellarius* was ſomeone who carried mail.

59. i.e., the printer.

60. Regulamque a regulato dpendere.

61. The original text miſtakenly reads 2:2. *Compendium Theologiae Chriſtianae*, 5.

62. Inepte. Ross has, “fooliſhly” (*Abridgment*, p. 7).

63. Stulte. Ross has “ridiculous” (*Abridgment*, p. 7).

64. Wollebius places this citation in italics to indicate that he was quoting the paſſage cited, but he modified the terms of the text to make it fit his ſentence grammatically.

65. Page 6 in the original text (ſee footnote 3).

read them myself and, reading [them], I have impressed this syllogism⁶⁶ on my mind:

[Major Premise:]⁶⁷ That Scripture: 1. introduces God Himself speaking all over the place, 2. by those men who were equipped with prophecy and miraculous divine gifts, and who were instructed extraordinarily, recording all things faithfully in it, including sin and offenses that needed to be mentioned, neither sparing themselves or others,⁶⁸ 3. [consisting of] things not only true and agreeing with right reason,⁶⁹ but also divine and transcending all reason,⁷⁰ 4. in a divine manner and in wonderful circumstances, by recording the same things through various writers,⁷¹ 5. to the glory of God alone and to our salvation, 6. with admirable efficacy in moving hearts and strengthening them against [facing] exquisite tortures, 7. and in its miraculous preservation it was delivered against demonic and tyrannical fury. That which consists of these things is without doubt divine in its origins and authority.

[Minor Premise:] But Sacred Scripture is such things.

[Conclusion:] Therefore, it is of divine origin and authority.

X. The canonical books of Scripture are of the Old and the New Testament. To the Old Testament belongs the Mosaic Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, which are single.⁷² Those of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles come in pairs.⁷³ Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, the four Major Prophets,⁷⁴ and the twelve Minor Prophets, are singular. The books of the New Testament are the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the epistles of Paul⁷⁵ (one

to the Romans, two to the Corinthians; one each to the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, and the Colossians; two each to the Thessalonians and to Timothy; one each to Titus, to Philemon, and to the Hebrews).⁷⁶ There are likewise two epistles of Peter, three of John, one each of James and Jude, and the Apocalypse.

XI. But the books of Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, third and fourth Ezra, first, second, and third Maccabees, Baruch,⁷⁷ the Prayer of Manasseh, the Epistle of Jeremiah, the additions to Daniel and Esther, even though they can be useful to read, they nevertheless do not have the same canonical authority for obtaining proof for articles of faith. Therefore, they are called Apocrypha, or hidden things.

The reasons for this assertion are: 1. Because they were not written by the prophets, but most of them were written after Malachi. 2. Because they were not written in the style of the prophets, nor were they written certainly in Hebrew.⁷⁸ 3. Because they are never cited in the New Testament. 4. Because in reading them we find many things in them that are contrary to those books that are canonical, in which occur *asusata*, fables, and things that are repugnant to faith and to piety.

XII. Holy Scripture is perfect⁷⁹ for salvation.

2 Tim. 3:16–17: “The entirety of the divine Scripture, is inspired and useful for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction,⁸⁰ which is in righteousness. In order that the man of God may be perfect,⁸¹ and perfectly⁸² instructed for every good work.”

66. A syllogism consists of a major term, minor term, and conclusion. The following seven points substantiate the major term or premise of Wollebius' argument.

67. This is to help readers identify the parts of the argument. It is not in the original text.

68. Turretin lists the fact that the authors of Scripture “do not conceal even their own faults” as a proof of the divine origin of Scripture. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, ed. James T Dennison, trans. George Musgrave Giger, 3 vols. (Phillipsburg, N.J.: P&R Publishing, 1992), 1.4.7 (1:63). References are to topic, question, and paragraph. Parenthetical references are to volume and page number of the translated text.

69. *Recti rationi*

70. Muller notes that Reformed authors stressed the fact that biblical truths could transcend reason without contradicting reason particularly in relation to Socinian denials of doctrines such as the Trinity and Christ's two natures. Muller, *PRRD*, 1:394–396. Turretin wrote, “For a thing to be contrary to reason is different from being above and beyond it; to be overthrown by reason and to be unknown to it. The mysteries of faith are indeed contrary to corrupt reason and are assailed by it, but they are only above and beyond right reason and are not taught by it.” Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, 1.8.18 (1:27). The Socinians were his primary target in this section.

71. Greek: *panarmonian*

72. *Singuli*. In other words, they are stand by themselves and they do not come in two parts as do the following books in the list.

73. *Bini*

74. Page 7 in the original text (see footnote 3). Contrary to the arrangement of the Jewish Hebrew canon of the Old Testament, Wollebius included Daniel with the major prophets instead of with the *ketuvim*, or writings. It is likely either an oversight that Lamentations does not fit into his numbering, or he may have included this book with Jeremiah. The Westminster Confession of Faith makes clear that the Reformed orthodox accepted this book.

75. The translator has added parentheses to make the sentence clearer.

76. For the Pauline authorship of Hebrews, see Owen, *Hebrews, Works*, 18:65–95.

77. Wollebius and Ross have, “Baruch I.” Cf. *Compendium Theologiae Christianae*, p. 7; *Abridgment*, p. 10.

78. *Hebraico nimirum*.

79. *Perfecta*. Ross captures the meaning only partially by translating the term as, “sufficient” (*Abridgment*, p. 10). In Reformed orthodoxy, the perfection of Scripture included both the completion of the canon of Scripture and its sufficiency for faith and practice. Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, 2.16, (1:134–143). I have translated the term as, “perfect,” in order to connect the verbal parallel in the Latin text to Wollebius' citation of 2 Timothy 3:17. This makes the translation slightly awkward, but it illustrates that by his choice of terms, Wollebius implied that he drew much of his theological vocabulary from Scripture itself.

80. *Institutionem*. This term can refer also to a manner of living or to one's disposition.

81. *Perfectus*

82. *Perfecte*

XIII. Therefore, even though the sanctions of the church for ordering external rites⁸³ are to be observed in their proper place, no tradition besides Scripture is to be admitted as necessary to salvation.⁸⁴

The Papiſts⁸⁵ do not only fight for Papal traditions, but they make them equal to and even prefer them before Holy Scripture. But we reſt in that command of God that does not permit anyone either to add to or to ſubtract from his Word. Deut. 4:2; 5:32; 12:32; Rev. 22:18.

XIV. It is incumbent upon all Chriſtians to ſearch⁸⁶ the Scriptures.

John 5:39: “Search the Scriptures.” Colossians 3:16: “Let the Word of Chriſt dwell in you richly.” Neither is the obſcurity of Scripture an obſtacle [to ſearching them], as the Papiſts pretend. For even though [Scripture] might be obſcure in ſome places, it explains itſelf in other places, and it gives to us the primary articles of religion⁸⁷ clearly.

XV. Therefore, it is neceſſary to translate the Scriptures into the common language of each nation.⁸⁸

XVI. However, no translation is authentic except inſo far as it agrees with the Hebrew and Greek ſources.⁸⁹

XVII. Even though the church is charged [by God] to interpret Scripture, nevertheless the ſupreme judge in its interpretation is no other than the Holy Spirit ſpeaking in it.⁹⁰

Isaiah 59:21: “My Spirit who is in you, and my Word which

is placed in your mouth, they will not depart from you.” 2 Peter 1:20–21: “If you know firſt that no prophecy is of one’s private interpretation, for prophecy is not of old time by the will of men, but holy men of God ſpoke as they were acted upon by the Holy Spirit.” Therefore, the Papiſts ſacrilegiously aſcribe to the Roman Church the ſupreme right of ſupreme judge in their councils, or alſo to the Pope alone.

XVIII.⁹¹ The ſenſe of each paſſage of Scripture is only one,⁹² nevertheless the prophecies of the Old Teſtament are often composed of hiſtory and type.⁹³

For example, in theſe words in Hoſea 11:1, “When Iſrael was a child I loved him, therefore out of Egypt I called my ſon,” the ſenſe is composite, for literally and hiſtorically [the words] concern the liberation of the people of Iſrael from Egypt, but typologically or myſtically we muſt underſtand the words as referring to the calling of Chriſt out of Egypt. Matt. 2:15.⁹⁴

XIX. The means through which the true ſenſe of Scripture ſhould be investigated are: praying frequently; the knowledge of languages; looking at the ſources; conſidering the argument and ſcope; diſtinguiſhing between proper and figurative ex- preſſions; [conſidering] through logical analysis the cauſes, circumſtances, antecedents, and conſequents; comparing ob- ſcure paſſages with clearer ones, like paſſages with like ones, and diſſimilar paſſages with diſſimilar ones; and, laſtly, by the analogy of faith.⁹⁵

83. Page 8 in the original text (see footnote 3).

84. While Wollebius’ ſtatement may, at firſt glance, ſeem obſcure, he is likely making the ſame point as Weſtmiſter Confession of Faith 1.6: “The whole counſel of God concerning all things neceſſary for His own glory, man’s ſalvation, faith and life, is either expreſſly ſet down in Scripture, or by good and neceſſary conſequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men. Nevertheless, we acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be neceſſary for the ſaving underſtanding of ſuch things as are revealed in the Word and that there are ſome circumſtances concerning the worſhip of God, and government of the Church, common to human actions and ſocieties, which are to be ordered by the light of nature, and Chriſtian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word, which are always to be obſerved.” Wollebius’ ſtatements follow the ſame order, though in leſs detail. In paragraph XII, he ſtated the perfection of Scripture to ſalvation. In paragraph XIII., he alludes to thoſe “circumſtances” that are neceſſary for the right ordering of worſhip and government. He did not believe that the church had the authority to invent its own ordinances. “Circumſtances” could include the time of day the church met on the Lord’s Day or the place in which they met. For an analysis of primary ſource material on circumſtances, ſee McGraw, *A Heavenly Directory*, 102–104.

85. Pontificii. Ross translates, “Romaniſts” (*Abridgment*, p. 11). Moſt English works from this period uſed “Papiſts,” which is why the translated has choſen this term in the translation.

86. *Scrutatio*.

87. *Primarios Religionis articulos*. This is functionally equivalent to the well-eſtablished phrase, “fundamental articles.” See Muller, *PRRD*, 1:406–429.

88. *Cuique genti*. Ross omits this phrase from his translation (*Abridgment*, p. 11).

89. *Fontibus*. This reflects the Renaissance *ad fontes* emphasis.

90. This ſtatement is almoſt identical to WCF 1.10: “The ſupreme judge by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private ſpirits, are to be examined, and in whoſe ſentence we are to reſt, can be no other but the Holy Spirit ſpeaking in the Scripture.”

91. Page 9 in the original text (see footnote 3).

92. Cf. WCF 1.9.

93. *Hiſtoria et typo*. Ross intereſtingly but inaccurately translates this as “hiſtory and myſtery” (*Abridgment*, p. 12). Wollebius diſtinguiſhes typological and myſtical later in the ſame paragraph, though with roughly the ſame meaning.

94. The Medieval church accepted a fourfold ſenſe of Scripture known as the *quadriga*. [explain] The Reformed modified the *quadriga*, transforming the four ſenſes of Scripture into various uſes or applications of the ſingle ſenſe of Scripture. For fuller treatments of this topic, ſee Richard A. Muller and Rowland S. Ward, *Scripture and Worſhip: Biblical Interpretation and the Directory for Public Worſhip* (Phillipsburg, N.J.: P & R Publishing, 2007); Ryan M. McGraw, *By Good and Neceſſary Conſequence* (Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012).

95. *Fidei Analogia*. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*, 33: “The uſe of a general ſenſe of the meaning of Scripture, conſtructed from the clear or unambiguous *loci* ... as the baſis for interpreting unclear or ambiguous texts. As diſtinct from the more baſic *analogia Scripturae*, the *analogia fidei* preſuppoſes a ſenſe of the theological meaning of Scripture.” Even good ſcholars have at times conflated theſe two terms. E.g., Mark Jones, *Why Heaven Kissed*

XX. As God is the nearest and primary object [of theology], so he is the primary and highest end of theology.

XXI. Since, therefore, the highest end and the highest good are the same thing, it is clear that Christian theology alone can teach us rightly concerning the highest good.⁹⁶

XXII. The subordinate end of Sacred Theology is our salvation, which consists in communion⁹⁷ with and fruition of God.⁹⁸

There are two parts of theology: The first part concerns the knowledge of God.⁹⁹ The second part consists in the manner in which he should be worshiped.¹⁰⁰ The first part concerns faith, or the things that should be believed.¹⁰¹ The latter part consists of works, or the things that should be done.¹⁰² ■

Earth: The Christology of the Puritan Reformed Orthodox Theologian, Thomas Goodwin (1600–1680), vol. 13, *Reformed Historical Theology* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 88.

96. Cf. Westminster Shorter Catechism questions one and two.

97. Communion. Ross has, “union” (*Abridgment*, p. 13). However, WLC 65 is careful in distinguishing union and communion. Union is the ground of communion and communion is the goal of union.

98. “Now communion is the mutual communication of such good things as wherein the persons holding that communion are delighted, bottomed upon some union between them.... Our communion, then, with God consisteth in his *communication of himself unto us, with our returnal unto him*, of that which he requireth and

accepteth, flowing from that *union* which in Jesus Christ we have with him.” Owen, *Communion with God, Works*, 2:8–9. Emphasis is in the original text.

99. Page 10 in the original text (see footnote 3).

100. Compare to Calvin’s *Necessity of Reforming the Church*. Worship includes public worship preeminently, but it is here functionally equivalent to personal holiness. The Westminster Catechisms follow this general division, though the Confession of Faith does not. See Brill’s *Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy* for the structure of dogmatic works during this time period.

101. Greek: *ta piſta*

102. Greek: *ta praktá*