The Journal of Northwest Theological Seminary

Volume 22, Number 3 December 2007

"vita vestra abscondita est cum Christo in Deo"—Col. 3:3

KERUX: THE JOURNAL
OF
NORTHWEST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KERUX is a publication of Northwest Theological Seminary and appears three times each year (May, September, December). Editorial offices are located at 17711 Spruce Way, Lynnwood, WA 98037-7431. Correspondence should be directed to the editor at this address. Subscription rates for one year are: $20.00 (U.S. and Canada); $25.00 (Elsewhere). All remittances should be made payable in U. S. Funds. **KERUX** is: abstracted in **New Testament Abstracts**, Cambridge, MA, **Old Testament Abstracts,** Washingon, DC and **Religious and Theological Abstracts**, Myerstown, PA; indexed in **ATLA Religion Database,** Chicago, IL and the **Elenchus of Biblica**, Rome, Italy.

Visit our Website: kerux.com

ISSN 0888-8513 **December 2007** **Vol. 22, No. 3**

Introduction

This issue of *Kerux* contains material from scholars working on primary documents. Dr. Frank Gumerlock has submitted his English translation of the Gottschalk corpus to a major university publishing house and has been encouraged by a positive preliminary response. Together with his scholarly colleague, Viktor Genke of Nizhni Novgorod, Russia, he is preparing a critical edition of Gottschalk's writings with a full historical introduction. This will be a first for surviving Gottschalk opera in English. Richard Bishop is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Virginia, Charlotte. His translation of Andrew Duncan's *Rudimenta* is also a first in English. The importance of Duncan's little work is spelled out in the introduction to Rich's translation.

We are sharing these works with our readers not only to educate and inform you; we are also sharing them as an emblem of the commitment of Northwest Theological Seminary to education based on primary documents. The curricular emphasis of this institution is upon original documents (in English translation). Education is thus not propaganda or the pedantic spinning of theories from agenda oriented dilettantes; education is learning from original works in order to grapple with the work of the Creator, Redeemer and Consummator of his people. In fact, that is what all the great theologians of the Patristic, Medieval, Reformation and Modern era have done—they have read, learned, meditated, and critically reflected on primary documents.

We live in a day of deconstructed and hair-brained Christian theology—even in Reformed circles. The solution to this malaise of ignorance is learning—learning from primary documents. And supremely do we seek to educate and learn from the inspired primary document—the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. So it is that we delight in loving the Triune God—Father, Son, Holy Spirit—with all our mind (so that our hearts and lives may be conformed to the mind and heart of Christ Jesus, our Savior).

[*K:NWTS* 22/3 (Dec 2007) 4-11]

Micah's Bethlehem and Matthew's

Micah 5:2-5

James T. Dennison, Jr.

It was a wee village, nestled in the mountains of Judah, elevated 2500 feet above the Mediterranean Sea. Its terraced orchards of figs, stair-step vineyards and groves dotted with olive and almond trees decorated the slopes just below the small cluster of homes astride the town hilltop. Caravans to and from Egypt passed by on the major trade route just outside the tiny hamlet. But commerce didn't pause in her shops, nor swell her mercantile—these international caravansaries were bound for Jerusalem, five miles to the north. Rachel—Jacob's beloved wife!—Rachel's tomb was here, a few miles east of town. Ruth and Boaz met here in the gleaning fields just beyond the village. And David—yes, King David had been born here; had tended his father's sheep here; had left here for a palace in Jerusalem. And in 586 B.C., at the destruction of the city-capital of David's and Judah's monarchy, this wee town—this tiny hamlet lay desolate—desolate until the return from the Babylonian captivity. Ezra said only 123 returned (2:21)—only 123 came back: a tiny remnant of a tiny, insignificant town—quiet, sleepy inconsequential little town of Bethlehem.

"But as for you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, too little to be among the clans of Judah, From you one will go forth for me to be ruler in Israel. His goings forth are from long ago, from the days of eternity." Therefore, he will give them up until the time when she who is in labor has borne a child. Then the remainder of his brethren will return to the sons of Israel. And he will arise and shepherd his flock in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord

his God. And they will remain, because at that time he will be great to the ends of the earth. And this one will be our peace.

We are reading a text from the 8th century B.C.—from the period 800-700 B.C. Micah, the prophet, is eye-witness to the social, political and military turmoil of this turbulent century. As he mentions in chapter 1:1, his commission occurs during the reigns of King Jotham, King Ahaz and King Hezekiah. And in that century, Micah joins his eyes and voice to the prophetic testimony of his contemporaries: Isaiah, Hosea, Amos. These four horsemen of the 8th century B.C. proclaim the Word of the Lord to Israel-Judah. The 8th century B.C. and the resurgence of Assyria—the resurgence of the mighty Neo-Assyria Empire galvanizes the eye of each inspired prophet, energizes the words of each God-breathed seer. Isaiah's Emmanuel Christmas-child with the Assyrian wolf at the gate (11:6). Hosea's wilderness honeymoon reprised after the spiritual harlotry of Baal-idolized, Assyria-decimated Samaria (722/21 B.C.) (10:5-7). Amos's fallen booth of David, resurrected after the Assyrian brings the great and terrible day of the Lord (5:18-20). And Micah? Micah foresees the Assyrian horde blitzing the land, trampling the citadels, ravaging the flock like a lion (5:8). The inexorable Assyrian march of Tiglath-Pileser III, of Shalmaneser V, of Sargon II, of Sennacherib and the 8th century B.C. Iraqi terrorists.

Micah as Isaiah as Hosea as Amos sees; he/they prophesy; Assyria comes to lay waste the cities of Israel and Judah—to level, burn, destroy Samaria in 722/21 B.C.—to besiege, to terrify, to shut up Hezekiah in Jerusalem in 701 B.C. What is insignificant Bethlehem against such an onslaught? Of what use is this inconsequential little village—once upon a time birth place of Israel's king, now superseded by Jerusalem with Samaria smoldering from Assyrian torches and Jerusalem herself surrounded by Assyrian muscle? What is Bethlehem Ephratah among the clans of Judah—among the sons of Israel?

The triviality of Bethlehem at the height of Assyrian hegemony—at the zenith of Assyrian imperialism—the irrelevance of Bethlehem in that time is the dramatic context out of which Micah pours forth the words of our text. Bethlehem—little Bethlehem!—against Assyria—against the decimators of Samaria—against the siege towers before the walls of Jerusalem. O little town of Bethlehem—what of you?

Bethlehem Ephrathah
Little among the clans of Judah

One goes forth from you, Ruler in Israel
Whose going forth originates in eternity.

Whose time will be as the birth of a child;
Return remnant, sons and daughters of Israel.

Whose up-rising as Shepherd is in the strength of the Lord
Whose up-rising as Shepherd is in the majestic name of the Lord our God.

Return for this Great One
Great to the ends of the earth

He will be our Shalom
He will be our Peace.

These words of Micah 5 are literally poetic; they are prophetic poetry. And these poetic lines are like all Hebrew poetic lines—they are parallel expressions—in this case, parallel expressions centered about two words: the word ruler (v. 2) and the word peace (v. 5). And what is even more remarkable about the central parallel between these two words—ruler and peace—is the parallel between the Hebrew consonants which make up each of the two Hebrew words: *moshel* (ruler), *shalom* (peace). The very same four Hebrew consonants appear in both words—the same four Hebrew consonants (*mem*, *shin*, *vav*, *lamed*), to underscore the parallel—this ruler is peace. What *is* this ruler! and what *is more*, he is peace!!

Poetic Symmetry

I want to exploit this matter of parallelism or symmetry in Hebrew poetry just a bit longer. Let's go back over our text once more.

You, Bethlehem Ephrathah

And what is more—you are little among the clans of Judah.

(Notice the relation between the first and second line is one of symmetry via expanded parallelism.)

From you, a forth-comer who will be ruler in Israel

And what is more—his forth coming is from all eternity.

(Again, notice the expanded parallelism.)

His time will break like a woman with child in labor

And what is more—his remnant sons will return/will be (re)born.

(Expanded parallelism.)

His Shepherd role is in the Lord's strength

And what is more—His Shepherd rise is in our Lord God's majestic name.

And what is even yet more—His remnant flock will be due to his greatness—a greatness

which extends to the ends of the earth.

(Threefold expanded parallelism.)

Shalom is this One	Peace is this One
And what is more—Moshel is this One	Ruler is this One.

The lines of Micah's prophecy must be read in context (the 8th century B.C. Assyrian crisis); the lines of Micah's prophecy must be read in parallel—one line augmented by the line which follows so as to give a rich, full portrait of this coming Ruler who is called Shalom.

Micah gives us a prophetic, poetic portrait—a narrative portrait of this Great One who emerges from the least one. Note the contrast between v. 2 ("little/least") and v. 4 ("he will be great"). Bernard of Clairvaux caught it: "O Bethlehem, thou art little, but now made great by the Lord; He hath made thee great who being Great was in thee made little."

The reverse fortune in Bethlehem's destiny is not due to any inherent exaltation in her. No! the reverse fortune for little Bethlehem is in the Great One who arises from her. Insignificant Bethlehem becomes significant Bethlehem because of eternal, majestic, glorious greatness extant in this One who comes forth from her.

Who is the Forth-Comer?

And who is this Great One? He is child of Bethlehem; he is son of Judah; he is Ruler over Israel; he is Shepherd; he is strength and the nominal majesty of the Lord; he is Peace; he is from the days of eternity.

Does not the prophetic, poetic portrait—this prophetic, poetic narrative recapitulate another narrative portrait? Did not the story of King David begin in Bethlehem? Did not the history of David the king begin among the clans of Judah? Did not King David become ruler over Israel? Did not David shepherd his father's flocks? Did not King David go forth in the strength of the Lord? Did not King David beget a son; and was not that child's name (in Hebrew) *Shelomo*—the man of peace (Solomon)?

But you will observe one line here in Micah's portrait does not recapitulate David or Solomon. That line is v. 2—his going forth is from eternity. The

subject of Micah's portrait possesses a biographical trait that neither David nor any mere descendant of David can match. This One is an eternal person—an eternal Ruler—an eternal Shepherd, eternally Great. He is eternal Peace.

The Eschatological David

Micah's poetic, prophetic portrait projects a new David—a second David—yet a David who exceeds the first David as eternity exceeds time; yea, as God exceeds man. Micah's portrait is of an eschatological David—an everlasting David, of whom the historical David is but a faint representation.

This David—this eschatological David—this David, as it were, from heaven will prevail where the David of history failed. He will raise up the fallen booth of David because he will be great David's greater resurrection-Son (Am. 9:11). He will be the Christmas child of Isaiah—Emmanuel, yea, God with us, for he is God—God in the flesh (Is. 7:14). He will marry a Bride to himself and carry her through the land in between to a heavenly wedding supper—for he is the heavenly Bridegroom (Hos. 2:14, 19-20).

This One of Amos and Isaiah and Hosea—this One of Micah 5:2-5—this One is the beginning of your story—your Christmas story, your resurrection-story, your kingdom-story under his rule, his strength, his majesty, his *Shalom*. For your story was joined to the prophetic story on that night in Bethlehem when that little town became the city of God—God the Son; on that night when the tribe of Judah was raised up to be revealed as the genealogy of the Son of God; on that night when a different shepherd was cradled in a manger; on that night when the strong and majestic name of the Lord was trumpeted, was hymned, was caroled in Glorias; on the night when the "prince of Peace his reign of peace upon the earth began" (Milton).

Matthew 2:1-6

And now, we read Micah's text in the light of the rest of the story.

Now after Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod the king, behold, magi from the east arrived in Jerusalem, saying, "Where is he

who has been born King of the Jews? For we saw his star in the east, and have come to worship him." And when Herod the king heard it, he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him. And gathering together all the chief priests and scribes of the people, he began to inquire of them where the Christ was to be born. And they said to him, "In Bethlehem of Judea, for so it has been written by the prophet, 'And you, Bethlehem, land of Judah, Are by no means least among the leaders of Judah; For out of you shall come forth a ruler, Who will shepherd my people Israel.'"

This child—this babe—is the full portrait of Micah's prophetic narrative. Micah's eschatological David is your eschatological David—Jesus Christ, your Lord and Savior. But Matthew's portrait contains a narrative not related in Micah's prophetic poetry. Matthew's portrait does not include King Herod or the chief priests and scribes. They remain outside the narrative—only on-lookers—curious about the texts—even diligent students of the texts, but haters of the text. They do not put themselves in the portrait—in the prophecy—in the poetry—in the fulfillment of the prophetic poetry. They stand apart—though they read the Scriptures—though they study the Scriptures—though they have memorized the Scriptures and can turn to chapter and verse. They are not part of the Scriptures—do not participate—do not identify—are not united with Micah's portrait and Christ Jesus' biography. They will not, no they will not make Christ's story their story, though they carry their Bibles and worship each Sabbath day and observe all the rituals of the faith: they will not join themselves to the story.

Their story—the story about them—that is the great story, the important story, the only story. And so, in their hypocrisy, in their hard-heartedness, in their deceit and duplicity, in their fake religious façade, they will perish outside of the story. For they will not—no, they will not have this Shepherd-King to rule their stubborn hearts; no, they will not have this Prince of Peace to pacify their turbulent, arrogant, angry hearts; no, they will not have this Son of David who is eternal Son of eternal God to be theirs, for then, he would be more important than they; he would have to take first place in their minds, their hearts, their lives. And they will not, no, they will not have any other god save themselves—save their own almighty selves. Their story is all about themselves; they will rather put him to death together with his story.

And so, the end of their story *is* death—death with King Herod and the scribes, whose next generation, King Herod Antipas and the scribes did just that. They crucified Micah's Shepherd, Ruler, Peace, Eternal One. They put to death Matthew's Shepherd, Ruler, Emmanuel, Son of God. They cut themselves off from Micah's story, from Matthew's story, from Jesus' story, from God's story.

But the Shepherd, though slain, was raised from the dead. And he shall feed his flock like a shepherd. And he shall gather the lambs with his arms and carry them in his bosom.

And the Ruler who was crucified in shame was raised to receive power and riches and wisdom and might and honor and glory and blessing. Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto him!

But the Prince of Peace whose blood was shed is that peace that passes all understanding. Peace I leave with you; my peace, I give unto you.

From little Bethlehem came forth the Eternal One, Son of God, Savior of sinners, King of kings, Lord of lords, Hallelujah, Amen!

You who love him, more than your own life—he is your story. Your Shepherd, your Ruler, your Eternal One, your *Shalom*, your Lord and your God.

[*K:NWTS* 22/3 (Dec 2007) 12-15]

O Remember Adam's Fall

Remember, O thou man,
O thou man, O thou man,
Remember O thou man,
Thy time is spent.

Remember, O thou man,
How thou cams't to me then,
And I did what I can,
Therefore repent.

Remember Adam's fall,
O thou man, O thou man!
Remember Adam's fall
From heaven to hell!

Remember Adam's fall,
How we were condemned all
To hell perpetual,
There for to dwell.

---

[1] I became familiar with this poem from its use in the BBC film *Under the Greenwood Tree* (2005). This excellent film is based on a pleasant (rare indeed!) Thomas Hardy novel of the same title.

Remember God's goodness,
O thou man, O thou man!
Remember God's goodness,
And promise made!

Remember God's goodness,
How His only Son He sent
Our sins for to redress,
Be not afraid.

The angels all did sing,
O thou man, O thou man!
The angel all did sing,
On Sion hill

The angels all did sing,
Praises to our glorious King,
And peace to man living,
With a good will!

The Shepherds amazed was,
O thou man, O thou man!
The Shepherds amazed was,
To hear the angels sing.

The Shepherds amazed was
How it should come to pass
That Christ our Messias
Should be our King!

To Bethlehem did they go,
O thou man, O thou man!
The shepherds three;
O thou man, O thou man!

To Bethlehem did they go,
To see whether it were so,
Whether Christ were borne or no
To set man free.

As the Angels before did say,
O thou man, O thou man!
As the Angels before did say,
So it came to pass;

As the Angels before did say,
They found him wrapt in hay
In a manger, where he lay
So poor he was.

In Bethlehem he was born,
O thou man, O thou man!
In Bethlehem he was born,
For mankind's sake;

In Bethlehem he was born,
For us that were forlorn,
And therefore took no scorn
Our sins to bear.

In a manger laid he was,
O thou Man, O thou Man,
In a manger laid he was
At this time present.

In a manger laid he was,
Between an ox and an ass,
And all for our trespass,
Therefore repent.

Give thanks to God always,
O thou man, O thou man!
Give thanks to God always,
With heart most joyfully

Give thanks to God always,
Upon this blessed day,
Let all men sing and say:
‘Holy, holy!’

[*K:NWTS* 22/3 (Dec 2007) 16]

In Marosszentimre Church[1]

Jékely Zoltán (1913-1982)

Translated by Bernard S. Adams

As crumbling plaster falls upon our heads,
Thus we the praises of dear Zion sing:
Beneath the pews mice scurry from their nests,
An ancient company of owls take wing.
We in the congregation number ten,
Eleven if we reckon in the priest,
But when we sing, we sound a hundred men.
Down pour the plaster and the dust;
The bats are startled in their attic roost;
Worm-eaten rafters weakened even more.
Eleventh is our solitary priest,
The twelfth among us is the Lord himself.
And so we sing, the few that still remain
—The Lord exacts a price from him that loves—
And those whom wicked time from us has ta'en
Join in our psalmody beneath the floor.

---

[1] Marosszentimre is in modern Rumania (Transylvania) near Gyulafehérvár (modern Alba Iulia). The church is an old Protestant structure. Bernard S. Adams lives in Hungary.

[*K:NWTS* 22/3 (Dec 2007) 17-34]

Gottschalk of Orbais: A Medieval Predestinarian[1]

By Francis X. Gumerlock

Seven hundred years before Calvin wrote his *Institutes,* a medieval monk from Saxony named Gottschalk articulated and defended the doctrine of salvation through the sovereign grace of God. This article will introduce the person of Gottschalk and present his views on the bondage of the human will, the gracious enablement of God necessary for a person to perform salutary acts, predestination and election, and Christ's atonement. Gottschalk's positions on these subjects will be illustrated from his own writings, most of which were discovered and edited in the twentieth century[2] and recently translated by Victor Genke, an accomplished linguist and historian who resides in Russia, and myself.[3] The article will then discuss the opposition against him, compare

---

[1] An earlier version of this article was presented and distributed in booklet form under the title "Predestination Before Calvin: A Ninth-Century Monk and His Doctrine of Grace" at the May 2007 Kerux conference in Lynnwood, Washington.

[2] Many of them were discovered by Germain Morin around 1930, and fifteen years later edited in Cyrille Lambot, *Oeuvres théologiques et grammaticales de Godescalc d'Orbais* (Louvain: "Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense" Bureaux, 1945) [hereafter referred to as "Lambot"].

[3] Victor Genke and Francis X. Gumerlock, *Gottschalk of Orbais: Translated Texts from a Medieval Predestination Controversy*. It includes English translations of Gottschalk's *Reply to Rabanus Maurus, Confession of Faith at Mainz, Tome to Gislemar, Shorter Confession, Longer Confession, Answers to Various Questions, On Predestination, On Different Ways of Speaking About Redemption,* and *Another Treatise on Predestination.* We are in the process of revising it for publication. Hereafter this book will be referred to as "Genke and Gumerlock" with pagination from our July 2007 manuscript of 366 pages. All translations in this article are mine unless otherwise noted.

and contrast Gottschalk with the early Reformers, and briefly answer questions which participants raised about Gottschalk at the 2007 *Kerux* conference hosted by Northwest Theological Seminary. It will conclude with an exhortation for prospective researchers and translators to continue working on Gottschalk and the ninth-century predestination controversy.

Gottshalk's Life

Gottschalk was born about the year 804 in Saxony, which is in present-day Germany. His parents gave him over to a monastery at Fulda when he was very young, to be educated and trained for a religious profession. After reaching the age of majority he applied for formal withdrawal from monastic life saying that such a life should be one's own decision not that of one's parents. Having been released from the monastery about 829 Gottschalk began traveling around France and Italy, staying a few years in this place and a few years in that. One of the monasteries at which Gottschalk studied was Orbais in the diocese of Soissons, hence the name Gottschalk of Orbais. For a time, he also stayed at the monastery at Corbie, and undoubtedly benefited from its great library. There is evidence that Gottschalk was involved in missionary work in what is today Croatia; still standing there today is a little chapel which is thought to have been built under his ministry.

As a scholar, Gottschalk was adept in many areas. We have poems written by him, several treatises on grammar, and theological writings on the Trinity and the Eucharist. According to the description in a letter from Hincmar, archbishop of Reims, to Pope Nicholas, Gottschalk possessed a great memory. From memory, he could recite passages from the church fathers throughout a whole day without any break. Hincmar implied in that same letter, that as a teacher Gottschalk was a master with words and quite convincing to his hearers.[4]

Gottschalk's preaching included a strong emphasis on the sovereignty of God in salvation. He also wrote several treatises on predestination, and sent

---

[4] Hincmar of Reims, *Letter to Pope Nicholas*. Patrologia Latina (hereafter PL) 126:45-6; Genke and Gumerlock, 294-5.

them to his friends in different parts of Europe. One particular bishop, Rabanus Maurus of Mainz, who has Gottschalk's former teacher at the monastery in Fulda, opposed Gottschalk's teachings which, he said, were influencing the faithful in his diocese in a negative manner.

In the 840s, Gottschalk stayed as a guest on the estate of a certain count[5] in northern Italy, using it as a headquarters for his ministry. The count was essentially his patron. In 846, Rabanus Maurus wrote a letter to the count saying in effect, "How can you support this man, Gottschalk, who is teaching this horrible doctrine of predestination?" Gottschalk may have been on a missionary trip when the count received the letter. Upon finding out about the letter, he decided to make a trip back to the northern regions to confront his former teacher about the matter.

In 848, there was an ecclesiastical council in the city of Mainz attended by many heads of both church and state, including Rabanus, who by this time had been elevated to bishop. This was an important council, and even the king, Louis the German, was present. At this council, Gottschalk and some of his followers presented a treatise and a confession of faith stating their views. The council declared them heretical, but Gottschalk refused to recant. For this he was flogged, and had to swear that he would not come into the kingdom of Louis ever again spreading his doctrine. From there Rabanus sent Gottschalk under custody to a bishop in another diocese, Hincmar of Reims, who technically was Gottschalk's ecclesiastical superior.

Hincmar examined Gottschalk's teaching in a synod of about fifteen bishops and he, too, found Gottschalk heretical. According to the Benedictine rule regarding incorrigible monks, Hincmar had Gottschalk flogged. In addition, he was compelled to throw the books that he wrote into the fire, and was imprisoned in the monastery at Hautvillers, where he remained for the next twenty years until his death.

The Predestination Controversy

In the monastery where he was under house arrest, Gottschalk managed

---

[5] Count Eberhard of Frioli.

to obtain writing material, compose treatises, and have them delivered to their recipients and circulated. Consequently, from prison Gottschalk started no small controversy on predestination within the Frankish empire. The debate centered around three topics or questions: predestination, free will, and redemption by the blood of Christ. Interestingly, some of the leading theologians of the time, particularly those in Corbie, Lyons, and Ferrière, said that Gottschalk was right in his theology on these points. Archbishop Hincmar mustered a few theologians for his side, who debated the predestinarians throughout the 850s. In several regional synods the opposing theologians condemned each others' doctrine, until finally they came to a compromise about 860.

Many of the standard church histories have a chapter summarizing the persons and issues involved in this ninth-century controversy on predestination. Unfortunately, most of the primary source material from the debate— the treatises on predestination and decrees of the synods— are still exclusively in Latin. This, Lord willing, I hope to rectify. About fifteen years ago, I translated Gottschalk's *Shorter Confession* and fragments from another work.[6] In 2003, a former classmate at Saint Louis University[7] informed me of a website dedicated to Gottschalk, constructed by Victor Genke, who was in the process of translating some of Gottschalk's works.[8] I contacted Victor and shortly thereafter we began to collaborate in our translating. Over the past four years, we have translated 21 treatises, nine written by Gottschalk himself and the remaining by others associated with the controversy. Victor wrote an extensive introduction; I compiled a bibliography; and we are in the process of revising our manuscript for an academic press that is very interested in publishing it.

Bondage of the Will and Freedom through Grace

In his *Answer to Various Questions*, Gottschalk discusses free will, teaching that humans do not have the freedom to do good apart from God. He writes,

---

[6] I translated these in an independent study in Medieval Latin at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs with Professor Kendra (Ettenhoffer) Henry.

[7] Jonathan Barlow of Saint Louis, Missouri.

[8] <http://gottschalk.inrebus.com/>

> If anyone says that the reprobate have the free will to do good or even can have it, the Son of God, clearer than light and more brightly than the sun itself, convicts such one of error, when He says concerning the Holy Spirit: *Whom the world cannot receive* (Jn 14:17). Consequently, holy Augustine rightly says concerning the will of the reprobate: *O bad will without God!* Therefore it is clear without a scruple, is evident without ambiguity, is manifest without a cloud that just as the reprobate do not have [freedom] to do good, but [only] evil, so also they certainly do not have it to say the truth but [only] to lie.[9]

A little later in that same treatise, Gottschalk recommends that on the subject of free will, one should read

> *On the Psalms* by Cassiodorus, where he says on the verse: *It is good to hope in the Lord* (Ps 117:9; Vulg., 118:9): *The profit [obtained by] mortals is never explained through free will*, and the book by Prosper against the conference of Cassian which is entitled *On God's Protection*, and his *Answers* to the Gauls, Genoans, and Vincentians, and his epistle, which is entitled *To Rufinus*, and the last part of *Moralia* by holy Gregory, as well as the first part of his *Commentary on Ezekiel*, and you will praise the omnipotent God. It should be clearly known that, as holy Augustine says, as much capability of seeing that a healthy eye has in a body [is comparable to] the amount of capability and possibility for doing good that free will, liberated through God's grace, has in a soul, mind or heart. Nevertheless, just as even a very healthy eye, being put in darkness, without the assistance of light from without cannot discern anything, so also undoubtedly without God's grace and help, the free will cannot do anything good.[10]

---

[9] Lambot, 150-1; Genke and Gumerlock, 162. Translation by Genke.

[10] Lambot, 152-3; Genke and Gumerlock, 165. Translation by Genke.

Again, in his *Longer Confession*, written in the form of a prayer to God, Gottschalk writes, "For, truly no one, not any one of your elect, have ever been able to please you from themselves even for a moment, but rather all of your people have pleased, do please, and will please you always from you, through your free grace."[11]

From the above citations, it is clear that this medieval monk believed that humans were unable to come to God of their own free will without God's grace first freeing and turning their wills toward Him.

Predestination and Election

In his *Reply to Rabanus Maurus*, Gottschalk put forth his doctrine of predestination in this manner:

> Indeed, just as He [God] predestined all of the elect to life through the gratuity of the free grace of His kindness, as the pages of the Old and New Testaments very clearly, skillfully, and soberly show those seeking wisdom on this matter, so also He altogether predestined the reprobate to the punishment of eternal death, of course, through the most righteous judgment of His immutable justice.[12]

Likewise, at the beginning of his *Longer Confession*, he wrote:

> I believe and also confess that you [God] foreknew before the ages whatsoever was going to happen, whether good things or bad things; but you predestined only good things. However, [with this question] having been investigated by your faithful ones, you have revealed this to them—that the good things have been predestined in a twofold manner. It is evident that they are known to consist in both benefits of grace and likewise judgments of justice. On behalf of both,

---

[11] Lambot, 76; Genke and Gumerlock, 152.

[12] Fragment preserved in Hincmar's *De praedestinatione*, 5. PL 121:365; Lambot, 39; Genke and Gumerlock, 107.

> the psalmist offers the surest proof: *You, Lord, love both mercy and judgment* (Ps 32:5). And so you have freely predestined eternal life for all of your elect, and also them unto everlasting glory. For, certainly you predestined life for them in vain if you had not also predestined them to that life. So also in nearly the same way, you deservedly predestined everlasting punishment *for the devil and his angels* (Matt 25:41) and also for all reprobate persons, and similarly you predestined those same for it.[13]

Particular Redemption

1 Timothy 2:4, which says that God *wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth*, for a long time has troubled those who profess divine election. Although interpretations of predestinarian-minded Christians vary,[14] some view "all" as synecdoche, a mode of speaking in which a whole is used for a part. This is the way Gottschalk interpreted the passage, i.e., "all" means all of the redeemed. He wrote in his *Reply to Rabanus Maurus*, "*All* those whom God *wills to be saved* (1 Tim 2:4) without doubt are saved. They cannot be saved unless God wills them to be saved; and there is no one whom God wills to be saved, who will not be saved, since our God *did all things whatsoever He willed* (Ps 135:6).[15]

---

[13] Lambot, 55-6; Genke and Gumerlock, 119.

[14] About five different interpretations of the passage can be found in Augustine's writings alone. Common to most of them is avoidance of interpretation that makes salvation dependent upon human free will. For two recent interpretations from a Calvinist perspective, see Abraham Kuyper, "What Does I Timothy 2:4 Teach?" chapter four of his *Particular Grace: A Defense of God's Sovereignty in Salvation.* Translated from Dutch by Marvin Kamps (Grandville, Michigan: Reformed Free Publishing Association, 2001), 34-42; and John Piper, "Are There Two Wills in God? Divine Election and God's Desire for All to Be Saved," chapter five in Thomas R. Schreiner and Bruce A. Ware, eds., *Still Sovereign: Contemporary Perspectives on Election, Foreknowledge, and Grace* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2000), 107-31.

[15] Preserved in Hincmar's *De praedestinatione*, 21; PL 121:366; Lambot, 40; Genke and Gumerlock. 108.

For Gottschalk, God's salvific will was particular to the elect and Christ shed His blood for the redemption of only the predestined. Another fragment of that same treatise explains: "All those impious persons and sinners for whom the Son of God came to redeem by shedding His own blood, those the omnipotent goodness of God predestined to life and irrevocably willed only those to be saved."[16] And, in a fragment extant from his *Tome to Gislemar*, Gottschalk taught that "the one who says that the Lord suffered generally for all, for the salvation and redemption of both the elect and reprobate, contradicts God the Father Himself."[17] However, his teaching of particular redemption can most clearly be seen in five paragraphs he wrote in *Answers to Various Questions*, which I shall cite in their entirety.

> Again, about the redemption of only the elect, the apostle Paul says: *Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having been made a curse for us* (Gal 3:13). Therefore, if Christ redeemed the reprobate from the curse of the law, having been made a curse for them, they therefore will not be cursed reprobates, but entirely blessed. However, the reprobate will not be blessed, but rather it is evident that they are surely accursed. To them the Son of God is going to say: *Depart from me, you accursed ones, into everlasting fire* (Matt 25:41). Therefore, Christ did not redeem the reprobate from the curse of the law, nor was He made a curse for them.
>
> Again, the apostle Paul says: *If God is for us, who can be against us? He who did not even spare his own Son, but gave Him up for us all, how will He not also give us with Him all things* (Rom 8:31-32). Therefore, if God gave His Son even for all of the reprobate, then He has given to them with Him all good things, and through this also eternal life. But He has not given them with Him all good things. Therefore, He did not give Him up for them.

---

[16] Preserved in Hincmar's *De praedestinatione*, 21; PL 121:366-7; Lambot, 40; Genke and Gumerlock, 109.

[17] Lambot, 42; Genke and Gumerlock, 111. Translation by Victor Genke.

Again: *But God commends His love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. Much more having now been justified in His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him* (Rom 5:8-9). Therefore, if Christ died even for the reprobate, then the reprobate too, having been justified in His blood, will be saved from wrath through Him. But the reprobate will not be saved from wrath through Him. Therefore, Christ did not die for the reprobate.

There follows: *For, if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, having been reconciled, we shall be saved through His life* (Rom 5:10). Therefore, if the reprobate were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, they would be saved through His life. But they will not be saved through His life. Therefore, the reprobate were not reconciled to God through the death of His Son.

Again, the apostle Paul says: *God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not counting their sins against them* (2 Cor 5:19). Therefore, if God the Father, who was in Christ hanging on the wood of the cross, reconciled even the reprobate world to Himself, then He neither has counted, nor is counting, nor will count their sins against them. But God indeed has counted, is counting, and will count the sins of the reprobate world against them.[18]

Opposition against Gottshalk's Form of Double Predestination

As mentioned earlier, a number of theologians came forward and said that Gottschalk's teaching was correct regarding twofold predestination and Christ shedding His blood exclusively for the redeemed. His opponents, however,

---

[18] Lambot, 157-8; Genke and Gumerlock, 169-71.

said that his strict form of double predestination was too harsh. Gottschalk would not concede to their belief that God before all time predestined simply *the punishment* of the reprobate. He insisted on saying that God predestined *the reprobate* to punishment.

This teaching on predestination of the reprobate to eternal punishment troubled his opponents because they believed that he was teaching that God had predestined people to evil, which would make God the author of sin. In response, Gottschalk, in several places in his writings, distinguished between the evil of sin which God *does not* cause, and the evil of punishment which He *does* execute.[19] Gottschalk also expressed in a number of places that the punishment of the reprobate was merited. One example of this comes from his *Shorter Confession*, where he wrote:

> I believe and confess that the omnipotent and immutable God has graciously foreknown and predestined the holy angels and elect humans to eternal life, and that He equally predestined the devil himself, the head of all the demons, with all of his apostate angels and also with all those reprobate humans unto *merited* eternal death, most certainly because of their own foreknown future *evil merits*, through His most righteous judgment.[20]

Another issue that opponents raised against Gottschalk was that he preached fatalism, which was leading people to desperation and spiritual negligence. Rabanus Maurus wrote that Gottschalk taught predestination as if conversion from the status of sinner to saint were impossible.[21] In other words, Gottschalk's teaching diminished the need for all sinners to repent and seek salvation from Christ. Rabanus' assessment may not have been far from the

---

[19] Lambot, 183, 189; Genke and Gumerlock, 176, 183-4.

[20] Lambot, 52; Genke and Gumerlock, 114.

[21] Rabanus's *Letter to Noting:* "For, they say that His predestination makes it so that…no person predestined to death can in any way recover himself to life." PL 112:1530; Genke and Gumerlock, 271; *Letter to Hincmar*: "He also says that certain people in this world, according to the predestination of God, which compels them to go into death, are unable to correct themselves from error and sin, as if God from the beginning had made them to be incorrigible…" PL 112:1575. Genke and Gumerlock, 275.

truth, given the fact that Amolo of Lyons, who had almost no ill-will toward Gottschalk, made the same observation. Gottschalk sent some of his writings to Amolo, who responded with a rhetorical question: "What is it to think and say that His predestination unalterably imposed on them [the reprobate] this necessity so that they can do nothing at all for their salvation, if not to blaspheme grievously and horribly against God?"[22]

Regarding the charge that Gottschalk's teaching led sinners to desperation, Amolo seemed to have some evidence. In a treatise, now lost, that Gottschalk addressed to bishops and sent to Amolo, Gottschalk apparently taught that if a person were predestined for condemnation, since the divine sentence could not be changed and the person could never be saved, that person should merely ask God to lighten his punishment in hell. Amolo responded saying:

> And the bishops, to whom you write, you exhort, as if compassionately, that they should preach to people that since they cannot escape the predetermined damnation, they should humiliate themselves and supplicate God that He may soften a little what is fixed for them or may alleviate the tortures. Tell me, I implore you, where in the holy Scriptures did you read that? Where in the holy and Catholic doctors of the Church did you find that?[23]

To these accusations, that his teaching was fatalistic and was causing sinners not to flee to Christ for salvation but to despair, Gottschalk, to my knowledge, never responded. If the portrayals of his doctrine put forth by Rabanus and Amolo were grossly inaccurate, I wish Gottschalk would have made an effort to clear himself by elucidating his beliefs regarding the call of the Gospel for all sinners to believe, repent, and be saved, regardless of their final destinies known only to God. Perhaps he did address the matter in a work that is now lost. On the other hand, were these bishops representing a true picture of Gottschalk's teaching? If that were the case, I would conclude that

---

[22] Amolo of Lyons, *Letter to Gottschalk*, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Ep. 5:372; Genke and Gumerlock, 315. Translation by Genke.

[23] Amolo, *Letter to Gottschalk*. PL 116:92. Genke and Gumerlock, 100-1. Translation by Genke.

Gottschalk on this point did not properly balance the tension between divine sovereignty and human responsibility. Did Gottschalk, like HyperCalvinists of more recent times, refuse to preach to all persons about a need for faith in Christ and repentance unto life?[24] I would like to think not. After all, he was a missionary in the Balkans. But the question deserves further investigation; and maybe his poems and grammatical writings can shed light on it.

Gottshalk and Reformed Theology

In view of Gottschalk's teaching on predestination, human inability, and the extent of Christ's redemptive sacrifice, many see him as a precursor of Reformed theology.[25] However, in describing him as such, caution must be exercised in order to avoid anachronism, i.e., reading modern or sixteenth-century concepts into Gottschalk's writings penned in the ninth century. Without question, the contexts, backgrounds, and struggles of Gottschalk differed drastically from those of the Reformers. Gottschalk's theology involved the interpretation of authors of late antiquity like Augustine, Fulgentius, Cassiodorus, and Gregory the Great, while the staples of sixteenth century theological education were the writings of Lombard and the schoolmen. The

---

[24] For a modern example of this, see the doctrine statement of the Gospel Standard Baptists, taken from a series of articles by J. H. Gosden entitled "Our Articles of Faith," *Gospel Standard* (July 1991), 203; (Sept 1991), 269; and (Dec 1991), 365, which reads: "Article 24. We believe that the invitations of the gospel, being spirit and life (that is, under the influence of the Holy Spirit), are intended only for those who have been made by the blessed Spirit to feel their lost state as sinners and their need of Christ as their Savior, and to repent of and forsake their sins. Article 26. We deny duty-faith and duty-repentance—these terms signifying that it is every man's duty spiritually and savingly to repent and believe. We deny also that there is any capability in man by nature to do any spiritual good whatever; so that we reject the doctrine that men in a state of nature should be exhorted to believe in or turn to God. Article 33. Therefore, that for ministers in the present day to address unconverted persons, or indiscriminately all in a mixed congregation, calling upon them to savingly repent, believe, and receive Christ, or perform any other acts dependent upon the new creative power of the Holy Ghost, is, on the one hand, to imply creature power, and, on the other hand to deny the doctrine of special redemption."

[25] According to D. E. Nineham ("Gottschalk of Orbais: Reactionary or Precursor of the Reformation?" *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 40.1 [1989]:1-18 at 12), Gottschalk's "insistence on the absolute sovereignty of God" is the reason why many have seen fit to view him as a "precursor of the Reformers." However, Nineham's own concluding analysis

Reformers were contending with indulgences, the concept of a "treasury of merit" from which the pope could dispense grace, and a Latin liturgy that could not be understood by most laypersons. These were almost entirely absent in the case of Gottschalk, as were debates on justification. And while Luther's feelings toward Rome were reflected in his public burning of a papal bull, Gottschalk actually appealed to the pope as a potential advocate.

With that being said, finding corollaries and similarities between two theologians separated by centuries is not necessarily an illegitimate or unfruitful exercise. According to church historian Fernand Mourret, "Gottschalk's doctrines and life are not without analogy with those of Luther."[26] Interestingly, Luther and Gottschalk were both of German stock and both from the area of Saxony; both were educated in monasteries and later released; and both were products of intellectual renaissances that were sweeping through Europe during their respective epochs. The doctrine of both was examined and condemned at ecclesiastical councils. Both were so thoroughly convinced of the correctness of their doctrine that they stubbornly defied extremely powerful ecclesiastical authorities who came against them. Finally, their personal lives were equally enriched with the bizarre and colorful. Gottschalk refused to wash his face for long periods of time, prophesied events that never came to pass, and once requested to settle his case by means of an ordeal that involved him

---

is as follows: "As for the question raised in the title, it will be clear that, despite manyclaims to the contrary, it is only in a very partial and rather Pickwickian sense that Gottschalk can be called a precursor of the Reformation. True, his doctrine of predestination resembled that of the leading Reformers, and the sense of the sovereignty of God in whi ch it was rooted was akin to theirs. On the other hand he was, and rejoiced to be, a strict upholder of Catholic orthodoxy. His views on predestination and the Trinity were not part of a more general protest against the ancient Catholic religion; rather an attempt to recapture it in its fullness. The cultural conditions which alone make possible the stance of the Reformers, and the widespread welcome for it, were almost entirely lacking in his day, as witness the rapid loss of interest in his views and his fate, and the lack of interest in him during the following centuries. To classify him as a Reformer before the time is to commit a sort of cultural category mistake." (p. 18) The issue of Gottschalk as a Reformed precursor was also treated in Benoît Lavaud, "Précurseur de Calvin ou témoin de l'augustinisme? Le cas de Godescalc," *Révue Thomiste* 15 (1932):71-101.

[26] Fernand Mourret, *A History of the Catholic Church*, Vol. 3. Newton Thompson, trans. (Saint Louis and London: Herder, 1936), 475.

being dipped in barrels of boiling water, oil, animal fat, and pitch.[27] In the life of Luther, I recall reading the story of some German nuns who, after embracing Lutheran doctrine, escaped from their convent hiding in the empty barrels of a beer cart and showed up on Luther's doorstep, expecting him to find husbands for them.

Furthermore, the ability of the Gospel to transcend all times and cultures, a shared salvific experience by members of the one body of Christ from different time periods, the ongoing illumination of God's people by the same Spirit throughout the ages, and the passing down of exegetical traditions from generation to generation, may all contribute to the fact that Christians separated by centuries sometimes manifest similar currents of thought.

Although the early Reformers in all likelihood had not read Gottschalk's writings, both were battling what they perceived as Semi-Pelagianism infecting the church of their respective times. And because they shared common weapons—the sword of God's word and hammer of Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings—the similarity between Gottschalk's statements on the bondage of the will, gracious ability, predestination, and redemption with those of the early Reformers, especially Calvin and his followers, is sometimes uncanny.

Questions and Answers on Gottshalk

Three questions were asked about Gottschalk during the question and answer session at the *Kerux* conference. These are listed below along with my answers.

1. *What were the politics involved in the Gottschalk controversy?*

The Gottschalk controversy occurred during the Carolingian period of European history. About 781 Charlemagne recruited Alcuin of York, one of the top scholars in Christendom at the time, to be the palace teacher. Through him Charlemagne's educational reforms were realized, so that when Gottschalk was being educated an intellectual renaissance was taking place in the monasteries

---

[27] His request for an ordeal is in his *Longer Confession.* Lambot, 74-5; Genke and Gumerlock, 151.

and cathedral schools. Gottschalk was schooled under Rabanus Maurus, who in turn had been taught by Alcuin.[28]

From the social and intellectual background to politics, the secular emperors seemed very much interested in the controversy on predestination, especially Charles the Bald. He convened a synod at Quierzy in 853 that addressed the issue of predestination. At his request Ratramnus of Corbie, Lupus of Ferrières, and Hincmar all composed explanations of predestination for him.[29]

Regarding ecclesiastical politics, there seems to have been some rivalry between certain clerics in the south and Hincmar in the north. Apparently, in the southeastern region there was dissatisfaction after a certain archbishop named Ebbo was deposed. Some thought that his deposition was improper, and there were most likely deep resentments after Hincmar the metropolitan prohibited clerics who had been ordained by Ebbo from exercising their ecclesiastical functions.[30] According to some scholars, these factors had a hand in

---

[28] Charlemagne's "Capitularies on Education" are translated in Colman J. Barry, ed., *Readings in Church History*, Rev. ed., Vol. 1 (Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1985), 224-8. On Alcuin's role in the Carolingian renaissance, Albrecht Diem, "The Emergence of Monastic Schools. The Role of Alcuin," and Mayke de Jong, "From Scolastici to Scioli. Alcuin and the Formation of an Intellectual Elite," in L.A.J.R. Houwen and A.A. MacDonald, eds., *Alcuin of York: Scholar at the Carolingian Court* (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1998), 27-44, 45-57; John J. Contreni, "The Carolingian Renaissance: Education and Literary Culture," in Rosamond McKitterick, ed., *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. 2 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 709-57; E. Ann Matter, "Exegesis and Christian Education: The Carolingian Model," in Patrick Henry, ed., *Schools of Thought in the Christian Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 90-105. Older, but still valuable, are Andrew Fleming West, *Alcuin and the Rise of the Christian Schools* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1892); and James Bass Mullinger, *The Schools of Charles the Great and the Restoration of Education in the Ninth Century* (London: Longmans, Green, 1877).

[29] Ratramnus of Corbie, *De Praedestinatione Dei*, PL 121:11-80. English: Timothy Roland Roberts, "A Translation and Critical Edition of Ratramnus of Corbie's 'De Praedestinatione Dei'," dissertation (University of Missouri-Columbia, 1977); Lupus of Ferrières, *Liber de tribus quaestionibus.* PL 119:619-66; and *Letter 78*. In *The Letters of Lupus of Ferrières.* Graydon W. Regenos, trans. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966), 86-91; Hincmar of Reims, *De praedestinatione* PL 125:49-474.

[30] David Ganz, "The Debate on Predestination," in Margaret T. Gibson and Janet L. Nelson, eds., *Charles the Bald. Court and* Kingdom, 2nd rev. ed. (Brookfield, VT: Variorum, 1990), 283-301 at 285; P. R. McKeon, "The Carolingian Councils of Savonnières (859) and Tusey (860) and Their Background," *Revue Bénédictine* 84 (1974):75-110 at 98-100; Charles Poulet, *A History of the Catholic Church*, Vol. 1. Sidney A. Raemers, trans. (Saint Louis and London: Herder, 1946), 364-5.

why the southern theologians tended to favor Gottschalk over Hincmar. Ebbo had been Gottschalk's patron. According to Dermot Moran, "In part, the predestination issue was a pretext for a political power struggle between Hincmar and the northern bishops, against Florus and the southern bishops of Gaul."[31]

The expert on the political aspects of the controversy is really Victor Genke. He is currently writing his dissertation in the history department of the N.I. Lobachevsky State University of Nizhni Novgorod entitled "Political Struggle and the Church in the Carolingian Empire: The Controversy over Predestination in Connection with Gottschalk of Orbais." Much of the fruit of his research is in the lengthy introduction that he wrote for our book.

2. *How did the Gottschalk controversy conclude?*

Rabanus Maurus removed himself from the controversy rather early, as did John the Scot after the latter wrote a treatise on predestination against Gottschalk to which many theologians vigorously objected.[32] As mentioned earlier, the two sides held several opposing councils in the 850s on the issue of predestination. Then in 860, the groups came together and reached a compromise at the Council of Tusey where, through the influence of Hincmar, it was stated that divine predestination is unto life, free will was not lost after the fall but in need of healing through grace, God wills all men to be saved, and Christ died for all.[33] Hincmar's side won the day.

Gottschalk, still imprisoned, appealed to Pope Nicholas who summoned a meeting at which Hincmar and Gottschalk were to appear before papal legates. Hincmar ignored the summons and later wrote Nicholas a long letter explaining his absence. Gottschalk died in the monastery at Hautvillers in 868, holding fast to his doctrinal positions, for which he was refused communion and the last rites upon his death.

---

[31] Dermot Moran, "The Predestination Debate," chapter two of his *The Philosophy of John Scottus Eriugena* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 27-34 at 33. For a contrast in theology between the northerners and southerners, John J. O'Meara, *Eriugena* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 33.

[32] John Scottus Eriugena, *Treatise on Divine Predestination*. Mary Brennan, trans. (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1998).

[33] The record of the council is in Hincmar's *Epistle 21*. PL 126:122-32.

3. *Did the Reformers know about Gottschalk and refer to him in their writings?*

To my knowledge the early Reformers did not know about Gottschalk nor did they seem to have been aware of his writings on predestination. Gottschalk's confessions were not published until 1631 by James Ussher, an Irish Calvinist archbishop, and then again in 1650 by Gilbert Mauguin, who was a French Jansenist.[34]

The Need for Additional Scholarship and Translations

I am delighted to be a part of providing the English speaking world with a translation of Gottschalk's works on predestination, and it is my hope that it will be a stimulus for more research. There is much work to be done on the dating of Gottschalk's writings, on the development of his thought, on his interpretation of Augustine, on his view of reprobation, and on the role that mysticism played in his theology. Additionally, the relationship between his view of grace and his sacramental theology needs to be explored,[35] as does the relationship between Gottschalk's predestinarian views and his eschatology.[36]

Many works from the ninth-century predestination controversy still have not been translated into English. Among them are Remigius' *Solution to a Certain Question*,[37] Florus' *On Holding Immovably to the Truth of Scripture*[38]

---

[34] James Ussher, *Gotteschalci, et praedestinationae controversiae ab eo motae historia: una cum duplice ejusdem confessione, nunc primum in lucem edita* (Dublin, 1631); Gilbert Mauguin. *Veterum auctorum qui IX. Saeculo de praedestinatione et gratia scripserunt opera et fragmenta plurima nunc primum in luce edita* (Paris, Ioannis Billaine, 1650).

[35] Gottschalk wrote a treatise *On the Body and Blood of the Lord* . Lambot, 324-37. Victor Genke began to translate it, but it will not be included in our present book.

[36] There is quite a bit of discussion in the writings of Gottschalk and others in the controversy on Judgment Day and Antichrist, and for a time Gottschalk was occupied with questions related to the beatific vision.

[37] *Absolutio cujiusdam quaestionis*. PL 121:1067-1084.

[38] *De tenenda immobiliter scripturae veritate*. PL 121:1083-1134.

and *Book Against the Erroneous Definitions of John Scottus Eriugena*,[39] Servatus Lupus' *Book on Three Questions*,[40] Prudentius' *On Predestination Against John the Scot*,[41] and the treatises entitled *On Predestination* by Rabanus Maurus[42] and Hincmar.[43] It is my hope that God will raise up other translators to embrace this challenge.

The purpose of this article was to introduce the person and teaching of this fascinating medieval predestinarian. Gottschalk saw in holy Scripture and the fathers that man's will was entirely bound in sin until God graciously freed it. He also preached that God, before the foundation of the world, chose a people who, through no merits of their own, would be redeemed through the blood of His Son. These would be effectually called, and through God's gift of perseverance would enjoy Him forever. Although Gottschalk's superiors were uncomfortable with his teaching of predestination as double, and that Christ's blood was shed only for the elect, a number of his contemporary theologians regarded his teaching as representative of the true faith handed down by the apostles.

---

[39] *Adversus Joannis Scoti Erigenae erroneas definitions liber.* PL 119:101-250.

[40] *Liber de tribus quaestionibus.* PL 119:619-666.

[41] *De praedestinatione contra Johannem Scotum cognomento Erigenam*. PL 115:1009-1366.

[42] *De praedestinatione*. PL 112:1531-1553.

[43] *De praedestinatione.* PL 125:49-474.

[*K:NWTS* 22/3 (Dec 2007) 35-49]

Rudimenta Pietatis

Andrew Duncan

Introduction by James T. Dennison, Jr.

Translation by Richard Bishop III

We are printing below, the first English translation (to our knowledge) of Andrew Duncan's *Rudimenta Pietatis* ("First Principles of Piety"). The translation is based upon the Latin version published by Thomas F. Torrance in his *The School of Faith* (1959) 283-90. We have included the summaries of the Questions and Answers as italicized headings, where Duncan has placed them on the margins of his text. The *Scholia* are notes on select questions expanding the explanations found in the answers; hence they should be read in concert with the corresponding question as numbered.

Andrew Duncan was born in Scotland ca. 1560.[1] Neither Cameron's authoritative dictionary nor Scott's famous *Fasti* list a place of birth. Duncan breaks upon us as Regent of St. Leonard's College at St. Andrews and, from 1591, Rector of the Grammar School of Dundee. In other words, he began his career as a schoolmaster and the *Rudimenta* is one small fruit of his desire to instruct Scottish pupils in the basics of the Reformed faith. So successful were

[1] The chief sources for information on his life and career are: Nigel M. de S. Cameron, ed., *Dictionary of Scottish Church History & Theology* (1993) 261-62; Hew Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae* (1925), vol. V:192; Thomas M'Crie, *Sketches of Scottish Church History* (1846) 1:181-82; John Howie, *The Scots Worthies* (1860) 288-90; Alan R. MacDonald, *The Jacobean Kirk, 1567-1625* (1998) 106-37.

his efforts in this regard that the *Rudimenta* was and remained the most popular and frequently reprinted catechism in Scottish Grammar Schools, being used well into the 18th century.

While Duncan taught at Dundee, he became a close friend of Andrew Melville (1545-1622), the successor to John Knox (ca.1514-1572) as leader of the Reformed Kirk. Duncan was ordained to the ministry in 1597 at Crail in Fife. These were days of contention in which the King (James VI of Scotland/from 1603, James I of England, 1566-1625) was pitted against the Presbyterian leaders of the Kirk. James, ever the divine-right royalist and closet Episcopalian, was no friend of Scottish Presbyterian independence. Duncan and several others defied him by participating in the 1605 Aberdeen (General) Assembly. This General Assembly was illegal because James had forbidden its *sederunt*. The royal policy was for "union" between the kirk elders and the bishops of the Anglican communion—hence a Presbyterian assembly of ministers and elders would forestall the ecumenical royalist design. Aided by Archbishop John Spottiswoode (1565-1639), James was urged to forbid the meeting of the Presbyterian General Assembly scheduled for July 1605. Spottiswoode argued because "they intended to call in question all the conclusions taken in former assemblies for the Episcopal government" (MacDonald 109). The specter of a tyrannical kirk was beginning to resemble that of a tyrannical monarch.

On July 2, 1605, despite intimations to the contrary (recall Andrew Melville's quip that King James was "God's silly vassal"), the Aberdeen Assembly was prorogued. Nonetheless, twenty-seven ministers from fourteen presbyteries appeared at Aberdeen between July 2 and 5 to convene the Assembly. While the Assembly was dissolved, a new date for gathering in September was determined. James declared the business "seditioun and plaine contempt of us and our authoritie" (MacDonald 112). Seventeen ministers were arrested and jailed, the most famous being the six remanded to Blackness Castle (Andrew Duncan, John Forbes, John Welsh, Robert Durie, Alexander Strachan and John Sharp). On January 10, 1606, these six appeared at the assizes in Linlithgow. Asked to submit to the King, they refused and were tried for treason before the Lord Justice Depute and the Privy Council. Adjudged guilty, they were sentenced to forfeiture of "estates and goods" as well as banishment from Scotland. On September 26, 1606, the sentence was imposed by James, who noted his royal leniency, since the rebels deserved the capital punishment. On November 8, they "embarked at Leith" for exile (MacDonald 126).

Duncan found refuge in France. He took up residence in Bordeaux and was appointed Professor of Theology at the College of Rochelle there in 1607. About 1612 or 1613, Duncan was permitted to return to Scotland upon making concessions to King James. But on April 13, 1619, he was convened by the Court of High Commission at St. Andrews. On this occasion, the charge was his opposition to the Perth Articles (1618) which James had contrived in order to impose "episcopalian worship ceremonies" on the Kirk (Cameron 654). Specifically, these five infamous articles included: kneeling (not sitting) at the Lord's Supper; private communions; private baptisms; bishops to confirm church members; and observance of ecclesiastical holy days. In cahoots with James on this occasion was his notorious chaplain, William Laud (1573-1645).

Duncan was deposed for refusing to submit to the High Commission and before he was imprisoned at Dundee declared to the commissioners: "Pity yourselves for the Lord's sake; lose not your own souls, I beseech you, for Esau's pottage" (M'Crie 181). "I have done nothing of this business, whereof I have been accused by you, but have been serving Jesus Christ, my Master" (Howie 288-89). He was deposed once more on May 10, 1620.

In July 1621, he presented a petition on behalf of himself and some other ministers to Sir George Hay, Clerk Register of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. He was summarily arrested and imprisoned at Dumbarton Castle from July to October 2. On his release, he was granted permission to settle anywhere in Scotland save Crail or Edinburgh. He moved to Kilrenny parish, but was banished from there to Berwick-upon-Tweed where he died in 1626.

Rudimenta Pietatis

(1595)

Threefold state of man:

1. In holiness and soundness

2. Under sin and death

3. Under the grace of Christ

1. Man free when created.

Q. 1 Who created man?

A. God.

Q. 2 In what condition did he create him?

A. Holy and sound, and lord of the world.

Q. 3 For what purpose was he created?

A. To serve God.

Q. 4 What kind of service did God require of him?

A. Fulfilling the requirements of his law.

Q. 5 Did he persevere in fulfilling the requirements of God's law?

A. Not at all; instead he shamefully transgressed it.

2. Captive when he sinned.

Q. 6 What was the punishment for this transgression?

A. Eternal death of both soul and body for himself and his descendents.

3. Liberated when he believes in Christ.

Q. 7 How are we liberated from this punishment?

A. By the mere grace of God in Christ Jesus, apart from our merits.

Q. 8 What sort of person is Christ?

A. True God and true man, in one person.

Mode of liberation, through Christ's death.

Q. 9 How did he liberate us?

A. By his death, for in our stead he underwent the death we owed, and rescued us.

Who are liberated, the faithful.

Q. 10 Are all liberated by Christ?

A. By no means, rather only those who embrace him by faith.

What faith is.

Q. 11 What is faith?

A. It is when I am persuaded that God loves me and all the saints, and that he gives Christ to us, with all his good gifts.

Sum of the faith.

Q. 12 Recite the sum of your faith.

A. "I believe in God the Father, etc."

Author of faith, the Holy Spirit.

Q. 13 Who produces this faith in us?

A. The Holy Spirit through the Word and sacraments.

Instruments of faith, Word and sacraments.

Q. 14 How does he produce it through the Word and sacraments?

A. He opens the heart that we might believe in God who speaks in the Word and sacraments.

What the Word of God is, i.e., Scripture.

Q. 15 What is the Word of God?

A. Whatever is contained in the books of the Old and the New Testament.

Parts of the Word of God: law, gospel.

Q. 16 How many parts of the Word of God are there?

A. Two, law and gospel.

What the law is.

Q. 17 What is the law?

A. The doctrine of God that requires a debt from us, and, because we cannot pay it, damns us.

What the gospel is.

Q. 18 What is the gospel?

A. The doctrine that offers Christ with all that he possesses, and proclaims that our debt was paid by him, and that we are free.

What the sacraments are.

Q. 19 What are the sacraments?

A. They are seals of God that signify and give Christ to us, with all that he possesses.

Benefits sealed by the sacraments.

Q. 20 What are these possessions of Christ?

A. The love of God, the Holy Spirit and our union with Christ; from which come the forgiveness of sins, the healing of our nature, spiritual nourishment and life eternal.

Number of sacraments.

Q. 21 How many sacraments of the New Testament are there?

A. Two, baptism and the Lord's Supper.

What baptism is.

Q. 22 What is baptism?

A. The sacrament of our engrafting into Christ and cleansing from sins.

What our engrafting into Christ is, and its effects.

Q. 23 What is our engrafting into Christ?

A. Our union with Christ, from which flow the forgiveness of sins and continual repentance.

Use of baptism for faith.

Q. 24 How does baptism help faith?

A. It testifies that, as the body is washed with water, so also, by the working of the Holy Spirit, we are cleansed from the root and guilt of our sins, through faith in the blood of Christ.

What the Lord's Supper is.

Q. 25 What is the Lord's Supper?

A. The sacrament of our spiritual nourishment in Christ.

Use of the Supper for faith.

Q. 26 How does the Lord's Supper help faith?

A. It testifies that, as our bodies are nourished and grow by bread and wine, so also, by the body and blood of Christ crucified, our souls are nourished and strengthened for life eternal.

Mode of our spiritual nourishment.

Q. 27 How are we nourished by the body and blood of Christ?

A. When we perceive them by faith, and, by the power of the Holy Spirit, who is also present, apply them to ourselves.

Q. 28 When do we perceive by faith and apply to ourselves the body of Christ crucified?

A. When we are persuaded that the death and crucifixion of Christ pertain no less to us than if we ourselves had been crucified for our own sins; that indeed is the persuasion of true faith.

Test of true faith by good works.

Q. 29 How is true faith discerned?

A. By good works.

Test of good works by the law of God.

Q. 30 How are good works recognized?

A. If they accord with the law of God.

Q. 31 Recite the law of God.

A. "Hear, O Israel, I am the Lord, etc."

Sum and use of the law.

Q. 32 To what does this law bid you?

A. To my duty to God and to my neighbor.

First table.

Q. 33 What duty do you owe to God?

A. That I love him above all things.

Second table.

Q. 34 What do you owe to your neighbor?

A. That I love him just as I love myself.

Fulfillment of the law by man impossible on account of indwelling sin.

Q. 35 Are you able to fulfill these duties?

A. By no means, for as long as we live here, sin dwells in us.

Inner dissension in man between flesh and spirit.

Q. 36 Then what exists in the sons of God?

A. A perpetual struggle between flesh and spirit.

Prayer the remedy.

Q. 37 How are we to conduct ourselves in this struggle?

A. We are to pray continually that God would forgive our sins and support us in our weakness.

Prayer of Christ.

Q. 38 How are we to pray?

A. As Christ taught us, “Our Father, etc.”

Source of confidence in prayer, namely, from the command and promise of God.

Q. 39 Why are you persuaded that God will grant what you ask?

A. Because he commanded me to pray and has promised that he will lavish on me whatever I ask in the name of Christ.

What we owe to God for so many benefits, namely, thanksgiving and service.

Q. 40 What do you owe to God in return for so many benefits?

A. That I thank and serve him always.

Norm of service to God, Scripture.

Q. 41 How is God to be served?

A. According to the rule of his own Word, as has already been said.

The End.

Scholia

1. The original benefits of God to man were: (1) That he should exist. (2) That he should be human. (3) That he should be like God—namely, holy and sound, and lord of the world.

2. On account of the fall, we fell both into sin and into sickness and death. For we were not only polluted by sin and stripped of dominion, but also grievously wounded and even slain. See then from whence wretched man fell! He was blessed, first of all, internally and eternally, and then externally. Holiness and soundness in all parts of body, soul, etc. were internal. Dominion, riches, wealth, etc. were external. But by the deceit of the devil, he was diverted from all these things and became wretched.

3. For (1) what is more just than that a workman's work should serve him? (2) What is more advantageous for us than that we attain to the end for which we were created? For that is our felicity. (3) You were made for no other end than serving God. Wherefore if you do not serve him, you are of no use, unless it be to perish forever in order to demonstrate his justice.

6. Death is twofold: of the soul and of the body. In this life, the soul dies as soon as it sins, since it forsakes God, who is the life of the soul. The body dies when it is forsaken by the soul. In the future, each will die when the whole man is punished with the most severe and eternal torments.

This punishment was inflicted on Adam's descendents because in Adam we all sinned, and he who sins is justly punished. For, since justice takes vengeance, punishment is the concomitant of sin.

8. He was man so that he could die and pay man's debt; he was God that by dying he might conquer death, so that death, the enemy of God and man, might rule over man no longer.

9. We incurred a debt on account of sin; wherefore we have been made liable to die an eternal death, but Christ bore this death for us and set us free.

10. For the just man lives by faith, and he who lacks faith must dwell under death and under the wrath of God forever.

11. For in faith there is a twofold persuasion: (1) Concerning the love of God towards us. (2) Concerning the benefits of God, which flow from his love—namely, Christ with all that he possesses. Hence there are two parts of the creed: (1) Concerning the love of God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit towards us, which shines forth in the things they provide for our sake. (2) Concerning the benefits of God conferred upon us. And from that double persuasion, trust is born, since we are completely dependent on God. Consider the creed.

14. The heart of man is obstructed in every part, in darkness, and crammed full of every perversity, so that there is no access for the Word of God or for any good thing. But when the Spirit of God draws near and opens it, he introduces the beauty of heavenly truth, and cleans out that Augean stable.

16. In the law, God requires his debt. Now the debt is that we either fulfill the law or perish forever; in this the justice of God shines forth. In the gospel he declares, and in the sacraments he seals, that this debt has been paid by Christ, and that we are free if Christ is ours. And he is ours, if we believe. It is especially here that the mercy of God shines forth, but in both cases, there is misery for man apart from Christ.

19. For the sacraments not only signify Christ, they also bestow him with all that he has. More precisely, they confirm and seal that he has been given to us in the Word, for they are seals. What, then, if I define it in this way? The sacraments are seals of God, which make me certain that Christ has been given to me with all that he possesses. For in the Word, God offers us Christ with all that he has. We receive and possess him by faith. Moreover the Holy Spirit seals this possession in the sacraments.

22. Baptism seals our heavenly birth, the Supper our training in the church.

23. Since we have been made one with Christ, we receive whatever he has. Whatever has been accomplished by him, God judges us to have accomplished it all. Therefore in Christ we ourselves have made satisfaction for sin; with Christ we ourselves have crucified sin so that it might no longer exercise its tyranny in us; in him we ourselves are as pleasing to God as if we had never sinned.

Christ liberated us both from the damnation of sin, as well as from its dominion or tyranny; for he died both to sin and for sin. In that he died for sin, he merited our forgiveness, for he made satisfaction. As a result, he destroyed both guilt and damnation. And in that he died to sin, he shattered the tyranny of sin and, at the same time, purified our nature; for with him, sin has been crucified and abolished; we are liberated. Hence there is a continual repentance in us and a renovation of our whole nature.

24. In sin there are two things: its guilt and root. Guilt is the liability to punishment on account of sin. The root is the corrupt nature from which sins flow. By his death Christ has done away with both: guilt, since he merited the forgiveness of sins; the root, since sin was nailed to the cross and destroyed by the power of his own death.

25, 26. As in baptism, we are born sons of God, so also in the Supper, we are nourished and grow into hearty and mature men.

27. We receive from God nothing that pertains to salvation except by the interposition of faith. For if you are not persuaded that you are receiving it, you are not receiving it.

What Christ merited by his death, we only receive by the working of the Holy Spirit. For it is the Spirit who gives life; the flesh profits nothing (John 6:63).

28. Why would we not be persuaded of this? If Christ is ours, then all that Christ has becomes ours, and that rightfully. If Christ, not his members, is the head, then God credits to us whatever Christ has done or suffered. Thus the death, the merits and, in short, all that belongs to Christ are ours by the judgment of God, such that God now has nothing more against us than against Christ himself.

29. For faith cannot coexist with evil works; because (1) he who is faithful is necessarily a good man, and it is the nature of a good man to do good. (2) Where faith is, there the Spirit of God reigns; but where works are evil, there the devil reigns. (3) He who has faith has Christ; but will he who possesses Christ be evil? Did God give you his Son and the Holy Spirit for you to serve the devil?

30. In a good work, there are two points: (1) that it is good; (2) that it is done well—namely, from faith and to the glory of God. If someone gives alms ostentatiously (as in Matthew 6:2), he does a good work but does not do it well.

33, 34. You ought to love God above yourself, but your neighbor as yourself. Therefore you ought to promote the glory of God even if it should mean your destruction. How much more when it is our highest good, and produces singular felicity?

36. Flesh is all the corrupt affections in man and corruption itself; the Spirit is holiness and soundness of nature and all the good impulses that proceed from it by the working of the Spirit of God. But this holiness is imperfect as long as we live, so that the inner man is unable to drive out the corruption or to overcome it. This, then, is the fight—for the Spirit is from God; the flesh is from the devil.

37. There are within us two foes with which we must continuously wrestle: (1) sins; (2) the corruption of our nature, from which come temptations. Therefore in the Lord's Prayer, we ask for the forgiveness of sins and victory over temptations.

38. This ought to be the norm for all prayers, which, though they may differ as to words, certainly should not differ as to meaning and sense.

39. Two things should make us certain that God will hear us: (1) that he so often and so earnestly commanded us to pray. Would any man who is more than a little human (to say nothing of the Father) command a request that he is unwilling to grant? (2) That he promised often, and of his own accord, that he himself would grant it. Why would he have promised? Does he glory in disappointing faith and deceiving us?

40. Before the benefits are received, he wants us to pray for them; after they are received, to give thanks. For so many benefits, he requires nothing more.

41. If you do what is commanded in Scripture, there is no doubt but that you will be pleasing to God, and attain salvation; therefore what work of others (O Papist) pertains to the worship of God?

The End.

Reviews

[*K:NWTS* 22/3 (Dec 2007) 50-52]

Simon J. Gathercole, *The Preexistent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2006. 344 pp. Paper. ISBN: 0-8028-2901-5. $32.00.

This too is an important book. And it is a splendid success. Gathercole defends the concept of the preexistence of Christ in the Synoptic Gospels (the fourth gospel *indisputably* declares the eternality of the Son of God) in a meticulous exegesis which will cheer the hearts of all orthodox lovers of classic Christian Christology. And he does so with panache in the face of a scholarly consensus which long ago surrendered the doctrine of Christ's preexistence as the benighted notion of hopeless naifs. In stepladder fashion, Gathercole joins what he calls the "High Christology Club" of Richard Bauckham and Larry Hurtado which places Jesus "on God's side" of the eternal/temporal divide. The latter two have done so based on "early Christian" Christology (i.e., pre-70 A.D.), not the specific Christology of the Synoptic writers. Thus, Gathercole zeroes in on the Christology of Matthew, Mark and Luke.

Gathercole is not discussing "nature" in this tour de force, only "existence" (1). In other words, he is not pursuing whether or not Christ shares in the divine nature (*ousia*) a la Nicene Christology (both pre- and post-), only whether the NT documents present a Jesus conscious of his own pre-adventual existence. One could, of course, argue that Jesus himself knew nothing of preexistence and was only 're-imaged' in this manner by the early Christian church. Here he summons NPP (New Perspective on Paul) guru, James D. G. Dunn, who

in his book *Christology in the Making* denied any notion of Christ's preexistence to Paul and the Synoptic writers (cf. also pages 23-31 in the present study on Dunn's hostility to preexistence Christology in all but the Johannine literature). All Enlightenment and post-Enlightenment critical fundamentalism has rejected the doctrine: from Deism's rejection of supernaturalism per se; to rationalistic Kantianism's eschewing of the possibility of noumenal/phenomenal incarnation; to 19th century German Idealism and its romanticization of the 'God-likeness' of Jesus; to the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* ("History of Religion School") which affirms preexistence, but only as borrowed from Iranian or Hellenistic mystery religions (Richard Reitzenstein and William Bossuet) or Gnostic 'Redeemer myths' (Rudolf Bultmann). Gathercole boldly intends to prove "that the preexistent, heavenly Son (seen in his radiant glory in the transfiguration) is the very person who is sent by the Father into the world to be crucified by humankind and to give his life as a ransom for many" (20).

Gathercole bases his demonstration on a detailed exegesis of the "I have come sayings" in Matthew (5:17; 8:29; 9:13; 10:34-35; 20:28), Mark (1:24, 38; 2:17; 10:45) and Luke (4:34, 43; 5:32; 12:49-51; 19:10). As it is self-evident to any unbiased reader, such statements presuppose "preexistence Christology" (Part II of his study, 83-189). He then dismisses the theory that Christian preexistence Christology is derived from Jewish Wisdom Christology (193-227), an origin popular with 20th century existentialists such as Bultmann and his disciples. Finally (Part IV of his stepladder, 231-83), he reviews insights relative to this matter derived from the Christological titles: Messiah (231-42), Lord (243-52), Son of Man (253-71), Son of God (272-83).

In conclusions reminiscent of the earlier work of Geerhardus Vos in his monumental *The Self-Disclosure of Jesus* (1926)—of which Gathercole appears to be sadly unaware—our author details the titles of the pre-temporal origins of the person owning/possessing those titles. As such, the Christological titles augur a "High-Christology-Club" Jesus! This is an altogether refreshing endorsement that the pre-critical (i.e., pre-Enlightenment) church did not invent the high Christology endemic to Apostolic, Patristic, Medieval and Reformation Christianity. As an old saw observed, the further back you go to the self-consciousness of the chief actor in the drama (namely, Jesus himself), the more evident it is that the high Christology is coincident

with the Nazarene himself. True, any of Gathercole's conclusions about the meaning of the titles descriptive of Jesus' preexistent self-consciousness could have arisen from a classic book on Christian dogmatics (systematic theology). But as systematics is dependent on careful exegesis of the Biblical text, Gathercole has vindicated historic Christian orthodoxy at this point with an up-to-date and exacting exegesis of the Synoptic texts. Hence, for readers of this journal, he supplements the work of Vos noted above by bringing us up to speed with Bultmann, Macquarrie, Pannenberg, Dunn, Murphy O'Connor and a host of other modern and postmodern figures.

In a brief concluding zinger, he argues that "the ditch often assumed between the Synoptic Gospels and the Fourth Gospel is not as ugly as many think" (295). Perhaps, Gathercole can help the higher critical (fundamentalist) world to just 'get over it!', i.e., G. E. Lessing's notorious ugly ditch. Wouldn't that be a relief to all lovers of objective truth! Select postmodernists are already ridiculing the chasm Lessing dredged between 'reality' and 'unreality' (i.e., 'imagination', 'faith', 'belief', 'superstition'—whatever!!). Regardless of the larger philosophical implications of this remark, Gathercole has served the orthodox and believing church heroically. Now, if he will just expand this book to consider the relation between preexistent existence and preexistent nature, we may yet have an up-to-date tour de force supportive of classic, orthodox two-nature (i.e., Nicene and Chalcedonian) Christology.

—James T. Dennison, Jr.

[*K:NWTS* 22/3 (Dec 2007) 52-55]

R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2007. 1169 pp. Cloth. ISBN:978-0-8028-2501-8. $60.00.

In the 1970s, I first became acquainted with the name R. T. France by way of his book *Jesus and the Old Testament* (1971). It was a welcome addition to the biblical-theological method of Geerhardus Vos which I had come to love. Using the formula citations of OT passages as indicative of the era of fulfillment in Christ, France elaborated on the mind of the NT writers (especially in their inspired presentation of Christ) as entering into the "fullness of time".

Over the past thirty years, I have continued to appreciate France's careful, generally conservative and evangelical exploration of NT materials, particularly the synoptic gospels.

This volume is the latest from his pen descriptive of the above goal. It is, in fact, the second major commentary he has written on Matthew—the earlier and shorter work (1985) was his revision of the 1961 original Tyndale NT Commentary on the first gospel by R. V. G. Tasker. The present 'weighty' tome is a more thorough and detailed exegetical work.

Throughout his career, France has eschewed the higher critical penchant for reconstructions of the gospel by attempting the (hopeless and perverse) task of peering behind the text. This arrogant evolutionism has given us the fabled (and mythical) Q documents, redactors *ad infinitum* (*ad nauseum*), Jesus seminars (and their glass bead games) and a host of other inaninities, absurdities, idiocies and dead ends. France chooses the "more excellent way" of the "continuous" reading of the narrative of Matthew. On this synchronic (as opposed to the liberal-critical diachronic) reading, he refreshs his contemporary evangelical and orthodox reader with traditional conclusions about authorship, provenance, destination, etc. (standard matters of NT Introduction). However these introductory details are more fully explored in another volume which France published in 1989 entitled *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*. This 1989 volume is propaedeutic to the present complete commentary (as France indicates on p. 1). In this former volume, France reviews the scholarly discussion of author (Matthew, the apostle, is his conclusion—"I believe that authorship of the first gospel by the tax-collector apostle Matthew is the most economical explanation of all the relevant factors" [79]), destination (an unknown "early Jewish-Christian" congregation or group), purpose ("to say things about Jesus which Matthew believed to be important"), etc. If these are 'conservative' conclusions, so be it. Those are the conclusions which the data suggests, apart from philosophical presuppositions imposing a re-imaging of Jesus and his disciples upon the first century Christian world. If the Jesus whom we meet in these re-imaging forays resembles the contemporary postmodern multicultural globalist, well surprise, surprise! (This is in fact the tendentious little dirty secret of all liberal criticism: they ever remake Jesus in their own cultural philosophical image.)

The surprises France provides for us are perceptive exegetical forays into the "treasures old and new", ever richer and deeper of this marvelous opening gospel of the NT canon. The 1989 volume elaborates the theology of Matthew on pages 166-317. The present commentary is a verse-by-verse exegetical elaboration and support of that theology.

I draw attention to only a few suggestions, leaving the reader to benefit from the rich insights—traditional and fresh—which greet him on the pages of this volume. France favors a geographical structure for the outline of the gospel. He interacts with David Bauer's important study (*The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*) and Jack Dean Kingsbury (*Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*) who maintain a threefold structure to the gospel: 1:1-4:16; 4:17-16:20; 16:21-28:20 (based on the evangelist's phrase "from that time Jesus began to"). France's demur is actually a refinement of Kingsbury and Bauer. He believes that Matthew (following Mark) provides a "conscious structuring of the story within a geographical framework" (3). His own outline reads: 1:1-4:11; 4:12-16:20; 16:21-20:34; 21:1-25:46; 26:1-28:15; 28:16-20.[1] He thus reaches conclusions formally reminiscent of Elizabeth Malbon's revolutionary study on geographical space in the gospel of Mark (*Narrative Space and Mythic Meaning in Mark* [1986]). Surprisingly, France does not seem to be aware of Malbon's book, though he regards space as a fundamental organizing structure of Matthew and Mark (see his NIGTC commentary on Mark [2002]). Let me also commend his theology of the Matthean birth and infancy narratives as well as the kingdom thrust of the Sermon on the Mount.[2]

This commentary will help the truly Vosian biblical theologian. How so? It will immerse him in the text; it will leave him with the powerful drama of the life of the incarnate Son of God (son of David, son of Abraham, Mt. 1:1); it will enable him to appreciate what Jesus and his apostle, Matthew, and the church to whom Matthew writes his gospel appreciate—the wonderfully climactic

---

[1] For a recent stimulating reworking of previous suggested outlines of Matthew, see Wim J. C. Weren, "The Macrostructure of Matthew's Gospel: A New Proposal," *Biblica* 87 (2006):171-200. Weren combines spatial and temporal markers in the text to provide a provocative new look at Matthew's narrative structure.

[2] Compare my "Born of the Virgin Mary," *Kerux: The Journal of Northwest Theological Seminary* 18/3 (December 2003): 16-25 and my "The Law from the New Mount," *Kerux: The Journal of Northwest Theological Seminary* 21/1 (May 2006): 42-48.

accomplishment of the OT in the person and work of the Lord Jesus, as well as the arrival and presence of the kingdom of God which has been a part of mankind's history since Jesus came. But the true Vosian biblical theologian will understand even more of these rich and precious realities. He will perceive the eschatological vector—that vertical penetration of life from above which joins him or her as a participant in the drama of the kingdom of heaven; which lifts him or her up to the King of that kingdom; which informs him or her via parable, discourse and miracle of the life of that kingdom; and draws his or her existential Christian life into the world to come which Jesus announced had arrived with his arrival. That is the truly distinctive difference a genuine Vosian biblical theology will draw from the gospel of Matthew. France does not do this (though, I venture, he would not be averse to it); but combined with Vos's paradigm, we may learn from them both how to more passionately identify with the kingdom-arena of the son of Abraham, son of David, Son of God. The exegesis from France, the biblical theology from Vos drawing the reader (and hearer) into the truly joyous and transformed existence of the kingdom of heaven both now and forevermore.

—James T. Dennison, Jr.

[*K:NWTS* 22/3 (Dec 2007) 55-58]

Young S. Chae. *Jesus as the Eschatological Davidic Shepherd: Studies in the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism, and in the Gospel of Matthew*. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2006. 417pp. Paper. ISBN: 3-16-148876-8. $108.

This is a specialized study which investigates the eschatological Davidic shepherd motif in its unfolding from the Old Testament through Second Temple Judaism to the New Testament. The version printed by Mohr Siebeck is an "unabridged" version of the author's Ph.D. dissertation at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL. This may explain why there are a number of typographical and printing errors in the text. This does explain the repetitive nature of some of the material—especially the otherwise useful summaries sprinkled along the way. The price will intimidate our readers, driving them to library copies, where available. But seeking and finding this book will be re-

warding to those interested in the biblical-theological continuity of the (Davidic) shepherd of Israel motif.

Chae takes us on a tour of the shepherd-ruler imagery in the Ancient Near East (very brief survey, 19-25); in the major prophetic texts (Mic. 2-5; Ezk. 34-37; Zech. 9-15—32-94); in the literature of Second Temple Judaism (Apocrypha, Qumran, etc.—95-160); and the New Testament (especially the first gospel, 173-246). Since the motif is central to the portrait of David as shepherd-ruler of Israel (1 Sam. 16:11-13; 17:34-37; 2 Sam. 7:8), is recapitulated by the prophets (cf. Is. 40:10-11, Jer. 23:2-5, but especially Micah, Ezekiel and Zechariah) and is incarnated by the Lord Jesus Christ, it is one of many wonderful portraits of our Savior which arches like a canopy over the history of redemption. Chae provides a detailed exegesis of the motif in all three areas noted above. The reader will find jewels of insight in these pages as the Shepherd-Lord is revealed retrospectively and prospectively via the "shepherd of Israel".[1] Divine grace in a new heart (Ezk. 36:26) embraces this Shepherd-King who is also Shepherd-Redeemer. There is much in the exposition of this imagery to warm the heart of the Christian believer. Each section of the book concludes with a summary which succinctly ties up the argument to that point.

In the section on the "Therapeutic Son of David" (279-323), the author connects the healing miracles of Jesus with the pastoral function of the prophetic eschatological Shepherd. Chae does this not only to lend support to his overall thesis, but to parry aberrant (Hellenistic *theios aner* ["divine man"] Christology), even bizarre (Jesus reprises the "Solomon-exorcist legend") Christologies of the gospels. In the process, he also makes some trenchantly critical remarks about E. P. Sanders and his 'Protestantization' theory of Phariseeism in the era of Second Temple Judaism. "[I]n reality, Sanders's description of pre-70 Judaism better resembles our postmodern pluralistic culture which nourishes diversity and tolerance as its foundational virtues" (256). Here is a reminder that E. P. Sanders, J. D. G. Dunn, N. T. Wright and their disciples have simply succeeded in applying the postmodern worldview (or philosophy of life) to the New Testament Scriptures, so that Jesus and first

---

[1] Compare his comments on the virgin birth (186-187) with my "Born of the Virgin Mary," *Kerux: The Journal of Northwest Theological Seminary* 18/3 (December 2003): 16-25.

century Judaism and the apostle Paul "turn out to be mirror images reflecting the spirit of the age in which [their] respective research [was] inspired and conducted." Surely those committed to the antithesis developed by Cornelius Van Til should be able to perceive this. In fact, that so many have been and continue to be snookered by the neo-Bultmanians (Dunn and Wright) is evidence not only of the waning of Van Til's influence in his students, but also of their base ignorance of the game that is being played by the 'big boys' who control the discussion. Citing the recent research of Roland Deines (*Jüdische Steingefäße und pharisäische Frömmigkeit* [1993]; *Die Pharisäer* [1997]; "The Pharisees between 'Judaisms and Common Judaism'," in *Justification and Varigated Nomism* [2001] 1:443-504), Chae concludes that Phariseeism was "normative" Judaism and "the most influential religious movement" in Palestinian Judaism from 150 B.C. to 70 A.D. (262). So much for Jewish "covenantal nomism"; the deconstructing of the sharp clash between Jesus, the disciples and Paul and contemporary (first century) Judaism (i.e., religion of grace versus religion of works-merit); and the New Perspective on Paul re-imaging the apostle as 20/21st century sociology of religion reconstructionist (i.e., the first Christian global village lobbyist).

One of the bonuses of this book is Chae's stimulating reflections on the literary structure of the Old and New Testament pericopes, including helpful (if not always persuasive) chiastic analyses. These outlines are sprinkled throughout the pages of the work.

The least satisfactory and persuasive aspect of his study is the attempt to view the Matthean Great Commission (28:16-20) as a concluding Davidic Shepherd motif (340-71). To do this, Chae must de-emphasize 'Son of God' in Matthew's paradigm for 'reign of God'. In fact, the Trinitarian nature of the conclusion of Matthew's gospel accentuates the Son of God Christology of the gospel as a whole (note especially Mt. 1:21—"Emmanuel"). Perhaps it would be more accurate (more Matthean!) to suggest that the reign of God (Shepherd motif) is brought into the fullness of the history of redemption by the Son of God (Trinitarian Christological motif). And all this is so because the eschatological Davidic Shepherd is at the same time God, the Son, incarnate.

This is a valuable and rewarding study for those working on the Shepherd motif in the Old and New Testament. Christ Jesus is richly displayed in Chae's

careful exegesis of the great Shepherd of the sheep, as that poignant motif unfolds itself across the range of redemptive history.

—James T. Dennison, Jr.

[*K:NWTS* 22/3 (Dec 2007) 58-64]

Guido Stucco. *Not Without Us: A Brief History of the Forgotten Catholic Doctrine of Predestination During the Semipelagian Controversy.* Tuscon, AZ: Fenestra Books, 2006. 294 pp. Paper. ISBN: 1-58736-533-2. $21.95.

In this review I shall provide an overview of the contents of the book including its purpose and conclusions, interact with its scholarship, and draw attention to its contributions to the study of the historical development of the doctrine of predestination.

The purpose of *Not Without Us* is two fold: "to trace the historical development of the Catholic doctrine of predestination and to present a concise summary of the views expressed by ecclesiastical writers during the Semipelagian controversy that took place in the V and VI centuries" (11). The subtitle of the book explains its contents further. According to Stucco, most Catholics are unaware of the church's teachings on predestination, hence the term "forgotten."

Although the subtitle refers to "*the* forgotten Catholic doctrine" in the singular, *Not Without Us* presents three Catholic views of predestination that emerged from the Semipelagian controversy. One position sees predestination simply in terms of divine foreknowledge of free human choices in the future. This was the view of the Semipelagians, Arnobius the Younger and Faustus of Riez. On the other side is the position headed by Augustine and expressed in the writings of Fulgentius of Ruspe. It asserts particular election by God's sovereignty and irresistible grace. A mediating view, that Stucco says is expressed in Prosper of Aquitaine, Pope Leo I, and the Council of Orange, attributes all of salvation to grace, but grace that does not necessarily involve particular election. This view Stucco calls the Magisterial view, the moderate Augustinian view, and "Arausican Spirituality" after the Latin name for the city of Orange. One of the book's conclusions is that a Catholic today has the

freedom to choose, from among these three views, the position most congenial to him (161). According to Stucco, his Catholic upbringing and theological education passed on to him a Semipelagian view of predestination. However, because of his research on the Semipelagian controversy, he has shifted his allegiance to the moderate Augustinian view reflected in the canons of the Second Council of Orange in 529.

A refreshing read, *Not Without Us* is not a sociology of religion text masquerading as historical theology, and Augustine is not the bad guy. While the trend of many church historians is to reduce ecclesiastical controversies to little more than political power struggles, this book is theological throughout. Additionally, the author does not follow that strand of patristic scholarship which portrays Augustine as never having completely abandoned Manichaeism. Stucco's avoidance of these Herculean pillars is laudable.

In the introduction, he lays out four central issues that were debated during the Semipelagian controversy—the origin of a person's faith, the roles of human freedom and God's grace in a person's salvation, predestination, and final perseverance. His observation that certain Semipelagian views eventually became official Catholic doctrine, including the universality of God's grace and the notion of cooperation of the human will in the process of salvation, I found insightful.

Stucco divides the Semipelagian controversy, which lasted over a century, into five phases, moving beyond Rebecca Weaver's 1996 study which separated the debate into two phases. In reality, the Semipelagian controversy is the sum of about twenty different brief historical episodes, each with its own characters stemming from a variety of localities, producing distinctive texts, and wrestling with unique questions, albeit related to the four central issues discussed above. Fulgentius' writings on grace demonstrate the inaccuracy that results from amalgamating these episodes. In 517, Fulgentius in Sardinia and Monimus in Carthage, both adherents of Augustine's theology of grace, corresponded on whether their mentor taught predestination to evil. The fruit of this encounter was Fulgentius' treatise *Ad Monimum.* In 519, a verbal dispute broke out between a Scythian monk named John Maxentius and an Algerian bishop named Possessor, both of whom were residing in Constantinople at the time. The spat erupted over the principle, "It is ours to choose, and God's

to complete," over the canonical status of Faustus of Riez' treatise on grace, and over interpretation of the Pauline passage about Jacob and Esau. Maxentius' views are contained in a letter and a few *libelli*. Maxentius and his followers then wrote to Fulgentius, stated their opinion on these issues, and asked for his response. This resulted in Fulgentius' *Letter 17* written in the name of the African bishops and Fulgentius' *On the Truth of Predestination and Grace*. If a scholar were to summarize Fulgentius' contribution to the Semipelagian controversy as one who took an Augustinian position against Semipelagians, such a statement would be deficient at best. For, while in both episodes Fulgentius touched upon predestination, in the former Fulgentius taught against hyper-predestinarianism, while in the latter he asserted predestination against its deniers. Therefore, although episodes of the Semipelagian controversy contain commonalities, applying the principle of *e pluribus unum* is the best means for full comprehension of the issues. In other words, the whole of the Semipelagian controversy can be grasped optimally when each of the historical episodes with its unique characters, questions, and texts, is thoroughly examined. *Not Without Us* advances scholarship in this direction.

Chapter one focuses upon the Hadrumetum crisis and the disagreement of the Massalians with Augustine's doctrine. It summarizes ten texts from this period including Augustine's *On Grace and Free Will, On Correction and Grace, On the Predestination of the Saints,* and *On the Gift of Perseverance*, John Cassian's *Conference 13 on the Protection of God*, and various letters. To this chapter could be added a letter of Januarius to Valentinus edited by Germain Morin in "Lettres inédites de s. Augustin et du prétre Januarien dan l'affaire des moines d'Adrumète," *Revue Bénédictine* 18 (1901):241-256 at 249-50. When the monks at Hadrumetum were asking for clarification of Augustine's doctrine of grace, their abbot Valentinus wrote to a priest named Januarius for his opinion. Januarius' reply, restricting the word "all" in 1 Timothy 2:4, 1 Corinthians 15:21-22, and Romans 5:18, is significant because it shows that from the very beginning of the Semipelagian controversy Augustine was not alone in such interpretations.

Chapter two treats writings by Prosper of Aquitaine and Arnobius the Younger. Stucco utilizes the best and latest research, attributing both the *Indiculus* and pseudo-Augustinian *Hypomnesticon* to Prosper. The chapter

spends eight pages examining the contents of the *Hypomnesticon* and includes a paraphrase of its sixth chapter which deals with predestination. This is a great contribution to scholarship on Prosper and Semipelagianism, as no English translation of this text exists, and the last English-language study of this text by Chisholm dates from about forty years ago. The study of Arnobius in chapter two of *Not Without Us*, along with the translation of Books 2 & 3 of his *Praedestinatus* in Appendix D, make up the book's main contribution, and is reason enough for patristic scholars and anyone interested in the history of predestination to purchase the book. *Praedestinatus*, dating from the 430s, is a scathing attack on predestination, which is presented as the culmination of all heresies. Existing in very few manuscripts and printed editions, it was recently edited in Volume 25b of Brepols' *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina*. Since Stucco still owns the copyright to *Not Without Us*, I highly recommend that he submit his translation of Arnobius' *Praedestinatus* to the Ancient Christian Writers or Fathers of the Church series. Its publication in one of those series will ensure wider dissemination and perpetuity for the duration of that series.

Because some have attributed *On the Hardening of Pharoah's Heart* to Apponius, and have dated it in the mid-fifth century, Stucco discusses this text in chapter two. However, I think it is better to follow Morin, Plinval, Ferguson, Martinetto, TeSelle, and Di Berardini in attributing it to Pelagius and assigning it before the year 411. The most thorough examination of the Pelagian context of *On the Hardening of Pharoah's Heart* is Appendix Two (pp 313-28) of Carole C. Burnett's dissertation "God's Self-Revelation in the Theology of Pelagius" (Catholic University of America, 1998). However, I am grateful for Stucco's synopsis of this unique patristic text interpreting Romans 9, a treatise which is in need of a critical edition and English translation.

Chapter three of *Not Without Us*, entitled "Fulgentius of Ruspe and Faustus of Riez," begins with an analysis of the contents of Faustus' *De gratia*. Stucco enumerates ten views of Augustinians that Faustus, the quintessential representative of the Semipelagian position, opposed. The chapter then turns its attention to the Augustinian, Fulgentius, giving a five page summary of his *Letter 15*, *Letter 17*, and *On the Truth of Predestination and Grace*, all texts that did not make it into Robert Eno's 1997 translation of selected works of Fulgentius in Volume 95 of Fathers of the Church.

Toward the end of chapter three Stucco reviews the contents of an obscure mid-fifth century pseudo-Fulgentian writing entitled *Liber de praedestinatione et gratia*. Very little secondary literature has been written on it and no English translation of it exists. Nevertheless, it is significant for its correlation of predestination with the attribute of divine timelessness. In the development of this view of predestination, the text serves as a bridge between Augustine in the early fifth century who hinted at it and Boethius in the early sixth century, who elaborated upon it in his *Consolation of Philosophy*.

If there were to be a revision of *Not Without Us*, I would suggest the following change in the order of the texts reviewed in chapter three—that the *Letter of Peter the Deacon* be coupled with Fulgentius' response to it, *Letter 17*; and that Fulgentius' *Letter 15* be joined with his *On the Truth of Predestination*, since *Letter 15* is probably the cover letter to that treatise.

Chapter four, the shortest of them, covers Caesarius of Arles and the Second Council of Orange. It provides a three page summary of Caesarius' brief treatise *De gratia*. This is yet another contribution to scholarship, since little if any secondary literature on it exists. My dissertation, "Fulgentius of Ruspe on the Saving Will of God" (Saint Louis University, 2004), 207-14, contains a translation of it. After Caesarius, chapter four presents the teachings of Orange on grace and free will, and cites many of its canons.

Chapter five is a summary of the major figures, texts, and doctrinal issues of the Semipelagian controversy. Those who have little toleration for Semipelagianism may not be happy with Stucco's refusal to label Semipelagianism as a heresy; others may find it irenic. One feature in this chapter which I have never come across in studies on Semipelagianism is Stucco's relation of these issues with the possibility of the salvation of those who never heard of Jesus (pp. 18, 143-4, 155-6). To me, this seems more reflective of a modern Catholic concern than a question that disquieted the characters in the fifth and sixth century Semipelagian controversy.

In reading the conclusion I found myself becoming defensive at its statement that "the Augustinian party was guilty of escalating the theological debate by invoking the charge of heresy and the label of Pelagianism to discredit their opponents" (p. 154). While the statement may have merit, in my

opinion, the Semipelagians were much nastier in their polemics than the Augustinians. Faustus threatened the priest Lucidius with excommunication because he believed in predestination, and made him subscribe to a document very intolerant of strict Augustinian views. Arnobius called predestinarians heretics and "antichrists." And Vincent of Lerins attributed to the Augustinians the view that when mothers commit incest with their sons they are doing this by the will of God.

Augustinian-minded readers of *Not Without Us* may be pleased with Stucco's assessment that "the Augustinian view of predestination can withstand any biblical and theological objection leveled against it by fellow Christians. In other words, I found no conclusive evidence that it is unbiblical and 'unfounded.' On the contrary, I have concluded that it is logically consistent and that it forms a homogeneous whole" (p. 156).

Appendices A & B contain citations from Scripture pertaining to God's grace and the issues which were debated in the Semipelagian controversy. Appendix C shows the doctrine of grace in various prayers from the Roman Missal, illustrating the tension that still exists between Augustinian and Semipelagian theology in the Roman church's contemporary prayer life. Appendix D contains a seventy page translation of Arnobius' *Praedestinatus*. A bibliography and endnotes follow. Endnotes #287-306 are missing from page 293.

The book has already encouraged me to further research, namely, to seek the identity of Arnobius' opponent in *Praedestinatus*. I narrowed the choices down to Augustine, Quodvultdeus, and Prosper, and discovered that good cases can be made for each. However, I believe I have found literary evidence in Book 3 of *Praedestinatus* that Arnobius' work was directed specifically against Prosper. On page 204 of Stucco's translation Arnobius writes, "We condemn them [the predestinarians] not by resorting to authority but by employing true arguments." This statement seems to be a direct reaction to and stab at Prosper's statement in *On Grace and Free Will Against Cassian the Lecturer*, 21.4: "Accordingly, the wicked errors of such men must be countered less by way of argument than by the weight of authority" (De Letter, *Prosper of Aquitaine: Defense of St. Augustine*, Ancient Christian Writers, 32, p. 136). This literary correspondence may also help date the *Praedestinatus* more ac-

curately. Corroborating my suggestion that Arnobius' nemesis was Prosper is the circumstantial evidence that both were living in or near Rome in the 430s. Arnobius' views on grace are also contained in his Psalms commentary, which may shed light upon the proposed interchange between Arnobius and Prosper on predestination. Interestingly, Prosper also wrote a Psalms commentary during his tenure at Rome. Therefore, the question of a possible relationship between the two Psalms commentaries is worth exploring.

Not Without Us, written a decade after Rebecca Weaver's well-received study of the Semipelagian controversy, makes significant contributions to scholarship. It offers analysis of and commentary upon a host of Latin texts seldom studied, and provides the first English translation of Arnobius' *Praedestinatus*. Stucco is working on a second volume tracing the history of predestination from the Council of Orange to Thomas Aquinas. I very much look forward to it. If it will be anything like this book, I anticipate that it will shed light upon Latin texts on predestination from medieval Christendom that are rarely investigated.

—Francis X. Gumerlock

[*K:NWTS* 22/3 (Dec 2007) 64-71]

Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2003. 288 pp. Cloth. ISBN: 0-19-515701-X. $74.00.

Richard Muller has put together for us in one volume some of his significant articles on seventeenth century Reformed Orthodoxy—articles whose contents did not find their way into the four-volume set of *Post Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*. He has organized these articles around his central thesis—that the older scholarship that forged a wedge between Calvin and later Reformed Scholasticism of the late sixteenth to the early eighteenth century is flawed. This scholarship has wrongly viewed Reformed Scholasticism as discontinuous with the early Reformed tradition, philosophical as opposed to biblical and rhetorical, and legalistic rather than gracious. Muller's articles take on all these claims.

In this effort, Muller shows how the Reformed Orthodox used both philosophy and rhetoric in a way that was consistent with their developments through the Renaissance and Reformation periods. Even the use of Ramist logic among the Reformed shows the use of Renaissance logic as opposed to pure Aristotelian logic. At the same time, Muller thinks that a sharp distinction between Ramism and Aristotelianism is unwarranted.

Muller's primary goal is to show that Scholasticism is a method rather than a philosophy.

In this respect, he shows that scholasticism does not represent a particular philosophical position (whether Platonism, Aristotelianism, Nominalism, or Rationalism). For all of these philosophical traditions are represented among Scholastic theologians. Nor does it represent a particular theological belief, such as a strongly Augustinian view of predestination. For Suarez, Molina, and Arminius were all scholastics even though they were Semi-Pelagians. No, instead, scholasticism represents a method of theological investigation and articulation.

To further support this point, Muller indicates that even among Reformed Scholastics, there were varying philosophical perspectives, ranging from Reconstructed Aristotelians (the majority), to Cartesian (rejected by most but used by some of the Cocceians), to Wolffian Rationalism (Johann Friedrich Stapfer and Daniel Wyttenbach).

Muller provides helpful distinctions of interest to those wanting to understand the Christ-centered approach of Reformed Scholasticism. First he distinguishes the redemptive christocentric approach of Reformed Orthodoxy from the principial christocentrism of Neo-Orthodoxy. Reformed Orthodoxy believed that Christ is the center of Scripture, that is, its central focus as redemptive revelation. However, Neo-Orthodoxy taught that Christ was the "principium cognoscendi theologiae" (97). Presumably Muller has in mind the fact that, according to Neo-Orthodoxy, no one can know anything theologically without first knowing Christ. That is, it rejected natural revelation and taught that there is no natural knowledge of God in man prior to one's knowledge of Christ.

In a chapter on Voetius, Muller lays out Voetius's suggestions for the course of theological study by ministerial candidates. These include a variety of things not found in modern theological studies, including the study of numerous languages such as Arabic and a first hand study of the Koran. Muller notes the connection between Voetius and his student Witsius as well as the connection of both to the *Nadere Reformatie* (110).

Voetius, while a polemical theologian, was concerned with Christian devotion, as seen in his concern for theology as a practical discipline. Muller distinguished this Reformed understanding of practical theology from technique (found in modern notions of practical theology). As Muller states, "in these, as in all of the works noted, 'practical' does not indicate a tendency toward technique or the study of technique: instead, it indicates, as it did in the curricular projects of Bullinger, Hyperius, Voetius, and Witsius, knowledge oriented toward a goal, specifically, the goal of salvation" (120). Technique was taught in writing, meditation, and speaking, but it was only taught as a "necessary adjunct, not as the central discipline" (120).

Muller's discussion of Keckermann's view of natural theology is enlightening. First he shows the positive use of philosophy among the Reformed, summarizing Peter Martyr Vermigli's view that "Paul intends no assault on *vera philosophia* when he attacks worldly wisdom but only a warning against the false inventions of ambitious men and the ineptitude of pagan thinkers" (123). Following this perspective of Vermigli and Melancthon's positive use of philosophy (found in his commentary on Colossians), Muller concludes that Keckermann's positive use of philosophy is not discontinuous with the Reformed tradition, as some have claimed.

Still, there are differences between Keckermann and Vermigli. Vermigli believed that theology was both theoretical and practical, providing a large overlap between theology and philosophy, which deals with theoretical sciences. But Keckermann believed that theology was a practical science, perhaps following the Scotist tradition. Still Keckermann saw overlap between philosophy and theology because he accepted Aristotle's view of philosophy set forth in the Metaphysics. In Aristotle, philosophy is not only theoretical but also practical and concerns the will as much as the intellect, dealing with grammar, rhetoric, logic, mathematics, ethics, economics, and politics. Thus

philosophy and theology deal with many similar areas, presumably in the practical sciences.

Keckermann's view stands in contrast to the view of double truth—the view that something can be false in philosophy but true in theology. Instead, for Keckermann, following the Catholic tradition, it is impossible to have something true in philosophy that is false in theology in the same respect. Muller summarizes Keckermann's arguments for this conviction: "Since philosophy simply does not include within its purview such ideas as the redemption of mankind by the merit of Christ or the resurrection and its causes or the glorification of the body, it can no more refute these concepts than theology, which does not treat of the methods of healing the body, can refute or dismiss medicine" (129). Keckermann's concerns for these issues was connected with his teaching of theology and philosophy in an institution which taught a wide variety of disciplines.

In another chapter, Muller discusses Francis Turretin and his understanding of theology. Muller notes the general question of whether theology is theoretical or practical, reminding us that most in the history of the church believed it was both. However some, like the Thomists, placed more emphasis on the theoretical (or contemplative) side of theology while others (the Franciscans and many of the Reformed, including Turretin) placed the emphasis on the practical aspect of theology. At the same time, Turretin regarded his view, not as one extreme on the pendulum, but as the mean between two extremes, the other extreme being found among the Socinians, who believed that theology was purely practical, in which they were followed by Spinoza.

Muller also suggests that, following this perspective, Turretin took a middle ground on the relation of philosophy to theology. He believed that Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and many of the Medieval Schoolmen had taken over too much philosophy into theology so as to bring Gentile thinking into Christian theology. At the same time, Turretin would not accept the wholesale rejection of philosophy in the study of theology that was found among fanatics. He believed that general philosophy (not the particular philosophical doctrines of the philosophical schools) could be used instrumentally to understand the meaning of Scripture. That is, as Muller points out in another context, theologians can use the tools of logic, rhetoric, etc. in the interpretation of

Scripture and in the formulation of sound doctrine, as well as the refutation of errors.

Moving in a more textual direction, Muller helps his readers see that the Reformed concern to defend the inspiration of the Hebrew vowel points must be seen in its historical context. In the late sixteenth century, Roman Catholic theologians (preeminently Bellarmine) argued that Hebrew scribes had often miscopied the Hebrew letters (which look alike) and had inserted the vowel points with the intention of refuting Christian interpretations of the text. Roman theologians had done this to exalt the Vulgate (which they believed to be inspired) over the Hebrew text, and to conclude that men cannot rely on the Old Testament text alone but must rely upon the Church for its proper interpretation.

In defending the authority of the Hebrew text, most of the Reformed defended the inspiration of the Hebrew vowels points. The elder Buxtorf wrote one of the most extensive defenses of this position in his *Tiberias sive commentarius Masorethicus* (1620). But four years later, his arguments were soundly refuted by Louis Cappel's *Arcanum punctationis revelatum* (149). However, Cappel still attempted to defend the authority of the Hebrew text. The vowel points represented the reading of the Hebrew text as received in the Jewish text. The vowel points ultimately depend upon the Hebrew sentence structure of the original text as displayed in its original Hebrew letters. In this way, Muller believes that Cappel is closer to Calvin, Bullinger, and Vermigli.

At the same time, Muller suggests that the Reformers were not concerned with the inspiration of every letter of the text (not simply of every vowel point) when he states: "Ironically, they maintained this hermeneutic by means of a more rigid view of inspiration of the text than that held by their predecessors, a view that depended (or so it seemed to the early orthodox) on the extension of divine authority beyond the sense of the scripture to the individual words, indeed to their letters and even to the tiny 'jots and tittles' of the system of vocalization" (151). Here Muller suggests that "Calvin, Bullinger, Vermigli, and the other exegetes of the mid-sixteenth century" (the immediately preceding antecedents of the previous sentence) did not believe in the inspiration of every Hebrew letter of the original text. With this the reviewer must strongly disagree. We might have thought that, following his principle of continuity

between the Reformers and their orthodox children, Muller would have argued differently, that because the Reformers held to the inspiration of every word and letter of the original Hebrew text, their orthodox followers were tempted to argue for the very inspiration of the vowel points themselves, when these were attacked.

Muller's chapter on Henry Ainsworth (the Brownist exegete) and his exegetical approach, endeavors to show that Ainsworth focused his Old Testament interpretation on the immediate historical context of the text. Only from there did he further develop its Christological interpretation and that not as extensively as some of his contemporaries. In this respect Muller compares Ainsworth to Calvin, Beza, Perkins, Willet, Rivetus, Diodati, and Poole, and contrasts him to Piscator, the Federal School, Dickson, and Matthew Henry (164). The later gave much more attention to the typological elements of the text in a way that Muller once labels allegorical.

Ainsworth was conversant with Hebrew exegesis including the Talmud and the Mishnah. Muller suggests that he most frequently used Jewish exegesis positively in a way that Muller contrasts to the more frequent polemic against Jewish exegesis in the history of the Christian Church. At the same time, Muller notes an apocryphal story that developed around Ainsworth's death in which he would accept no ransom price for an expensive ring he found (belonging to a Jew) except a meeting with the Rabbis to convince them of the Christian faith. Such a story presumably does not arise from one supportive of Judaism itself.

Muller believes that Ainsworth's exegetical interest in Judaica fits with that of Johannes Buxtorf and notes that it is a generation before the flowing study of Judaica among Reformed exegetes. At the same time he sees no direct influence of Ainsworth upon this later development. Toward the end of this chapter, Muller compares Ainsworth with Andrew Willet on the interpretation of Melchizedek.

Muller concludes his book with an examination of Hermann Witsius and Wilhelmus a Brakel's understanding of the covenant of works and the stability of divine law. His goal in this chapter is to contradict the view that the covenant of works and an unbiblical definition of covenant in Reformed Orthodoxy lead to legalism (the views of Rolston, Torrance, and Poole).

Witsius taught that covenant is a mutual agreement between God and man, thus including promise and law together in his understanding of covenant. Torrance considers this definition to be legalistic, implicitly denying the promissory character of the covenant.

Muller takes on Torrance's criticisms, noting that Witsius believes that promise was fundamental to covenant.

Modern writers like Torrance distinguish between the unilateral and bilateral definitions of covenant, assuming that the unilateral definition fits with a doctrine of Predestination while the bilateral definition does not, the latter rather fitting a synergistic view of salvation. However, following the Reformed tradition, Witsius and Brakel unite the unilateral and bilateral aspects of the covenant. The bilateral nature of the covenant does not undermine the doctrine of the decrees.

Muller notes the background in Calvin for the covenant of works such as the relationship between the natural order and God's good pleasure. In this he points to Bierma and Lillback's interpretations of Calvin. Bierma points to Calvin's use of the right of creation. And Lillback focuses on Calvin's use of the legal relationship between God and Adam, the sacramental aspect of the tree of life, etc. (182). In these points Muller finds consistency between Calvin and the later Reformed tradition on the covenant of works. Torrance does not see this because he overemphasizes Calvin's views on God's grace before the fall and minimizes Calvin's view of Adam's responsibility to God's law.

Muller concludes by showing that the covenant of works actually supports the doctrines of grace and justification. First he notes Witsius's polemic against an opponent who claimed that Adam did not need law before the fall. Next we are lead to see that the law continues its binding force even after the fall. By implication its binding force continues for sinners both before and after grace. On this assumption, it is necessary for Christ to obey the law perfectly on behalf of sinners and to bear their wrath for breaking the law. Therefore, the covenant of works and the continuing validity of the law, rather than producing legalism, actually support the gracious nature of the covenant of grace.

Muller's book is well worth reading for anyone interested in the history of Reformed theology and for clarity on numerous issues in its theological heri-

tage. He also helps us to see the vital aspects of Reformed Scholasticism at various points. Finally, with the glaring exception of his understanding of the Reformers's views on inspiration, this book is a clear refutation in certain areas of the older scholarship, which sought to drive a wedge between Calvin and Reformed Scholasticism. To the extent that that wedge is forged in similar ways by those professing to be Reformed and Orthodox, it is a useful remedy to their misapprehensions. We can only wish that, like Muller's *The Unaccomodated Calvin*, this volume might soon be available in paperback and thereby find a wider audience.

—Scott F. Sanborn