

Introduction

François du Jon (1545–1602), Latinized as Franciscus Junius, was a significant Reformed Protestant voice in the era of late sixteenth-century confessionalization.¹ He is perhaps best known as a professor of theology at Leiden University from 1592–1602. The faculty of Leiden University frequently had the task of solving theological conundrums for the church and sometimes for the state. While the Dutch Reformed Church (NL: *Nederduits Gereformeerde Kerk*, 1571–1795) and the Dutch Republic (NL: *Republiek der Zeven Verenigde Provinciën*, LAT: *Foederatae Belgii Provinciae*, 1581–1795) were both still in their infancy, it was not uncommon for theological, civil, and legal paroxysms to rock both church and state simultaneously. It is in this context of the almost concentric overlap

¹ With respect to the biography of Junius, there is his autobiographical *Vita Francisci Ivnii* available in volume 1 of his 1607 and 1613 *Opera Theologica* (Geneva) respectively, and Abraham Kuypers' overview of his life and works lists the biographical sources of Junius' life from the seventeenth century through the nineteenth century, *D. Francisci Junii Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, Bibliotheca Reformata, vol. 1 (Amsterdam: Muller and Kruyt, 1882), x. One may also consult: *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, ed. P. C. Molhuysen and P. J. Blok (Leiden: Sijthoffs Uitgeversmaatschappij 1911–1935), Deel 9, coll. 481/483; and Eugene and Emil Haag, *La France Protestante* (Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1896), vol. 5, coll. 711–26. See entry "Junius, Franz (du Jon)" by Michael Plathow, in *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexicon* (1992), 3. coll. 885–86.

between a rising republic and a rising national church that the question of the role of the Mosaic polity surfaced. After all, the Dutch Republic, forged as it was in the fires and blood of a religious rebellion against Roman Catholic Spain, was a proud but young Reformed Protestant republic. Thus at some level, if Scripture alone is the authority in the Church for faith and morals and if all of Scripture is inspired and profitable for every good work (2 Tim. 3:16–17), how does it apply in the realm of the Christian State?

Because such a thorny question required both legal and theological acumen, it was a prickly question indeed, layered with many variegated barbs, such as: What role, if any, should the Mosaic law play in the development of a civil legal code? How much of the Mosaic polity applies in light of the promulgation of the gospel in which Christ fulfilled the law? How does the Mosaic law relate to or reflect the natural law? How much of the case law is mutable or immutable? On what grounds? What are the roles of the church and state respectively? What are the proper limits of each in the exposition and institution of morals? What is the relationship between right and law? Is there a difference between a universal or common right and a specific or particular right? How does this impact legislation? Can we distinguish between law for human beings and law for Christian human beings? How is the classic Christian distinction of the Mosaic law into ceremonial law, judicial law, and moral laws coordinated to eternal law, natural law, and human law? How binding is the Mosaic case law? Do the Mosaic capital punishments still apply? How does the Mosaic law regarding the capital offense of idolatry apply to sixteenth-century heresy trials, if at all?

As you can imagine, such a project has many moving parts in order to answer these and related questions. In the Dutch Reformed context of the last decade of the sixteenth century, for a person to even attempt an answer to such a question, he must first have unquestioned ability in the original languages of the Bible, deep familiarity with Scripture, trusted academic training and expertise in Christian theology, grounding and proficiency in the study of law and rights, pastoral sensibility, and impeccable creedal and confessional credentials. Perhaps most of all, he would have to have had the wisdom to know when to stop. That is quite a tall order for one person. Following by way of introduction is a brief account of how Junius was uniquely equipped for such a momentous task in the late sixteenth-century Dutch Reformed context.

A Brief Overview of Junius' Life

Junius was born in Bourges, France, into a family of minor nobility with all of the attendant social and educational advantages of one of such rank. At the age of twelve, Junius matriculated at the academy of Bourges and studied law under the Huguenot jurist, François Douaren (1509–1559) who is recognized as a major voice in articulating the *mos gallicus* school of applying the fruits of Italian humanism to the legal code of Justinian.² Junius also studied under the renowned French humanist, Huguenot, and jurist Hugues Doneau (1527–1591). Doneau, or Latinized Hugo Donellus, was perhaps best known for his application of French humanism to a study of Justinian's *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, specifically the *Digesta*. Junius would imbibe of these studies deeply, and the maturation of these studies is evidenced in the marginalia and citations of the classical Greco-Roman legal tradition of the translation below.

With the Franco-Ottoman alliance beginning in 1536 against the Holy Roman Empire and by extension various allied city-states in Italy, there were frequent French diplomatic envoys crossing from Toulon to Istanbul. In 1560, due to his facility in Greek and law, Junius secured a diplomatic position as an aide to the French ambassador to the court of Suleiman I (1494–1567). Junius, however, did not journey to Constantinople because he literally missed the boat, or rather the entourage that departed from Lyon heading to the Mediterranean coast for passage to Constantinople. For the next two years, he lived instead in Lyons studying and attending lectures on the Greek and Roman classics. It was also during this time that he was nearly persuaded to become an atheist after hearing lectures on Cicero's *De natura deorum* and in confronting Epicurus' arguments against God's providence. In a state of despair, he read the first half of chapter 1 of John's gospel and was overwhelmed by the sense of "the divinity of the argument as well as the majesty and authority of what was written."³ From this point on, Junius resolutely committed himself in devotion to God to a study of Scripture.

Shortly thereafter, Junius decided to enter the French Reformed Church, and just shy of his seventeenth birthday, in the midst of the Huguenot wars in France,

² Jochen Otto, "Duaren, François," in *Juristen: ein biographisches Lexikon; von der Antike bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Michael Stolleis, 2d ed. (Münich: Beck, 2001), 186.

³ Haag, *La France Protestante*, vol. 5, coll. 714–15.

Junius arrived in Geneva on March 17, 1562, to study under Calvin and Beza. Although of noble birth, his income was severed due to the revolt in France as well as to the murder of his Protestant father, reducing him to the severest poverty while he studied for three years. In April of 1565 and almost twenty years of age, he accepted a call to pastor a Walloon church in Antwerp, Belgium.

It was during this period in Antwerp that Junius took part in shepherding the Belgic Confession through the ecclesiastical channels in the Reformed church for formal recognition at the Synod of Antwerp. Although prepared in 1561 primarily by Guido de Bres with the assistance of H. Modestus and G. Wingen, Junius was tasked with a slight modification and abridgment of Article 16 of the Belgic Confession.⁴ Junius also played an active role in distributing copies of the Belgic Confession to Geneva and other Reformed churches for feedback and for reaching a broader consensus. In 1566, the Synod of Antwerp was the first synodical body to adopt the Belgic Confession, followed by the Synod of Wesel (1568), and the Synod of Emden (1571).

In early 1566, King Philip II of Spain allowed the inquisition to come to the Netherlands. Throughout the Netherlands, there was a general uproar that resulted in iconoclastic excess, of which Junius did not take part or encourage. There is a famous period picture of unknown authorship of Junius preaching at night to his Antwerp congregation in a room lit through the windows by the fires of Walloon Protestant martyrs in the public square.⁵ Junius also made his political voice known in a published appeal to the King of Spain on behalf of the Walloon churches that was printed in French (1565) as well as in German (1566).⁶ One of the accords William of Orange reached with Philip II of Spain on September

⁴ Philip Schaff, *Creeeds of Christendom*, 6th ed. (Harper & Brothers, 1919) 1:504–6, especially note 964.

⁵ William E. Griffis, *Belgium: The Land of Art: Its History, Legends, Industry, and Modern Expansion* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1919), 199.

⁶ *Brief discovrs envoye' av roy philippe nostre Sire & souuerain Seigneur, pour le bien & profit de sa Maieste, & singulierement de ses pais bas: auquel est monstre le moyen qu'il faudroit tenir pour obuier aux troubles & emotions pour le fait de la Religion, & extirper les sectes & heresies pululantes en ses dits pais (1565); Ein kurz Christlichs Bedencken der Koniglichen Wurdten in hispania herrn Philippo & c zu geschichte Wie man aller hand auffruren vnd enthdrungen so in deren Niederlanden von wegen der Religion zu fesorgen moge begegnen vnd die Secten vnd Rekereien so des orts teglichs erwachsen auszrotten (1566).*

2, 1566, only protected ministers and preachers who were natives of the Low Countries.⁷ As a result, Junius fled to Limburg. Still exposed to threats from Roman Catholics and Anabaptists, he fled again to Heidelberg. The year 1568 places Junius in Heidelberg. Following a brief tenure as pastor of a Reformed Church at Schonau, and an even briefer stint as a chaplain in a failed military campaign to the Netherlands, Junius returned to his pastorate at Schonau until 1573.

The period from 1573 to 1578 was marked by an extraordinary contribution to Reformed biblical studies in the period of Reformed Protestant orthodoxy. In one edition or another, the Tremellius-Junius translation of the Bible shaped Protestant—and especially Reformed—theology and dogmatics well into the late eighteenth century. During this period, Junius was partner to a distinctively Reformed Protestant translation of the Scriptures from the original languages into Latin. He embarked on this work with famed Hebraist, Giovanni Emmanuele Tremellio (1510–1580), or Tremellius. Tremellius was an Italian-Jewish scholar and graduate from the humanist bastion of the University of Padua, a convert to Roman Catholicism (1540) and then to Protestantism (1541). Tremellius was also imprisoned briefly for a period in the 1550s as a Calvinist. As a Hebrew professor, Tremellius' career took him to academies and universities at Strasbourg (1541–1549), Cambridge (1549–1553), Heidelberg (1561–1577), and then Sedan (1577–1580). Both of these scholars were skilled in Hebrew, Aramaic, and its cognates of Syriac and Chaldee, as well as Arabic, Greek, and Latin.⁸ The first edition of the Tremellius-Junius Bible appeared in 1579 and enjoyed three further recensions by Junius (1581, 1593, 1602), with the most popular recensions being the second (1581) and the fourth (1602). The Tremellius-Junius Bible was published in Frankfurt, Amsterdam, London, Geneva, Hanover, and Zürich with over thirty-three different printings between 1579 to 1764. The Tremellius-Junius translation of the Old Testament was frequently paired as well with Theodore Beza's Latin translation of the New Testament.

In 1576 upon the death of Frederick III, Elector of the Palatinate and staunch adherent of Reformed Protestantism, he was succeeded by his Lutheran son, Louis VI. Under the tenet of *cuius regio, eius religio* (whoever's region, that one's religion), Heidelberg became Lutheran again. The Reformed faculty and

⁷ *La France Protestante*, vol. 5, col. 716.

⁸ It was also during this period in his spare time that Junius published a translation of the Epistles of John in Latin from Arabic.

students who refused to sign the Formula of Concord (1577) were driven out of the University of Heidelberg in 1577. Over the discord from the Formula of Concord, in approximately 1578–1579 Johann Casimir von Pfalz-Simmern (1543–1592), Frederick III's brother and also an ally of the Reformed, founded the *Casmirianum Collegium* (1579–1583) at Neustadt. Junius was among the faculty at the newly formed and short-lived college with one of the primary authors of the Heidelberg Catechism, Zacharias Ursinus (1534–1583), who had become a friend beginning in his days in Heidelberg. Junius would later deliver the funeral oration upon Ursinus' death in Neustadt.

It was very likely during this period at Neustadt in his lectures on the Psalms that Junius would first articulate his hermeneutical method for interpreting the psalms as well as his distinctive understanding of *foedus*, *pactum*, and *testamentum* articulated in his commentaries on Genesis as well as his theological theses.⁹ In 1583 upon Louis VI's death, Casimir became regent for his young nephew and future elector, Frederick IV, and thus Heidelberg crossed from Lutheran hands into Reformed hands once again. At this time, after Ursinus' death, Junius was invited back as professor of theology to Heidelberg, a post he would hold until the late 1580s. While here, Junius' engaged in the writing of biblical commentaries, political tracts and letters, and theological theses for his students' practice disputations. One of his most significant contributions from this period is his work *Sacrorum Parallelorum* (3d ed., 1588), which was a comparison, correlation, and commentary on all the Old Testament passages in the New Testament.¹⁰

At some point in the late 1580s through early 1592, Junius was involved in diplomatic conversations and missions for the duke of Bouillon in France and Germany at the close of the Huguenot wars and in personal conversation with Henry IV of Navarre, king of France. It was during this time that the curators of the University of Leiden persistently beseeched Junius to consider a professor-

⁹ *Psalms Ci. Principis Christiani Institutio. a Davide Rege et Viro Dei Perscripta: et Aperta analysi commodaq; ad rationes temporum nostrorum commentatione a Fr. Ivnio Biturige illustrata: ... Ad Illustrissimvm Principem Fridericvm Iiij. Electorem Palatinum, &c.* (Heidelberg : Hieronymus Commelinus, 1588); *Protoktisia, Seu Creationis A Deo Factae, Et In Ea Prioris Adami Ex Creatione Integri & ex lapsu corrupti, Historia* (Heidelberg, 1589).

¹⁰ *Sacrorum Parallelorum libri tres: id est, Comparatio locorum Scripturae sacrae, qui ex Testamento vetere in Novo adducuntur*; 3d ed. (London: G. Bishop, 1588).

ship in theology at the University of Leiden. In early 1592, Junius accepted the position of *professor primarius*.

While at Leiden, Junius authored the work before us now as well as a significant work on theological prolegomena, *De Vera Theologia*. The content of *De Vera Theologia* became a cornerstone of Reformed, scholastic theology, surviving well into late nineteenth-century Reformed theologians such as Herman Bavinck. Themes and hints of the *De Vera Theologia* even found their way into such seventeenth-century Lutheran scholastics as Andreas Quenstedt and Johannes Gerhard's *Loci Communes*. In this work, Junius not only outlines the archetypal/ectypal relationship as the basis for understanding the Creator/creature distinction but also for understanding theology and the necessity of Scripture for human beings fallen in sin, but striving as pilgrims or wayfarers for the blessed *visio Dei*. This work first appears in print in Leiden in 1594, two years after he employs the archetypal/ectypal understanding of the Creator/creature distinction in explaining natural law and its relationship to the Mosaic polity.

In 1602 upon his death, it was Junius' chair of theology (and house on the Rapenburg in Leiden together with most of the furniture) that Jacobus Arminius filled after Junius' death in the plague that struck Leiden. No less than the world-renowned historian and humanist Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540–1609) composed these words upon Junius' death for the bereaved Leiden university community:

*You, O mourning school, weep for your teacher!
You, O bereft Church, your parent!
Your doctor, O whole wide world, lament!*¹¹

Scholarly Reminders on the Translation Proper

As to comments on the translation proper, a translator's introduction frequently sounds, it seems, like a series of disclaimers or apologetic warnings. In a sense, this is so; for if it were not, why would one need a translator's introduction? Perhaps it is better to speak of scholarly reminders then.

¹¹ Junius, *Opuscula theologica*, ix.

*Te moerens scola flet suum magistrum
Orba ecclesia, te suum parentum
Doctorem gemit orbis universus.*

First and foremost, Junius is writing almost 175 years prior to the publication of Jean-Jacque Rousseau's 1762 *Du contrat social ou Principes du droit politique*. Rousseau's work is a significant piece of Enlightenment legal theory and forever shaped the way the West thought about laws and rights. On the other hand, Junius' project stands squarely in the midst of terms and theories derived from the classic jurists of Rome and Athens, Justinian's sixth-century *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, and the classic natural-law tradition of much of the Western Christian legal tradition. Junius is in many ways farther in thought, rather than time, from the Enlightenment treatises and trends that would sweep the currents of Western political and legal thought away from its moorings in Greco-Roman as well as Christian natural-law theories. For example, Rousseau frequently maintains that human beings are good but corrupt through society. In theological terms, Rousseau speaks with a Pelagian lisp. Junius, on the other hand, maintains that human beings once were good but are now corrupt through sin. In theological terms, Junius speaks with an Augustinian accent. Such deep-rooted changes in thought inevitably mean changes in terms. Thus, to contemporary ears more attuned to Rousseau, the older Christian legal tradition that grew for approximately a millennium may sound foreign.

Second, there is a significant and somewhat ambiguous divide—not quite a chasm—between modern usage of the terms *law* and *right*. Even today, there is a great amount of disagreement as to whether we can or even should speak about intrinsic rights or natural law. As such, the modern English usage is notoriously vague as to what one means by the phrase, for example, rule of law. Is it the rule of law as enacted by a particular governing authority or administration? Otherwise, is it the *rule of law* as laying claim to higher principles and issues of intrinsic, universal merit? Is it law as power or law as reason? Is it law as enacted or is it law as principle? In older terms, the former typically means “law” or *lex*, and the latter “right” or *ius*. For the purposes of this translation, I have endeavored to maintain Junius' clear and rather distinct usage of Latin between a *lex* and a *ius* by translating the former as law and the latter as right. For example, Junius does not speak for the most part of a Mosaic *ius*, but rather of the Mosaic *lex* as a system that reflects dependence upon the archetypal character of God. Thus, in striving for clarity in this modern translation to arrive at what Junius is doing in the text with these terms, I beg your patience, dear reader. What sounds perhaps artificial to a modern ear is actually a rather old, and as it were, original distinction in the legal vocabulary of the late sixteenth century. We may speak of

the “law of the land” in colloquial terms and, as Americans do, say that human beings “are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights,” and in so doing, we hearken back to a meaning much closer to the intent of Junius if we attend closely to the distinction. Furthermore, for example, in this translation I have carefully refrained from translating *commune ius*, as a “common law,” and instead employed a “common right.” It is true that one must take care when translating *civilis ius* for it frequently means a civil right but also may mean a civil code. One way, perhaps, to sort through this issue is to note that the jurisdiction of a *lex* is generally tied to a regime, a territory, a time period, and so forth, whereas a *ius* is universal. Perhaps one road through the forest is to remember that we moderns are familiar with the distinction that something may be legal (tied to the *lex* as it were) but may not meet the standards of justice or what is just (appealing to the *ius* that transcends a particular system). How often have we heard the complaint, “It may be legal, but it isn’t fair!”? That one statement highlights the conceptual difference Junius generally employs between *lex* as system and *ius* as right or principle of right.

Third, for the benefit of the scholar, the marginalia of Junius have been included in the translation in several ways. First, all Scripture citations in the original text occurred in the marginalia as citations of chapters without verses. These citations appear in this translation within the body of the text. Second, the marginalia of specific citations of philosophers, theologians, and jurists are included in the text as footnotes. Additionally, the Latin or Greek texts of the citations appear in the footnotes if known and rare. If, for example, the citation is from Augustine, it is assumed there is broad enough access to find the work. On the other hand, other quotes of harder-to-find authors are included in the footnotes. It is this translator’s opinion that Junius is frequently working from legal *florilegia* and topical *compendia* for these quotes. For example, in chapter 1 when Junius cites Chrysippus, more than likely Junius found this in an edition of Marcianus, book 1 *Institutes*, in which the exact quote of Chrysippus that Junius employs appears. When possible, I have endeavored to include citations to critical editions of these texts. It is also worth mentioning that besides reading this text with a copy of the Christian Scriptures readily available, one should also have a copy of the *Corpus Iuris Civilis* available as well. Several critical editions and translations are available. As to the Latin text of Scripture to which Junius refers, it may also serve as a helpful reminder that Franciscus Junius and Immanuel Tremellius published perhaps the most significant Protestant Latin

translation of the Christian Bible in 1579, which did not drop out of print until the mid-to-late eighteenth century, running through over twenty-five editions in Geneva, London, Amsterdam, Frankfurt, and Zürich. Junius personally produced three recensions after the first edition between 1579 and his death in 1602. Given that this piece was penned in 1592, citations of Scripture that may sound odd to readers of English translations of the Bible or even to those familiar with the Latin Vulgate or the *Glossa Ordinaria*, should be compared against the second and perhaps third edition of the Tremellius-Junius Bible.

Finally, in seeking to produce a modern translation, I have sought to distinguish between *homines* as human beings or persons and *viri* as men, rather than the frequent issue of older translations in which man stands in for both. That being said, in translating an early modern theologian who did not think in gender neutral terms or hold to egalitarian views regarding the sexes, this translator did not greatly agonize over whether it is appropriate to force a twentieth-century-stylistic question on a sixteenth-century author's text. It is my sincerest hope that this will not hinder the usefulness of this text or its readability but instead convey a transparency or clarity of Junius' thought to the reader.

Learning from and Improving upon Junius' Work

One point that is certainly striking in considering the relevance of a premodern theological work of this nature is the depth of its interdisciplinarity. Despite the fact that Junius insists in his letter to the nobles of Holland that he will stay within the bounds of a theologian who knows his place, one wonders if there was a judicial complement who had studied theology, languages, and classics as closely and with as much distinction as Junius had studied law. This work as well as Junius' scholarly caliber forms also a counterpoint and rebuke to overcome the frequent stereotype that humanism and scholasticism are necessarily antithetical. In Junius, we have one theologian who was trained as a humanist upon legal and classical sources, formally cultivated the study of biblical languages and hermeneutics, contributed to the development of theological systems, thoroughly engaged in pastoral praxis and confessional development, and managed to maintain a modest sobriety about his role as a theologian. Yet, how many opportunities did Junius have to address matters of state and civil polity whether as diplomat, pastor, or theologian? Furthermore, Junius and his work stand as a beacon and call for the interconnectivity, engagement, and distinctness of philosophy, culture, society, civil polity, and theology.