제14회 칼빈학술세미나 프랑수아 투레티니 출생400주년 기념

프랑수아 투레티니의 작품을 통해 보는 신학과 설교

일시: 2022. 5. 23 화요일 오후2시

장소: 개혁주의학술원 유튜브 채널

발표1- Nicholas Cumming (Pepperdine Univ.)

Luther vs. the Lutherans:
The Reception and Authority of Martin Luther and Philip Melanchthon in Francis Turretin's (1623-87) Institutio Theologiae Elencticae (1679-85)

발표2- 권경철 박사(열린교회 부목사)

목회자 투레티니가 본 구약의 그리스도:
10개의 소논문과 설교를 중심으로

개혁주의학술원
Korean Institute for Reformed Studies

Luther vs. the Lutherans: The Reception and Authority of Martin Luther and Philip Melanchthon in Francis Turretin's (1623-87) Institutio Theologiae Elencticae (1679-85)

Introduction

In 1679 the Reformed scholastic theologian Francis Turretin published the first volume of what would become his massive *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*.[i] In his dedication to the civil magistrates of the city of Geneva, Turretin wrote that he "can solemnly testify before God that no other object was ever proposed to me than that I might always follow my predecessors."[ii] Though speaking about his position as the Chair of Theology at Geneva's Reformed Academy, Turretin's appeal to his "predecessors" speaks volumes in terms of his overall theological system: continuity. This continuity, though, was not simply amongst his theological peers, but with a long tradition, as he viewed it, of orthodox Christian belief.[iii] However, contrary to what one might think, "continuity" for Turretin is not defined so narrowly as to include only his immediate predecessors (Jean Diodati, Theodore Tronchin) or even the founders of his particular brand of Protestantism (John Calvin, Theodore Béza). When making his case, Turretin pulls from a wide variety of historical sources to produce a Reformed orthodoxy.[iv] It is this article's goal to expand scholars' scope to include the reception of reformers not usually deemed "Reformed" in Turretin's *Institutes*, rather than focusing exclusively on more common figures like John Calvin and Theodore Béza. This article will show clearly that Turretin's concept of tradition and authority in his works was more generous than simply sticking to Calvin. Turretin received a wide-variety of works across the Reformation era and utilized them liberally as he conceived of his own defense of Reformed orthodoxy in the seventeenth century.

As indicated by the tongue-in-cheek title of this article, I intend to analyze Turretin's use of Martin Luther (1483-1546) and Luther's protégé Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560) in the development of his theological polemics against Lutherans and Catholics in the late-seventeenth

century. Turretin and these two theologians overlap in their concern for Protestant, or evangelical, theology, but the circumstances of their lives and writings are substantially different. Luther and Melanchthon were blazing new trails in sixteenth-century Europe; Turretin was solidifying Protestant orthodoxy in an age of continued reform and a revitalized, post-Council of Trent Catholic Church. The reception of Luther and Melancthon in post-Reformation works is a growing field of scholarship and this makes Turretin's use of the original Reformers vital in understanding the development of Protestantism one hundred and sixty years after Luther's first protest.

1 Reception Historiography

Early trends in reception history in the early modern period have largely centered on Reformation theologians' reception of the Church Fathers.[v] Irena Backus looking at the Reformed theologians Abraham Scultetus (1566-1624) and André Rivet (1571/3-1651) illustrates the critical reception of Basil of Caesarea's works not only as authoritative theological texts, but also as being authentically the works of Basil to begin with.[vi] With considerable nuance, Backus concludes that in the case of Scultetus and Rivet, Reformed reception of the Patristics was convoluted and far from uniform. Scultetus was more willing to reject out-of-hand Basil's works that were "*a priori* opposed to Calvinist doctrines and might thus be useful to his Roman Catholic adversaries" and yet still accepted Basil's conclusions concerning the Trinity, the Incarnation, and other important "catholic" doctrines.[vii] Backus also argues that the return to the Patristics was a part of the larger Renaissance trend of returning to the sources of Western history.[viii] This took two forms, one scholarly and one popular. From the perspective of the schools, Patristic study provided access to larger Patristic works and many scholars began to move away from the pithy *sententiae* and towards a more holistic corpus. Second, the *devotio moderna* of late-Medieval lay piety also focused on retrieving the "patristic piety" of the early church.[ix] From a more theological point-of-view, E. P. Meijering convincingly

illustrates that the Reformed of the seventeenth century did not at face value subscribe to the idea that a *consensus patrum* was sufficient in a doctrine's orthodoxy.[x] Rather, one needed to place the Fathers *contra* scripture to determine their veracity. This was even the case of Turretin, who, according to Meijering, was familiar with the critical reception of the Fathers in the scholarship of his contemporaries and yet utilized the sources as evidence for the orthodoxy of certain views.[xi]

In more recent historiography, scholars have begun to narrow their parameters, examining, in particular, the reception of Calvin in later Reformed theology.[xii] This narrowing, however, has come simultaneously with the thesis that Calvin was *not* the sole font of Reformed theology, but rather one of many sources utilized by the Reformed after the Reformation.[xiii] In recent works, then, the reception of the first- and second-generation Reformers has still been limited to primarily looking at Calvin's influence, whether explicit or implicit, in later Reformed works. The reception of Martin Luther and Philip Melanchthon have been studied in their broader Reformed context, though. Recent works have uncovered the multifaceted uses of Luther and Melanchthon in the works of Reformed theologians since the Reformation.[xiv]

Beginning early in the Reformation period, Protestants of all stripes had to deal with the issue of "innovation"; were they *really* members of the universal church or were they schismatics who had brought new ideas into the faith? Reformed Christians, therefore, could not escape the work and writings of Martin Luther.[xv] Karin Maag's work examining early Reformed historiography notes that Luther's reputation shifts over time. Luther goes from the "starting point of the Reformation", to "God's instrument", to simply a "Great Man" in the works of Reformed historians who were trying to explain what happened at the Reformation. In each of these views, Luther's flaws could still be present though he was recognized for his important contributions.[xvi] The use of Luther's theology and appeal to Luther as an authority were very mixed in the seventeenth century,

and often Luther was utilized against the "Lutherans" as not being in line with Luther's original thought.[xvii]

Works on the reception of Melanchthon in the twentieth century often focused on his influence on later Protestant scholastics.[xviii] Andreas Beck, though, refutes this idea as being too disjointed. There were many influences upon later Protestant scholastics and Melanchthon was one important voice amongst many.[xix] Additionally, Anthony Milton's work on the reception of Melanchthon in England in the post-Reformation period is enlightening. He illustrates that Melanchthon was used by both anti-Calvinists and Puritans as authoritative depending on the circumstance. For anti-Calvinists in the late-seventeenth century, Melancthon was a key source against Puritanism, and Milton shows how writers like Thomas Pierce and Peter Heylyn connected the Anglican church of the seventeenth century back to the moderating influence of Melanchthon in the sixteenth.[xx] However, Melanchthon was also cited by pro-congregationalist ministers in the 1640s and his devotional writings were translated and published by Puritans in the late-sixteenth century, as well.[xxi] Various sects, then, tried to claim Melanchthon as an authority, though his conclusions were hard to pin-down for one side or the other in England during the Tudor and Stuart periods. This article seeks to ameliorate this problem to a degree by examining the broader reception of first-generation Reformers in later Reformed orthodoxy, but expanding it beyond Calvin and Béza.[xxii]

Reception history, as a field, however, can be rife with difficulties. Carl Trueman has illustrated convincingly that reception history is more than simple attribution of an idea.[xxiii] Trueman points out that the idea of reception as simple attribution resulted in scholarship that oversimplified the development of tradition. If a seventeenth-century "Calvinist" wanted to be a "pure Calvinist," according to older scholarship, then his formulations and conclusions needed to line-up with Calvin's. This essay will be utilizing Trueman's category of reception as "historical action."[xxiv]

According to Trueman, the newer threads of reception history are driven by the ways in which earlier authors were used by later authors in the new context. For instance, Francis Turretin as a seventeenth-century theologian from Geneva, is writing in a particular context with an identifiable goal: to defend Reformed orthodoxy. As such, the question is less of "how does this formula correspond to Calvin and the Reformers" and instead "how has Francis Turretin utilized his theological forbearers in his novel context?" As Trueman notes, this important nuance protects against scholarship sliding back into too simple of categories, like the discredited "Calvin vs. the Calvinist" thesis of the mid-twentieth century.[xxv]

Another issue to hand, though, is the sheer idea that one can adequately chart reception as an historian. Quentin Skinner has argued in the past that one can overemphasize what can be known, historically, about the development of a tradition.[xxvi] Even explicit attribution (i.e. citation of a source) is not always enough to establish a clear lineage of thought. For instance, one promising avenue of scholarship into the seventeenth-century Reformed is the idea of "silent Aquinas".[xxvii] This thesis argues that behind many Reformed scholastics is Aquinas (or Scotus or Lombard, etc.) and the writer has not made that resource explicit. There are certainly confessional reasons one might not want to do this (i.e. fear of excommunication for utilizing an "unorthodox" or "heterodox" source), but it is equally likely that the author simply assumes an intellectual legacy due the nature of early modern education. It was still the norm for students in theology to write glosses on the great theologians of the Middle Ages, like Aquinas or Lombard. The reception of a person's theology or the citation of a work as a source, therefore, may be saying much more than the author intended, knew, or needed to record. This is particularly difficult when it comes to someone like Turretin who is writing in a post-Reformation context, but with the methods of "school" theology extending back to the Middle Ages. Trueman's "historical action" category becomes even more important in light of this issue, as instead of addressing whether one is "true" to any particular person, the question

becomes more about the use of that person's work in a new context. However, as Reformed orthodoxy is itself diverse and variegated, it will be necessary to limit our scope to a particular exemplar of the tradition, namely Francis Turretin (1623-87).[xxviii] Ultimately, this article argues that the use of Luther and Melanchthon in Francis Turretin's *Institutes* was fluid and scattered, and it is difficult to ascertain an exact system for how or why Luther and Melanchthon would be cited. What is not difficult to discern, though, is that Luther and Melanchthon were considered legitimate and authoritative Reformers by Turretin, whose works could buttress an argument substantially against both his Catholic opponents as we as against the Lutherans themselves.

Turretin was born in 1623 in Geneva and served in a variety of pastoral and academic roles. He worked as the minister to the Italian congregation in Geneva for the majority of his life while simultaneously teaching as Professor of Theology in the Academy of Geneva from 1653 until his death in 1687. Turretin also studied under theologians at the academies in Leiden, Paris, Nîmes, and Saumur where he defended his theses *Concerning the Written Word of God and its Origins.* Therefore, Turretin had a diverse education throughout the Reformed centers of early modern Europe; he is, however, recognized primarily as a defender of Reformed orthodoxy against the hypothetical universalism of several of his colleagues in Geneva and for his support of the *Helvetic Formula Consensus.*[xxix]

Turretin's *magnum opus*, the *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* (1679-85) were written in an era of intense polemics, not only between Protestants and Catholics, but also amongst the Reformed communities of early modern Europe. Of primary concern to the Reformed, were the issues *du jour*: the non-imputation of Adam's sin, the inspiration of the Hebrew vowel points of the Masoretic texts, and the doctrine of hypothetical universalism. In Turretin's ecclesial and academic contexts, these three issues were of primary importance. Beginning with Moses Amyraut (1569-1664), the Reformed Academy of Saumur had become a bastion of heterodoxy.[xxx] Amyraut himself was a

proponent of hypothetical universalism, while his colleagues Josué de la Place (1596-1665), and Louis Cappel (1585-1658) promoted the non-imputation of Adam's sin, and the non-inspiration of the Hebrew vowel points, respectively.[xxxi] *Contra* Saumur, Turretin, Lucas Gernler (1625-1675) of Basel, and John Henry Heidegger (1633-1698) of Zurich issued the *Helvetic Formula Consensus* (1675), which denied the theology of Saumur and presented a Swiss refutation.[xxxii] The *Consensus* was finally adopted in Geneva in 1679, the same year as Turretin's first volume of the *Institutes*. In the midst of these intra-confessional issues, though, were the continued differences between Reformed and Lutheran Protestants. It is in this divided era of Protestantism that Turretin developed his own version of Reformed orthodoxy and used diverse sources to show, in his view, a clear unity among Protestant authorities.

The *Consensus*, however, like most confessions is light on extra-biblical authorities. There are, of course, significant *implicit* authorities, as when the writers assume traditional Christian doctrines, but there is very little explicit sourcing in the *Consensus*. As Protestants, the only true source of orthodoxy was scripture, and the *Consensus* does not skimp on its use of Bible. In order to understand the broader context of early modern authority, then, this article will examine Turretin's arguments found in the *Institutes*. Because this venture can quickly expand beyond the scope of this article, it will necessary to limit our examination to only those instances where Luther and Melanchthon are explicitly mentioned. Though Turretin would have surely looked to closer authorities (particularly his father Bénédict Turretin and his mentor Friedrich Spanheim) as sources of orthodox theology, this article's aim is to understand how Turretin internalized the early Reformation reforms and the works of these two important theologians outside of his own confessional association.

2 Turretin's Reception of Martin Luther

Turretin was born more than a century after Luther's original protest in 1517. Indeed, Turretin's

career did not begin in earnest until well after the deaths of Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, and even

Theodore Beza (d. 1605). By the time of the first printing of Turretin's *Institutes* in 1679, the religious

context of continental Europe had changed drastically. Understanding Turretin's use of theologians

a century prior, then, should be done with care. Throughout the *Institutes* Luther is identified as an

authoritative voice at the Reformation. One of the first references to Luther made explicit in the

Institutes is on the question of whether or not God is the author of sin.[xxxiii] In orthodox Reformed

theology God's providence is active in all human choices; God is not simply a spectator. The

constant retort to this doctrine, even during the time of Augustine against the Pelagians, was that

this meant that God caused sin. Turretin unequivocally denies this assertion. Unlike the Pelagians (or

Julian of Eclanum) during the time of Augustine, Turretin claims that one major opponent of his

theology was the "Lutherans". Primary Lutherans that Turretin identifies are Caspar Brochmand

(1585-1652), Heinrich Eckhard (1582-1624), and Albert Graverus (1575-1617). Each of these had

produced his own works of systematic theology and they articulated a view that though the

Reformed do not explicitly state that God is the author of sin, that Reformed theology naturally

leads to this conclusion.[xxxiv] As a first level defense against these Lutheran scholastics, Turretin

appeals to a variety of confessions. In other words, the public declarations of the Reformed church

are more than enough to refute these accusations. However, Turretin takes it a step further citing

individual theologians, one of which being Luther.[xxxv]

Turretin utilizes Luther in particular as a defense against the Lutherans; if the Lutherans are

going to claim that the Reformed are harsh, then they need to realize that Luther, at times, is

harsher. For instance, Turretin claims that the Reformed have not said anything in their confessions

or theology that reaches the level of severity as Luther and others. Turretin quotes *On the Bondage of

the Will* (1525) where Luther addresses Pharaoh's "heart hardening" in Ex. 7-12. Luther explained

that God's hardening of Pharaoh's heart cannot be considered simply "permission" on God' part; God is causing, "operating", or "making it so" that Pharaoh's heart is hardened. Turretin summarizes pithily that "if these have a sound sense in the judgement of Lutherans, why can they not explain the words of our divines kindly also from the same charitable judgement?"[xxxvi] What Turretin's argument hinges on is his assertion that though words can be at times insufficient to explain difficult concepts, theologians should utilize charity in judging their intent. Here again he cites Luther to make his point, "it is wicked to determine heresy in words, since it is in the meaning alone, not in the words."[xxxvii] If the Lutherans can give charity to Luther in *Bondage* why is it that they declare heresy when confronted with similar propositions from the Reformed?

Again, Luther is utilized in Turretin's section on the covenant of nature and the state of humanity before the first sin.[xxxviii] Luther is mentioned in a list of Reformation heroes, who are, in his estimation, akin to the two witnesses revealed to John of Patmos in Revelation 11:3. Turretin argues that these "two witnesses" cannot be Enoch and Elijah, as many interpreters suggested. Rather, Turretin states that "two" is meant to illustrate that God always sends his prophets in "twos". Moses and Aaron, Elijah and Elisha, Zerubbabel and Joshua in the Old Testament, and the disciples sent two-by-two in the New Testament. In the same way, at the time of the Reformation, God sent his new prophets in pairs: "John Hus and Jerome of Prague in Bohemia, Zwingli and Oecolampadius in Switzerland, Luther and Melanchthon in Germany, Calvin and Farel in France."[xxxix] Here Luther, alongside other Reformers, is utilized in an anti-Catholic polemic. Turretin's appeal to the authority of the first-generation Reformers was intended to refute Robert Bellarmine's assertion that Elijah and Enoch are to come at the end times to slay Antichrist. Instead of ceding the point to Bellarmine, Turretin makes the "two witnesses" analogical for any of God's prophets, and in particular the "prophets" of the Protestant Reformation.[xl] This indicates a major theme in Turretin's use of the Reformers: a traditionary, authority list. In other words, it was

common for Turretin to simply list a series of trustworthy theologians who held *prima facie* authority

in the evangelical church. It is one thing to address Luther's theology; another to identify Luther

with Calvin and Farel and the esteem of the Swiss Reformers.

Indeed, this is a common use of Luther and other Reformers in Turretin: appeal to tradition.

Often Luther is simply dropped into a conversation with the presupposition that his opinion holds

considerable weight. For instance, in Turretin's *locus* on free will, Luther is used as evidence for the

Reformed belief in free will. Luther is considered one of "our men" in contrast to the "adversaries"

of the Roman Catholic Church, and in particular the Catholic theologian Robert Bellarmine. The use

of "our men" here indicates a certain spiritual affinity for Turretin, indicating that Luther is not only

an authority, but also one who holds a legitimate Reformed view.[xli] Here Turretin links Luther with

Augustine, arguing that Luther did not come up with the idea of free will, but it can be identified as

early as Augustine's *Enchiridion* and *Against the Two Letters of the Pelagians*.[xlii] Turretin does something

similar later during his *locus* on justification. Luther would naturally be brought up here, as

justification by grace through faith was a key component of Luther's theological system. However,

Luther is only briefly mentioned to buttress Turretin's contention that justification "is everywhere

set forth as the primary effect of faith."[xliii] Luther is quoted here quickly as stating that justification is

"the article of a standing and a falling church."[xliv] He then broadens out his evidence to say "by other

Christians" justification carries the same theological weight. Here, though, Luther is provided as a

standard-bearer of orthodox thought against the "Romanists" and is more than sufficient to make

his polemical point.

Luther is cited again, as he was previously, in a polemic against the Lutherans on the

communication of the divine attributes in the person of Jesus of Nazareth.[xlv] According to Turretin,

the issue revolves around whether the divine nature of God was communicated truly in the

hypostatic union. The Reformed, so says Turretin, deny such an assertion, while the Lutherans

affirm it. In his detailing of the origin of the argument, Turretin states that the doctrine did not begin with Luther, but rather with it was precipitated at the Conference of Maulbronn in 1564. Luther, Turretin claims, "wished to discard" the communication of the attributes; when it came to the ubiquity of Christ in the Lord's Supper, Lutherans after Luther's death proposed that some of the divine attributes necessarily were communicated to the human person of Jesus. Turretin goes a step further here than he had previously by citing Luther directly from his *Disputation concerning the Divinity and Humanity of Christ*.[xlvi] Here Turretin uses Luther as evidence against the Lutherans, utilizing a "Luther against the Lutherans" convention. Luther did not intend to claim that the human Jesus was communicated divine attributes, but later Lutherans, committed to the ubiquity of Christ in the Lord's Supper, went beyond Luther's original intent. In this instance, Turretin believes Luther is more Reformed than "Lutheran."

For Turretin, Luther is an eminently important founder of true, orthodox Christianity. When Turretin directs his attention towards the nature of the visible and invisible church, he addresses the many controversies that Luther had to face. The common Catholic response to the notion of an "invisible" church was to note that there must not have been any church at all before the advent of Luther. Turretin acknowledges this assumption, but counters that Luther had already addressed it. Luther was not willing to submit the Church to the senses; the church cannot be seen or touched. Neither could it be determined by a type of ecclesiology, particularly one under the authority of the Roman Pontiff. Rather, Luther argued that the true church was one of inward faith and piety. Turretin then explicitly cites Bellarmine again, who recognized this doctrine in Luther's writing. Bellarmine wrote:

> "Luther in book four of his *On the Bondage of the Will*, since Erasmus had objected to him that it was incredible that God had deserted his church for long a time, answered, God had never deserted his church, but that is not the church of Christ which is commonly so called, i.e., the pope and the bishops; but the church is the certain few pious persons whom he preserves as remnants."[xlvii]

Luther's doctrine, for Turretin, is sufficient to support the underlying doctrine of the invisible church. Instead of retreading that foundational issue, Turretin instead moves on to what it means for the church to be invisible *contra* the Roman Church. Luther is a "founding father" of Protestantism for Turretin, one whose opinion holds significant authority in doctrinal debates.

Indeed, Turretin believes that at the advent of Luther and Zwingli, the church was obscure. There certainly was a church, but she was only found in those who were outside "the tyranny of the Roman bishop." Here Turretin mentions explicitly the Waldensians and the Albigensians, as well as assemblies found in Bohemia and certain parts of England and France.[xlviii] After the Roman Catholic church began to persecute these communities, the church was too obscure to be recognized. It was only, according to Turretin, when Luther protested that "our church" (*ecclesia nostra*) became clearer. Even when Luther, Zwingli and others were cloistered as Catholic monks, God was still illustrating to them in secret that "pure religion" of the holy scriptures. In private families the gospel was still being preached, though necessarily in hiding, though at times rebuking, publicly, those could not separate popish errors from the truth of God's gospel. Providentially, according Turretin, God was raising up faithful members of his true church to spread God's word. Here Turretin brings back his "two witnesses" theology, appealing to the work of Jan Hus, John Wycliffe and, of course, Martin Luther.[xlix] In fact, Luther was a turning point for Turretin, where the invisible church hidden for fear of the dominions of Satan found in the Roman Catholic Church came out of hiding, providentially spreading God's pure church.

Later in Turretin's *locus* on the Church, he addresses the Catholic polemic that the evangelical church is an innovation to religion, unknown to the antiquity of Christianity. Turretin here utilizes Luther again, stating that Luther, alongside Waldo, Wycliffe, and Hus, was not an innovator, but a restorer. "They were not [the church's] authors, but only 'heralds and restorers,' who proposed no other doctrine that the prophetic and apostolic."[l] Far from being innovators, Turretin argues that

they were the true descendants of the original apostles and carried forward God's pure "apostolic tradition."[li] Because of this, Turretin argues that their doctrines and reforms should not be attributed to the Reformers, but to Christ himself, whose pure church they were restoring.[lii]

One of the most telling sections concerning Turretin's doctrine of the church and Luther's place in it comes in *quaestio* fifteen: are the evangelical and Reformed churches true churches of Christ?[liii] Turretin answers in the affirmative, but in order to do so he has to wade through various arguments presented by the post-Tridentine Roman Catholic Church. One primary concern for Turretin was the various disagreements found in the evangelical and Reformed camps. He even goes as far as to criticize "some of those who take their name from the great Luther" who cannot surmount their disagreements with the Reformed and instead of providing a unified defense against Rome, instead attack fellow Protestants.[liv] Here Turretin gives surprising charity, noting that just because some Lutherans attack some Calvinists does not mean that their "brotherly affection" should be rescinded. The lives of the Reformers were also under attack by the Catholic Church and Turretin was keen to defend the honor of those who came before. Though he acknowledges that Luther, Zwingli, and others were sinners and liable to the same passions of all humans, their lives were far removed from the indictments of the Roman Catholic Church.[lv] Furthermore, Turretin states that the last thing the Catholic Church wants to do is tread down this road; they would lapse into hypocrisy as part of the Reformation was fought over the corrupt nature of the "Romanists." Here Turretin's broad ecumenism is illustrated. Turretin believed that Luther represented a real restoration of the primitive church and that those who came after Luther and those who came after the Reformers in Switzerland were naturally and concretely members of the same true church. Like any family, there were matters to dispute amongst "brothers", but that did not entail so strong a divide as to make Luther and Calvin members of different Christian traditions.

The final mention of Luther in Turretin's ecclesiology concerns the creeds and confessions of Christianity.[lvi] Turretin's argument is that the church has the power to regulate the doctrine of the faith. He, in clear Protestant fashion, notes, however, that creeds and confessions are ultimately guided by scripture, and that most pious churches issue public creeds. He mentions many that are intrinsic to evangelical Christianity including the Apostles Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Creed. Alongside the creeds are confessions: "fuller explanations of the creeds themselves", according to Turretin.[lvii] Among these confessions is the Augsburg Confession, the Helvetic Confession, and, as it pertains to Luther, the Bohemian Confession of 1532. Here we get a mention of Luther and Philip Melanchthon having approved the Confession. This is in reference to the Unitas Confession, written and published by Luther in Wittenberg, then adopted by Ferdinand I of Bohemia in 1535.[lviii] Again, Luther is used here to illustrate his authority. It is sufficient for Turretin to cite Luther, and Melanchthon, in order to give perhaps a lesser known and authoritative confession the legitimacy it deserves. Because of Luther's witness to the Unitas Confession, it now stands in continuity with other authoritative works of evangelical Christianity. The Church can stand without these confessions, as Turretin notes it did for many hundreds of years; yet, they are authoritative in the church as a public rebuke and a rule for excommunication. In this regard, Luther buttresses the Unitas Confession making him an authority unto himself.

The final mentions of Luther come, appropriately, in Turretin's *locus* on the Last Things.[lix] Here in question eleven Turretin asks whether "the saints" who are with God at the general resurrection will know one another. Turretin starts with the important clarification that scripture does not make a clear pronouncement one way or the other, and so Christians have some latitude in their thinking. If possible, though, Turretin believes that it is important to try and answer the question. For Turretin, the question does not involve all types of knowledge, as he states that the saints' knowledge of God in the resurrection will "swallow up all such affections" such as the carnal

or earthly.[lx] Indeed, Turretin recognizes that there are different voices on this matter and those voices should be allowed into the public sphere. However, in his appeal to authority, Turretin makes mention of only Luther. Though he may give charity to others who disagree with him, Turretin makes known that Luther's opinion was that Christians would know each other in the resurrection. This is an instance that Turretin would not have been able to turn to other sources, as Calvin is sheepish concerning the doctrine in his *Institutes*.[lxi] This makes his hedging on doctrine more understandable as, perhaps, Calvin would not have agreed. Instead of offering a position, Calvin chooses to chastise those who pry into issues that scripture does not address. Therefore, Turretin appeals to Luther alone outside of the hints found in scripture. This illustrates again, though, that Turretin views Luther as holding sufficient authority in the evangelical church that he does not need to cite other sources as well. Certainly, there would have been other opinions, but Luther's holds enough weight to be sufficient on its own.

3 Turretin's Reception of Philip Melanchthon

Beyond Luther, his protégé Philip Melanchthon is used sparingly in Turretin's works.[lxii] In Turretin's *locus* on the Trinity, he engages in a long discussion about the meaning of the word "person" as it relates to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.[lxiii] In particular, Turretin utilizes a variety of Reformation era theologians in order to define what a "person" is in a concrete and abstract way. In the former, Turretin cites the book of Philippians where Paul describes the Son as being in the "form" of God. In the latter, Turretin addresses the book of Hebrews where the Son is described as the "express image of the person of the Father."[lxiv] To give evidence for the abstract position, Turretin mentions one major Reformer: John Calvin. In contrast, Turretin cites Melanchthon and Zachary Ursinus (1534-1583) who argue for the concretive. Interestingly here, Turretin uses all three

as authoritative examples, landing on the importance of both the concrete and abstract nature of a "person" found in the Trinity. Melanchthon is just as authoritative as Calvin in this regard.

Additionally, in Turretin's *locus* on the "Law of God", Melanchthon is cited to address what a "ceremony" is in relation the "ceremonial laws" of the Hebrew Bible.[lxv] Here Melanchthon is utilized to define what a human being is. According to Turretin, Melanchthon's definition of humans as "ceremonial animal[s]" provides significant meaning to the purpose of ceremonies. For Turretin, ceremonies are "external rites" and "sacred accidents of the worship of God."[lxvi] Melanchthon indicates that humans *in se* desire external ceremonies and Turretin extends this analysis to illustrate that humans "[cleave] to and [are] affected by external ceremonies and rites."[lxvii] Ultimately, the point for Turretin is that the nature of humanity is bound up in the ceremonial law as an expression of their bodily worship. Thanks to Melanchthon, Turretin was able to provide a reliable definition of human beings and their relationship to the Old Testament law.

Perhaps one of the most peculiar instances of Turretin's appeal to Melanchthon comes in his defense of the execution of Michael Servetus. In his *locus* on the church and its function within the realm of the "Christian magistrate", Turretin has to deal with the polemic against Calvin and the government of Geneva when they decided to burn Servetus at the stake for his anti-Trinitarian views.[lxviii] In order to defend Calvin, Turretin goes through a litany of famous evangelicals who spoke-up for Calvin and the Genevan magistrates. Turretin begins, though, by indicating that this was no simple disagreement between the famous French theologian and the Spanish physician. Servetus's claim, according to Turretin, was that he had no shame in lambasting the Trinity, referring to the Godhead as a "three-headed dog." This made Servetus's sin the "basest of all, bursting forth with regard to the principal heads of Christianity and especially the adorable mystery of the Trinity."[lxix] Thankfully for Calvin, there was no shortage of evangelical defenders. In this paragraph, Turretin mentions testimony from Martin Bucer and he claims that Melanchthon said, "the Genevan

magistrates did right for killing this blasphemer after a regular trial."[lxx] When Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), the famed Dutch philosopher, called Calvin the "burner of Servetus" what he was really doing, according to Turretin, was defaming the "faith of the whole history and the testimony of all writers, who assert that Calvin did what it was his duty to do."[lxxi] Melanchthon, for Turretin, was adequately situated to give strong testimony countering Grotius's claim and he would have given Turretin an inter-confessional witness buttressing Calvin's authority to execute Servetus. Melanchthon was a major win in this regard.

Turretin's final reference to Melanchthon comes in his *locus* on the Sacraments, specifically in regards to the question of whether Christ is "corporeally present in the Eucharist, and he is eaten with the mouth by believers? We deny against the Romanists and the Lutherans".[lxxii] Earlier in the same *locus* Turretin dealt substantially with the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, arguing, not surprisingly, that it was a "fiction".[lxxiii] Here Turretin turns towards the subcategory of the Eucharist and namely whether Christ can said to be truly present at the celebration of the Lord' Supper. Here Turretin has to deal carefully with both Luther and Melanchthon, as Luther proposed what Turretin calls "consubstantiation" or "*syousia*". Turretin defines consubstantiation as the "co-existence of the bread and the body, of the wine and the blood of Christ."[lxxiv] Indeed, even the Augsburg Confession sets forth this doctrine, so Turretin cannot simply sweep it aside as he might for a more "Romanist" doctrine.[lxxv] In terms of Melanchthon's role in the subject, Turretin here argues that Melanchthon used very specific words in the first edition of the Augsburg Confession in order to "lessen the offense" of the Emperor and the Catholic Church. In so doing, he specifically wrote, "The body and blood of Christ are present under the appearance of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper." However, after coming to his senses and realizing that this was too close to the Catholic definition, the final edition states, "The body and blood of Christ are truly present and are distributed in the Lord's Supper."[lxxvi] Instead of substantially disagreeing with Melanchthon, Luther, and seventeenth-

century Lutherans, Turretin carefully delineates the "orthodox" rebuttal to any type of "consubstantiation". Turretin even goes so far as to redefine what Melanchthon meant in the Augsburg Confession.

4 Conclusion

What this article has illustrated, then, is that the issue of "sources" and "authority" in seventeenth-century Calvinism was far more complex than simply an appeal to Calvin. Building off of the work of Muller, Trueman, and others, this article has shown that important theologians who do not fit into the typical Reformed milieu were nonetheless viewed as authoritative by scholastic, Reformed theologians, often against their own traditions. Francis Turretin stands as an exemplar in this regard and it is clear that he has a much broader view of Christian authority than even just an appeal to the Church Fathers of the first few centuries of Christianity. God had sent his prophets in the era of the first- and second-generation Reformers, and Martin Luther and Philip Melanchthon were two important members of that school of prophets that included John Calvin, Theodore Béza, as well as Huldrych Zwingli and Johannes Oecolampadius. Like his use of the Church Fathers, the use of the first-generation Reformers was fluid and scattered in Turretin's *Institutes*. For Turretin, they could be cited to support the Reformed confessions or other broadly accepted Reformed doctrines. However, in proper Protestant fashion, each of these prophets must be subordinated to scripture and in the case of Melanchthon, Turretin had to provide some sharpening of Melanchthon's own theology in order to conform it to a broader Protestant orthodoxy. Luther and Melanchthon, then, fit into Trueman's "historical action" category in terms of Turretin's reception of their works. The conclusions of Luther and Melanchthon were clearly viewed as authoritative in discerning confessional differences amongst Protestants in the seventeenth century, and these works were not confined to simply the Lutheran churches. In his *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, Francis Turretin

illustrates what this article began with: his self-conscious lack of originality. However, this article

takes what previous scholarship has argued one-step further by going beyond Turretin's use of the

Church Fathers and Calvin and examining his more generous use of sources and ideas to include

different members of his "school of prophecy" at the Reformation. In this way, we can see that the

sources of seventeenth-century scholastic theologians were complex and diverse in their

understanding of the broader Grand Tradition of Christian dogmatics.

---

[i] In Latin: *Institutio Theologiae Elencticae* (Geneva, 1679).

[ii] F. Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, J. Dennison (ed.) (trans. G. M. Giger; Phillipsburg, NJ, 1992), I xxxvi.

[iii] If he does in fact mean this, he can only mean it polemically as he was entrenched in various doctrinal debates with his Academy colleagues, as well as the larger Reformed world of early modern Europe.

[iv] Meijering notes that Turretin has an "absolute" authority, the Bible, and "relative" authorities, church tradition and reason: E. P. Meijering, *Reformierte Scholastik und Patristische Theologie: Die Bedeutung des Väterbeweises in der Institutio Theologiae Elencticae F. Turrettins, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Gotteslehre und Christologie* (Nieuwkoop, 1991), 21. This is a perspective that Turretin would have inherited from the first-generation Reformers who also viewed scripture as absolute and the Fathers as only relatively authoritative: see, I. Backus, "The Fathers and the Reformation," pages 428-441 in K. Perry (ed.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Patristics* (Oxford, 2015), 433-434.

[v] An excellent resource detailing the reception of the Church Fathers over several centuries is I. Backus (ed.), *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists* (2 vols., Boston & Leiden, 2001).

[vi] I. Backus, "The Fathers and Calvinist Orthodoxy: Patristic Scholarship", in *idem.*, II 839-65.

[vii] *Ibid.*, II 864.

[viii] Backus, "The Fathers and the Reformation," 428.

[ix] Backus, "The Fathers and the Reformation," 428-429.

[x] E. P. Meijering, "The Fathers and Calvinist Orthodoxy: Systematic Theology," in *Ibid.*, II 867-8.

[xi] *Ibid.*, II 868.

[xii] As a small sampling see: R. Muller, "Reception and Response: Referencing and Understanding Calvin in Seventeenth-Century Calvinism," in I. Backus and P. Benedict (eds), *Calvin and His Influence, 1509-2009* (Oxford, 2011), 182-201; *Ibid.*, *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition: On the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation* (Grand Rapids, 2012); the special edition of *Church History and Religious Culture* on the proceedings from the international conference on the Reception of Calvin and His Theology in Reformed Orthodoxy (*CHRC* 91 1/2 [2011]) and its subsequent book, *The Reception of John Calvin and his Theology in Reformed Orthodoxy*, A. Beck (ed) (Leiden, 2011).

[xiii] This path was blazed by Richard Muller most fully in his four volume *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, 1520-1725* (2nd ed., Grand Rapids, 2003).

[xiv] For Luther, see: H. J. Selderhuis, Lange van Ravensswaay, J. Marius, J. (eds), *Luther and Calvinisim: Image and Reception of Martin Luther in the history and theology of Calvinism* (Göttingen, 2017); for Melanchthon, see: A. J. Beck (ed), *Melanchton und die reformierte Tradition* (Göttingen, 2016).

[xv] Karin Maag illustrates this point effectively in her assessment of Calvinist/Reformed historians in the post-Reformation period. See, K. Maag, "The Place and Image of Luther in Calvinist/Reformed Historiography," pages 17-27 in H. J. Selderhuis and Lange van Ravensswaay, J. Marius J. (eds), *Luther and Calvinism: Image and Reception of Martin Luther in the History and Theology of Calvinism* (Göttingen, 2017).

[xvi] Maag, "The Place and Image of Luther," 18-25. Costas Gaganakis finds a similar trend in Luther's reputation in later Reformed historiographies particularly in light of the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre and the French Wars of Religion. See, C. Gaganakis, "Calvinist Debates on History: *Historia Sacra*, *Historia Humana*", pages 270-286 in B. Gordon and C. R. Trueman (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Calvin and Calvinism* (Oxford, 2021), 270-278.

[xvii] Henk van den Belt draws this distinction out in his work on Dutch Reformed Orthodoxy in seventeenth century. He notes that for most theologians, Luther is not addressed at all. However, when Luther is addressed it is as a polemic against the Lutherans. See, H. van den Belt, "Luther in Dutch Reformed Orthodoxy: A Bag of Worms against the Lutherans," pages 427-442 in H. J. Selderhuis and Lange van Ravensswaay, J. Marius J. (eds), *Luther and Calvinism: Image and Reception of Martin Luther in the History and Theology of Calvinism* (Göttingen, 2017), 428-430.

[xviii] A. J. Beck, "Melanchthon und die reformierte Scholastik", pages 107-128 in A. J. Beck (ed.), *Melanchthon und die Reformierte Tradition* (Göttingen, 2016), 108.

[xix] Beck, "Melanchthon und die reformierte Scholastik", 108.

[xx] A. Milton, "A Tale of Two Melanchthons: Melanchthon and English Protestantism 1560-1660," pages 129-138 in A. J. Beck (ed.), *Melanchthon und Reformierte Tradition* (Göttingen, 2016), 130-134.

[xxi] Milton, "A Tale of Two Melanchthons," 136-138. Milton acknowledges that Melanchthon is sparingly used in the pro-congregationalist arguments, but he is considered an authority nonetheless.

[xxii] I am utilizing Muller's definitions concerning the different "generations" of Reformed theologians. According to Muller, the first and second generations were from approximately 1517-1560, with the preceding eras of orthodoxy (early, high, and late) extending from 1560 to 1780. Muller recognizes, though, that even these definitions can be imprecise. In this instance, then, my topic, Francis Turretin, would fit within the era of "high" orthodoxy, 1640-1725. See: Muller, *PRRD*, I 27-32 and *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition*, 13-16.

[xxiii] C. Trueman, "The Reception of Calvin: Historical Considerations" in *Church History and Religious Culture*, 91/1-2 (2011), 19-27.

[xxiv] *Ibid.*, 21.

[xxv] For the prime examples of the "Calvin vs. the Calvinists" thesis see: Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy* (Madison, WI, 1969) and R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford, 1979). For refutations of these arguments, see the works above from Richard Muller, as well as the edited volume *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, C. Trueman and R. S. Clark, eds. (Milton Keynes, 2005).

[xxvi] Q. Skinner, "The Limits of Historical Explanations," *Philosophy* 41 (1966), 119-215.

[xxvii] A recent work in this vein is M. Svensson and D. VanDrunen (eds), *Aquinas Amongst the Protestants* (Oxford, 2018). Additionally, for a fuller understanding of the inherited Medieval reading of the Church Fathers, including the development of Patristic sources, see: G. R. Ginther, "The Fathers and Scholasticism," pages 414-427 in K. Perry (ed.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Patristics* (Oxford, 2015).

[xxviii] As a descendant of Italian immigrants born and raised in Geneva, he is often referred to as François Turrettini. In his ecclesial Latin context he is referred to as Franciscus Turretinus. I will prefer the anglicized Francis Turretin in this article. For a biography of Turretin see: N. A. Cumming, *Francis Turretin (1623-87) and the Reformed Tradition* (Leiden, 2020).

[xxix] Cumming, *Francis Turretin.*

[xxx] For more on Amyraut see: B. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France* (Milwaukee, 1969).

[xxxi] Hypothetical universalism argued that Christ's death on the cross was "hypothetically" for all people, while only being effective for the elect, whom God had chosen. The non-imputation of Adam's sin was a *de facto* denial of "original sin." In other words, Adam's first sin did not cause his progeny to be guilty of sin, and therefore deserving of punishment, but only inheriting a general fallen nature. The non-inspiration of Hebrew vowel points argued that the medieval pointing of the Hebrew texts of the Old Testament were not inspired by God and, therefore, intrinsic to their infallibility, but rather simple human additions. For more on the non-imputation of Adam's sin in Turretin's theology, see: N. A. Cumming, "'Sin is Rightly Called the Punishment of Sin': Francis Turretin's Reformed Doctrine of Sin," in *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 22.1 (2020), 48-63.

[xxxii] For an introduction and translation of the *Consensus* see: M. Klauber, "The Helvetic Formula Consensus (1675): An Introduction and Translation," in *Trinity Journal* 11/1 (1990), 103-23.

[xxxiii] Turretinus, *Institutio*, I 570-7.

[xxxiv] See C. Brochmand, *Universae theologicae systema* (Leipzig, 1638), I: 527-37.

[xxxv] Turretin is clear, though, that he does not feel the need to do this. As he states, no tradition is beholden to a single divine, no matter how illustrious.

[xxxvi] Turretin, *Institutes*, I 531.

[xxxvii] *Ibid.*, I 530.

[xxxviii] *Ibid.*, I 569-89.

[xxxix] *Ibid.*, I 589.

[xl] Turretin does cede the point that many ancient Christians sided with Bellarmine concerning Elijah and Enoch's return in the eschaton, but since it is not explicit in scripture, Turretin does not feel bound to concur.

[xli] Turretin uses this term frequently in his *Institutes* for various theologians, but most often for John Calvin. Utilizing "our" was a fairly common Reformed tactic, as Frank van der Pol has noted in the works of Dutch Reformed Pietist Simon Oomius. Oomius uses "our" in his polemics to indicate his affinity for Melanchthon. Van der Pol, "A Seventeenth Century Reformed Pietist Portrait of Melanchthon," 166-167.

[xlii] *Ibid.*, I 663-4.

[xliii] *Ibid.*, II 633.

xliv There's little evidence that Luther uttered this exact phrase, though he said many statements to this sentiment throughout his works.

xlv *Ibid.*, II 323.

xlvi M. Luther, "Disputatio de divinitatae et humanitatae Christi" (1540).

xlvii Turretin, *Institutes*, III 33.

xlviii *Ibid.*, III 60-1.

xlix *Ibid.*, III 66-7. This fits with Maag's assessment that, at times, Reformed historians viewed Luther as one of "God's instruments." This allowed his flaws to still be present, while also indicating that God used Luther despite his flaws. Maag, "The Place and Image of Luther," 19-23.

l *Ibid.*, III 105.

li *Ibid.*

lii *Ibid.*

liii *Ibid.*, III 137-46.

liv *Ibid.*, III 143.

lv Again, this fits into the evolving view of Luther in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as a "Great Man" of the Reformation. Maag, "The Place and Image of Luther," 23-25.

lvi *Ibid.*, III 281-85.

lvii *Ibid.*, III 283.

lviii **The Unitas Confession was for the Unitas Fratrum (Unified Brotherhood) of Bohemia in the sixteenth century. They are often referred to as a Hussite group. See, "Unitas Fratrum" in *Encyclopedia Britannica*.**

lix Turretin, *Institutes*, III 561-637.

lx *Ibid.*, III 630.

lxi John Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion* (trans. H. Beveridge; Peabody, Mass., 2008), 652-65. This *locus* on the Last Resurrection comes in book 3, chapter 25.

lxii Frank van der Pol notes that at least in the Netherlands in the seventeenth century, Melanchthon was more associated with the Remonstrants. However, he gives clear evidence of Melanchthon's authority in the Dutch Reformed-Pietist Simon Oomius (1630-1706). Van der Pol concludes that according to Oomius, Melanchthon can be considered a "reliable guide and important authority" in Reformed-Pietistic concerns. See, F. van der Pol, "A Seventeenth Century Reformed-Pietistic Portrait of Melanchthon in the Netherlands", pages 165-174 in A. J. Beck (ed.), *Melanchthon und die Reformierte Tradition* (Göttingen, 2016), 174.

lxiii Turretinus, *Institutio*, I 253-60.

lxiv *Ibid.*, I 255.

lxv *Ibid.*, II 145-58.

lxvi *Ibid.*

lxvii *Ibid.*

lxviii *Ibid.*, III 316-36.

lxix *Ibid.*, III 335.

lxx *Ibid.*

lxxi *Ibid.*

lxxii *Ibid.*, III 505-19.

lxxiii *Ibid.*, III 505.

lxxiv *Ibid.*

lxxv Turretin rarely does simply dismiss a view, but often explicates in excruciating detail before explaining why it is incorrect according to scripture, tradition, and right reason.

lxxvi *Ibid.*, III 506.

목회자 투레티니가 본 구약의 그리스도: 10개의 소논문과 설교를 중심으로
권경철 박사(열린교회 부목사)

목회자 투레티니의 재발견
　　　　프랜시스 튜레틴으로 한국에 흔히 알려져있는 프랑수아 투레티니는, 개혁파 정통주의 신학을 대표하는 신학 백과사전이라고 할 수 있는 『논박신학강요』(혹은 변증신학강요)의 저자로 흔히 알려져 있다. 『논박신학강요』 는 개신교 스콜라주의의 고전이요 교과서로서 역사적으로 그 가치를 인정받아온 책이다. 그래서 투레티니의 학자적인 면모에 대해서는 주목하는 사람들은 제법 있었지만, 신학자 투레티니 이면에 있는 목회자 투레티니에 주목한 사람은 별로 없었다.[1] 실제로 현재까지 투레티니에 관련된 국내외 학술논문의 절대 다수는 목회자 투레티니가 아닌 신학자 투레티니, 그 중에서도 『논박신학강요』에 대부분의 지면을 할애해왔다.[2]

　　　　그러나 얼마 전 한글로 번역 출간된 『프랑수아 투레티니 평전』을 읽어보면, 투레티니는 학자였을 뿐만 아니라 목회자였다는 사실이 명확하게 드러난다.[3] 그는 젊을 때에 리옹 개신교회에 임시 목회자로 파견된 적도 있었고, 다시 돌아와서 제네바를 대표하는 신학교수로서 사역할 때에도 이탈리아 이민교회를 비롯한 여러 다른 교회들을 돌보고 그곳에서 설교를 했던 목회자였다. 그러므로 투레티니의 실제 모습을 정확하게 그려내기 위해서, 우리는 투레티니의 『논박신학강요』에만 집중되었던 우리 연구의 지평을, 목회자로서 투레티니가 남긴 작품들에까지 넓힐 필요가 있다.

　　　　연구의 지평을 넓히는 첫걸음으로써, 필자는 투레티니가 『논박신학강요』에서 이미 다루었던 구약의 그리스도에 관한 신학논쟁을, 그의 목회적인 작품에서 어떻게 풀어내었는가를 분석함으로써, 신학자 투레티니와 목회자 투레티니 사이의 부당한 단절을 극복해보려고 한다. 미출판된 그의 편지를 제외하면, 투레티니의 목회적인 작품 중에서 가장 중요한 것은 역시 그가 생전에 출판한 두 개의 설교집이라고 할 수 있을 것이다. 그 다음으로 중요한 것이 두 개의 큰 논쟁서와 10개의 소논문인데, 구약의 그리스도에 대해서 집중적으로 다루는 부분은 10개의 소논문에 수록되어 있는 관계로 이 글에서 필자는 설교집과 10개의 소논문에 초점을 맞추도록 하겠다.

---

1) 비슷한 학문적 공백이 루터 등의 종교개혁자들의 목회자로서의 면모에 대해서도 있어왔지만, 그래도 Timothy J. Wengert, *The Pastoral Luther: Essays on Martin Luther's Pastoral Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017)의 경우에서 보듯이 투레티니 연구에 비하면 종교개혁자들의 목회자로서의 면모는 많이 밝혀진 편이다.

2) 필자의 논문을 제외하면, 이 진술에서 거의 유일한 예외는 J. Mark Beach, "Preaching Predestination—An Examination of Francis Turrettini's Sermon De l'affermissement de la vocation et de l'election du fidele" *Mid-America Journal of Theology* 21(2010): 133-147이라고 할 수 있다.

3) 귀욤 드 뷔데, 『프랑수아 투레티니 평전』 권경철 강금희 공역 (군포: 다함, 2021).

17세기 구약의 그리스도 논쟁

구약의 그리스도에 관한 논쟁은, 순교자 유스틴과 유대인 트리포와의 대화에서 확인할 수 있듯이 오랜 역사와 전통을 가지고 있다. 그런데 주로 유대교도들을 상대로 구약의 그리스도를 논증했던 초대교회 신학자들과는 달리, 17세기 신학자들의 구약의 그리스도 논쟁은 대외적으로는 주로 소키누스주의자들을 상대해야 했고, 대내적으로는 개혁신학 내에서의 세대주의자라고 할 수 있는 코케이우스주의자들을 염두에 두어야만 했다.

당시 소키누스주의자들과 코케이우스주의자들은 서로 다른 이유로 그리스도가 주시는 구원의 은혜를 구약시대의 성도들은 충분히 받지 못했다고 주장하곤 했다. 소키누스주의자들은 구약의 그리스도를 부각시키지 않으므로 구약 성도에게 영적이고 천상적인 구원이 허락되었다는 사실에 대해 부정적이었던 반면, 코케이우스주의자들은 그리스도의 십자가 사역을 강조하려다가 십자가 이전과 이후가 같을 수 없다는 이유로 구약성도의 죄용서와 구원에 부족한 점이 있었을 것이라는 추측을 하곤 했다. 이러한 추측은 정통적인 기독교 교리를 믿었던 코케이우스주의자들이 구약의 그리스도 문제에서만큼은 소키누스주의자들과 타협하고 있다는 오해를 불러일으키곤 했다. 소키누스주의자들이야 정통과는 상극이므로 비판하고 차단하면 그만이었지만, 코케이우스주의자들은 정통주의 신학을 신봉하면서도 구약의 그리스도 문제에 있어서 미묘한 의견차이를 보인 것이었기에 정통주의 신학자들이 단순하게 단절하고 끝낼 수 있는 문제가 아니었다.

일단 투레티니의 제자로서 1681년 제네바 아카데미 교수로 취임했던 부티니우스가 쓴 『구약 성도의 구원에 관한 신학 논쟁』[4]이라는 두 권으로 된 소책자와, 푸치우스가 그의 대표작 『신학논제선집』 제5권에서 구약 성도의 구원과 신약 성도의 구원 사이에 있는 본질적인 동질성을 시편을 통해 논증한 부분을 보면,[5] 표면적으로는 그들의 주된 논박 대상이 소키누스주의자들임이 분명히 밝히면서 말을 아끼고 있다. 하지만 코케이우스 자신이 푸치우스의 논박에 불편함을 표시한 적이 있고,[6] 또 구약의 그리스도 문제를 놓고 코케이우스주의자들과 앞장서서 논쟁했던 이들이 다름아닌 푸치우스와 그의 신학적 제자들이라는 것을 고려할 때, 이면적으로는 그러한 진술들에 코케이우스주의자들에 대한 경계심이 내포되었다고 볼 수 있다. 실제로 투레티니와 서로 가까운 사이였고 푸치우스의 제자였던 레이데커는 『진리의 힘』이라는 책을 써서 코케이우스주의자들이 소키누스주의자들이나 할 법한 이야기를 하고 있다고 비판하기도 하였다.[7]

---

4) Dominicus Butinius, *Disputatio theologica de salute patrum*, 2 Vols. (Geneva: 1663-1664).

5) Gisbertus Voetius, *Selectarum Disputationum Theologicarum*, vol. 5 (Utrecht: 1669), 303-314.

6) Willem van Asselt, "The Doctrine of the Abrogations in the Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius(1603-1669)," *Calvin Theological Journal* 29 (1994): 113.

7) Melchior Leydekker, *Vis veritatis, sive disquisitionum ad nonnullas controversias, quae hodie in Belgio potissimum moventur de testamentis et oeconomia foederum Dei* (Utrecht, 1679).

코케이우스와 푸치우스, 그리고 그들의 제자들간의 논쟁은 유럽 각지에서 계속되었는데, 그중에서도 특히 네덜란드에서 매우 오랜 기간동안 지속되며 정치 및 사회와 문화적으로 큰 여파를 남겼다. 그리하여 신학자들 뿐만이 아니라 교회에 다니는 일반 성도들까지도 이 문제를 알 정도였다.[8] 이에 구약의 그리스도에 관한 논쟁에 목회적으로 어떻게 대처할지가 또 다른 관심사로 떠오르게 되었는데, 반틸 같은 이는 코케이우스주의를 비판하는 것은 교회에 분쟁만 일으킬 뿐 아무 유익을 줄 수 없다고 주장한 반면,[9] 레이데커는 설교단에서는 코케이우스를 비판하지 말라는 반틸의 대처법에 반대하면서, 구약의 그리스도에 대한 코케이우스주의자들의 오류를 교정하는 것은 작은 일이 아니고 순수한 복음의 본질이 달려있는 문제이므로 그 오류들을 철저히 논박해야 한다고 역설하였다.[10]

필자는 투레티니가 『논박신학강요』에서 레이데커의 코케이우스주의 논박을 상당수 받아들여서 사용하고 있음을 이미 다른 글에서 증명한 바 있다.[11] 하지만 투레티니가 코케이우스와의 논쟁을 지나치게 엄격히 논박하는 것은 "평화의 끈을 파괴하고 적대적인 연구들로 형제들의 영혼을 갈아놓아서 경건한 사람들에게 해를 끼치고 신앙을 저해한다"는 태도를 취했던 것은 일견 반틸의 입장과 유사해보이는 점이 있다.[12] 전에 레이데커를 지지할 때와는 상반된 것처럼 보이는 이러한 태도를 투레티니가 견지하는지에 대한 단초를 찾기 위해서는, 목회적인 상황 속에서 그가 구약의 그리스도 문제를 어떻게 다루었는지를 볼 필요가 있다. 이제부터 필자는 10개의 소논문과 설교를 중심으로 투레티니의 신학적인 면모가 목회적인 상황 속에서 어떻게 구현되고 있는지를 밝히도록 하겠다.

그리스도인의 참된 제단

투레티니는 생전에 두 개의 설교집을 출간하였다. 첫 번째 설교집은 『다양한 성경구절에 대한 설교』(Sermons sur divers passages de l'Ecriture Sainte)라는 제목으로 1676년 출간되었고, 두 번째 설교집은 『다양한 성경본문에 대한 설교 모음집』이라는 제하에 1686년 출판되었다. 첫 번째 설교집은 전체를 관통하는 특별한 주제가 없고 말 그대로 다양한 성경구절을 본문으로 다양한 내용을 다루고 있으나, 두 번째 설교집은 모든 설교가 낭트 칙령의 폐기로 인해서 고통받는 프랑스

---

8) D. H. Kromminga, *The Christian Reformed Tradition: From the Reforamtion till the Present* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1943), 52.

9) Salomon van Til, *Antidotum viperinis morsibus D. J. oppositum* (Leiden, 1707), 128.

10) Leydekker, *Filius Dei sponsor: Of de loff en eere Jesu Christi, onse vredevorst en borge* (Amsterdam, 1708), 194-227; van Asselt, "Expromissio or Fideiussio? A Seventeenth-Century Theological Debate between Voetians and Cocceians about the Nature of Christ's Suretyship in Salvation History" Mid-American Journal of Theology 14 (2003): 48-49.

11) 권경철, *Christ and the Old Covenant: Francis Turrettini (1623-1687) on Christ's Suretyship under the Old Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019); 권경철, "그리스도의 언약보증에 대한 프랑수아 투레티니(1623-1687)의 견해: 투레티니와 레이데커 견해에 나타난 양자의 관계를 중심으로"「갱신과 부흥」 26 (2020): 143-180.

12) François Turrettini, *Institutio Theologiae Elencticae* (Geneva, 1682), XII.x.32.

의 개신교도들을 위로하고 격려하는 내용으로 되어있다.

이 중에서 구약의 그리스도에 대해 가장 잘 다루고 있는 설교는 히브리서 13장 10절을 본문으로 한 "그리스도인의 참된 제단"(Le vray autel des chrétiens)이라는 설교이다. 이 설교의 요지는, 구약 율법 의식법에 그림자처럼 나타났던 그리스도야말로 우리의 참된 제단이시라는 것이다. 구약의 제도가 구약의 그리스도에 대해 가르치는 이 설교에서 투레티니가 마음만 먹는다면, 구원역사 속에서 행위언약이 단계적으로 폐지된다고 주장하면서 구약 의식법은 출애굽 당시 금송아지 사건에 대한 형벌로서 주어진 것이라고 역설하는 코케이우스주의자들의 의견에 대해 비판하고 논박하는 것은 어렵지 않은 일이었을 것이다.

투레티니는 "그리스도는 모든 믿는 자에게 율법의 의를 이루기 위하여 율법의 완성이 되시니라"고 말씀하는 로마서 10장 4절을 인용하면서 설교를 시작한다.13) 예수 그리스도가 오심으로써 율법이 완전히 성취되어 "장막과 성소와 제사장과 제사와 예물과 정결 예식"이 없어졌으나, 사실 구약 율법에서 예표된 그리스도는 신약 시대에 나타나신 그 분과 동일한 분이시다.14) 사실 투레티니는 이미 『논박신학강요』에서 코케이우스주의를 논박할 때 로마서 10장 3절을 인용하면서, 그리스도께서 십자가를 지기 이전이라는 이유로 구약 성도에게 청산되지 않은 죄의 책임을 묻는다는 것은 불가능하다고 언급한 바가 있다.15) 이러한 유사성이 있으면서도, 『논박신학강요』에서와 달리 이 설교에서는 코케이우스주의에 대한 언급이 아예 등장하지 않는다.

투레티니는 이어서 율법이라는 것은 사람을 그리스도께 인도하기 위한 것이라고 하면서, 율법은 본래 자력 구원이 불가능하다는 것을 알려주어 그리스도의 완전한 의를 바라도록 하기 위해 주어졌음을 역설하는데, 이 점 역시도 후에 『논박신학강요』에서 성도들이 그리스도가 십자가를 지신 이후에야 모든 개인적인 의무에서 해방되었다고 봐야 한다는 코케이우스주의자들의 주장이 마치 구약 성도가 자기 의로 구원을 쟁취하려고 노력했다는 식으로 오해를 불러일으킬 수 있음을 경계하는 문맥에서 재차 설명되고 있다.16) 그러나 설교에서는 여기서도 코케이우스주의에 대한 경계심이 드러나지 않는다.

물론 투레티니는 구약과 신약과의 차이를 부정하지 않는다. 신약에는 구약보다 더 큰 영광이 있고, 율법의 실체이신 그리스도가 더 밝히 증거된다. 모세의 장막과 솔로몬의 성전은 신성이 육체적으로 거하시는 그리스도로 대체되고, 교회는 "성령으로 말미암아 하나님의 장막이요 살아 계신 하나님의 집"이 된다. 레위 제사장들의 반복적이고 열등한 제사와 달리 그리스도의 대제사장 직분과 십자가의 희생제사는 우리에게 영원한 속죄를 이루었다. 그리스도로 말미암아 만인제사장이 된 성도들은 이제 레위 사람들과 제사장들처럼 "예수 그리스도를 통하여 하나님이 기

---

13) Turrettini, *Sermons sur divers passages de L'Ecriture Sainte*, (Geneva, 1676), 495-496.
14) Turrettini, *Sermons sur divers passages*, 496-497.
15) Turrettini, *Institutio*, XII.ix.5.
16) Turrettini, *Sermons sur divers passages*, 496; Turrettini, *Institutio*, XII.ix.5.

뻐하실 신령한 제사를 드리게 된다."[17]

그러나 신약의 탁월성과 율법의 완성과는 별개로, 구약의 믿음은 신약의 믿음과 본질상 동일하다는 것을 투레티니는 놓치지 않는다. 구약 시대의 신자들은 신약 시대의 성도들과 동일한 종류의 영적 축복에 참여했다. 후에 투레티니가 10개의 소논문에서도 부연설명할 고린도전서 10장 4절에 따라, 구약 성도들은 그리스도와 교제하며 영적 양식과 음료를 먹었던 것 역시도 확실하다. "장막에서 섬기는 자는 먹을 권리가 없다"는 말씀을 구약 성도들이 그리스도의 살과 피에 참여하지 못했다는 의미로 해석해서는 안된다. 신약 성도이든 구약 성도이든 모두 예수 그리스도의 은혜로 구원을 받았기 때문이다(히 11:13, 13:8, 요 14:6, 행 4:12).[18]

그리스도께서는 의식법을 폐지하시고 "영적이고 복음적인 예배"의 길을 여셨다. 신약 뿐만 아니라 구약에도 "하나님의 풍성한 은혜의 보증이시요 그의 변함없는 영광의 보증인"이신 그리스도 안에 "죄 사함과 양심의 평안과 마음의 성결"이 있다.

그러므로 구약에서나 신약에서나 본질적으로는 그리스도 자신이 그리스도인의 진정한 제단이다:

> 그리스도는 우리의 제단입니다. 즉, 죽어가는 제물이시요, 중보하는 제사장이시요, 우리를 양육하는 고기이시며, 십자가에서 죽으신 분, 하늘의 중보자, 그분의 말씀과 식탁으로 우리를 먹이시는 분입니다. 그분은 속죄사역을 이루심으로써 십자가에서 우리의 제단이 되셨습니다.[19]

그러므로 구약이든 신약이든 모든 성도는 "죄 사함과 하나님과의 화목을 위하여" 이 제단에 경건하게 나아가야 한다:[20]

> 이제 우리에게는 제물을 바칠 물질적 제단이나 우리 몸에 영양을 공급할 제물의 살은 없습니다. 그러나 우리에게는 우리의 죄를 속죄하신 하늘의 제물이 단번에 드려 진 그 제단, 즉 영생의 소망 안에서 우리를 지탱하기 위하여 믿음으로 날마다 그 살을 먹을 수 있는 영적이고 신비로운 제단이 있습니다.[21]

위와 같은 고찰을 통해 우리는 다음과 같은 결론을 내릴 수 있다. 첫째, 이 설교는 『논박신학강요』에도 나타나는 많은 요점을 포함하며, 로마서 10장을 공통적으로 참조하고 있다. 외부적으로는 의문의 율법이 복음과 양립할 수 없으나, 본질적으로

---

17) Turrettini, *Sermons sur divers passages*, 498.
18) Turrettini, *Sermons sur divers passages*, 540, 547.
19) Turrettini, *Sermons sur divers passages*, 518-519.
20) Turrettini, *Sermons sur divers passages*, 561.
21) Turrettini, *Sermons sur divers passages*, 498-499.

는 그 모든 것이 한 분 그리스도를 예표하고 그분의 은혜를 증거한다는 점에서 구원 역사적 연속성이 있다는 점을 설교와 책은 공히 강조하고 있다. 둘째, 이러한 일치에도 불구하고 투레티니는 설교에서 코케이우스 비판을 드러내놓고 하지 않았고, 푸치우스주의자들의 전형적인 주장을 인용하지도 않았다. 이러한 침묵은 투레티니가 이전에 『논박신학강요』에서 취했던 태도와 일맥상통하는 면도 있기는 하지만, 결국 1676년경 제네바 교회에서 코케이우스와 푸치우스간의 논쟁이 주요한 논점은 아니었고 오히려 소뮈르 학파에 대한 경계심이 더 컸다는 것을 반증해주는 것이기도 하다.

고린도전서 10장 및 모세의 놋뱀에 관한 소논문들
이어서 우리는 투레티니가 고린도전서 10장 그리고 모세가 든 놋뱀이 나타내는 그리스도 대해 쓴 일련의 소논문을 간단히 살펴보려고 한다. 이 논문들은 10개의 소논문 제일 뒤에 있는 네 편의 글들이다. 투레티니가 10개의 소논문을 출간한 것은 1667년부터 1681년 사이의 일이다. 투레티니가 최초로 코케이우스주의에 대해서 직접적으로 논박한 것이 1682년 『논박신학강요』 2권에서의 일임을 염두에 두면, 첫 번째 설교집과 논박신학강요 사이에 투레티니의 생각의 변화 혹은 발전을 추적하는 가장 좋은 방법은 10개의 소논문을 읽는 것이다.
　　　첫 번째 논문은 "생명책에 관하여"(De libro vitae)로서, 생명책이란 곧 하나님의 예정하심과 동의어라는 주장을 한다. 두 번째와 세 번째는 "교황주의자들에 반대하며, 성경의 권위에 관하여 신학적으로 논함"(Disputatio theologica de scripturae sacrae authoritate adversus Pontificios)이며, 성경의 권위는 교회에 달려있다는 로마 카톨릭의 주장을 반박한다. 네 번째 소논문은 "선행+의 필요성"(De bonorum operum necessitate)이며, 율법폐기론자들을 경계하는 요지의 글이다. 다섯 번째는 "하늘로부터 증거하는 세 분에 관하여"(De tribus testibus coelestibus)인데, 요한일서 5장 7절을 해석하면서 삼위일체론을 증명한다. 여섯 번째는 다섯 번째의 후속작으로서, "땅에서 증거하시는, 성령과 물과 피에 관하여"(De Spiritu, Aqua et Sanguine in terra testantibus)라는 제목으로 요한일서 5장 8절을 분석한다. 마지막 네 개의 논문은 구약에 나타난 그리스도의 모형에 대한 것으로서, 고린도전서 10장을 매우 중요하게 다루고 있다. 각각의 제목은 "구름과 바다에서의 세례에 관하여"(De baptismo nubis et maris), "만나에 관하여"(De manna), "반석이신 그리스도에 관하여" (De petra Christo), 그리고 "놋뱀에 관하여"(De serpente aeneo)이다. 이 마지막 네 개의 소논문은 1677년부터 1681년까지의 기간에 쓰여진 것들로서, 투레티니의 성례론이면서 동시에 구약의 그리스도에 대한 진술이기도 하다.그래서 우리의 목적을 위해서 중요한 것은 마지막 네 개의 논문이라고 할 수 있다.
　　　먼저 투레티니는 구약 이스라엘 백성이 구름과 바다에서 세례를 받은 것이 그리스도의 세례와 그 혜택을 표상하는 것이라고 밝힌다.[22] 이스라엘 사람들과 이

집트 사람들 사이를 구름이 갈라놓았듯이, 기독교인에게 세례란 세상과 단절하고 그리스도와 교제하겠다는 것을 의미한다.23) 반석이 그리스도라고 하는 것은, 마치 성찬에 있어서 떡이 그리스도의 몸이라고 하는 것이 떡의 본질이 변했다는 의미가 아니라 상징적인 의미인 것처럼 상징적인 것이다.24) 반석에서 물이 솟아나듯, 그리스도는 십자가에서 물과 피를 흘리셔서, 신자들에게 생수의 강을 선사해주셨다.25) 그러므로 구약 성도들은 신약의 성도들처럼 그리스도 성육신 전에 이미 믿음으로 말미암아 영적으로 그리스도를 먹고 마셨던 것이니,26) 이는 구약 성도들이 신약 성도들과 동일한 은혜 언약 아래에 있었기 때문이다.27) 아브라함과 모세가 그러했듯이, 구약 성도들은 하나님이 사람이 되신 구주 예수 그리스도의 속성과 직분과 사역과 그분의 비하와 승귀를 미리 보고 증거하며 그리스도의 모든 유익에 신약 성도와 함께 참여했던 것이다.28) 그래서 구약 성도들은 신약의 성도들처럼 그리스도를 알고 그리스도로 말미암아 칭의되고 구원받았다(히13:8). 따라서 신약과 구약의 차이는 정도의 차이이지 본질적인 차이가 아니다.29)

만약 위와 같은 진술이 『논박신학강요』 제2권에 나왔다면, 자연스럽게 소키누스주의나 코케이우스주의 비판으로 이어질 수 있었을 것이다. "그리스도인의 참된 제단" 설교와 비교하면 위의 소논문들은 훨씬 더 구체적으로 구약의 그리스도에 대해 다루고 있는 것도 사실이다. 실제로 투레티니는 1682년에 나온 2에서 구약과 신약의 차이는 정도의 차이이지 본질적인 차이가 아니라고 재차 진술하면서 코케이우스 논박을 위해 "반석이신 그리스도에 관하여"의 논지를 반복하기도 했다.30) 하지만 무슨 이유에서인지 10개의 소논문에서도 투레티니는 코케이우스를 직접적으로 언급하지 않는다. 위와 같은 글을 이 시기에 투레티니가 갑자기 많이 쓴 것을 보면 코케이우스주의자들과 푸치우스주의자들 사이의 갈등이 고조되는 상황에서 뭔가를 해야겠다고 느꼈을 가능성은 높다. 하지만 투레티니는 레이데커가 코케이우스주의에 대한 논박서인 『진리의 힘』을 1679년에 출간했던 것처럼 적극적으로 논쟁에 개입할 생각은 없었던 것으로 보인다.

투레티니는 마지막 소논문인 "놋뱀에 관하여"에서도 직접적인 코케이우스 비판을 하지 않고, 정통주의 신학자 모두가 동의할만한 교과서적인 진리만을 말하

---

22) Turrettini, *Decas disputationum miscellanearum*, in *Francisci Turrettini opera* (Edinburgh: 1848) 4:139-140.

23) "Ut nubes quae continebat Israelitas sub sinu suo, separabat eos ab Aegyptiis: Ita baptismus, qui symbolum est nostrae cum Christo communionis, est etiam separationis nostrae a Mundo tessera, & symbolum gratiae Dei, quae sola separat Ecclesiam a Mundo, Quis te discernit? 1. Cor. 4.7." Turrettini, *Decas disputationum miscellanearum*, 145.

24) Turrettini, *Decas disputationum miscellanearum*, 172-174.

25) Turrettini, *Decas disputationum miscellanearum*, 177.

26) Turrettini, *Decas disputationum miscellanearum*, 161-162, 171.

27) Turrettini, *Decas disputationum miscellanearum*, 162.

28) Turrettini, *Decas disputationum miscellanearum*, 162-163.

29) Turrettini, *Decas disputationum miscellanearum*, 163-164.

30) "Unde Circumcisio dicitur sigillum justitiae fidei, Rom. iv. 11 et petra Christus, 1 Cor. x. 4." Turrettini, *Institutio* XII.ix.20.

는 것으로 만족하는, 신중한 접근을 한다.31) 이 논문의 요지는 그리스도의 중보의 직분은 신약과 구약을 막론하고 동일하다는 것이다. 성육신 전에도 그리스도는 하나님과 사람 사이의 유일한 중보자였다.32) 놋뱀은 하나님의 은혜의 상징으로서, 참된 생명과 구원을 주시는 치료자 그리스도를 가리킨다.33)

지금까지 필자는 고린도전서 10장과 놋뱀에 대한 투레티니의 소논문들을 개관하였다. 1670년대에 쓴 이 논문들에서 투레티니는 구약의 그리스도에 관하여 이전보다 더 자세히 탐구하였고, 그 중 일부 내용은 1682년에 출간된 『논박신학강요』 제2권에 편입되기도 하였다. 이로 보아 투레티니도 10개의 소논문을 쓸 무렵에는 코케이우스주의에 대해서 신경을 쓰고 있었을 것이다. 하지만 투레티니는 설교에서 그랬듯이 10개의 소논문에 있어서도 코케이우스주의 비판을 자제하는 경향을 보이고 있다. 이는 구약에 그리스도에 관한 당대의 논쟁이, 최소한 제네바에서는 설교에서까지 다루어져야 할 만큼 심각한 문제가 아니었다는 사실을 암시하는 것으로 보인다. 투레티니가 보기에 구약의 그리스도에 관한 코케이우스주의의 무리한 주장은 『논박신학강요』에서만 약간 다루어지면 충분한 성질의 것이었다.

결론

우리는 『논박신학강요』를 통해, 구약의 그리스도 문제에 있어서 투레티니가 코케이우스 반대파인 레이데커의 손을 들어주고 있는 것을 볼 수 있다. 동시에, 투레티니의 설교와 10개의 소논문을 통해서는, 논쟁을 더 이상 키우고 싶어하지 않는 신중하며 진중한 목회자의 모습을 발견한다. 투레티니는 신학자인 동시에 목회자이기에, 신학자로서 자신이 가진 소신을 양보하지 않으면서도, 푸치우스주의자들과 코케이우스주의자들 사이에서 화평을 추구하는 태도를 견지하였던 것이다. 『논박신학강요』에서도 이미 암시되었던 이러한 관대한 태도는, 설교와 10개의 소논문에서 한층 더 잘 나타나고 있다. 이 작품들에 코케이우스에 대한 언급이 전혀 없다는 사실로부터 우리는 투레티니가 제네바 교회와 사회에 큰 물의를 일으킨 적이 없는 코케이우스주의 논박에 많은 시간을 들이기보다는, 제네바 교회와 직접적으로 연관이 있는 소뮈르 신학 문제 및 낭트 칙령의 폐기로 인한 프랑스어권 개신교의 위기를 타개하기 위해 온 힘을 쏟기로 결심했음을 눈치챌 수 있다. 또한 프랑스의 위협 앞에 제네바의 안위를 지키기 위해서 네덜란드와 친밀한 관계를 유지할 현실적인 필요성 역시도 그로 하여금 말을 아끼도록 했을 것이다. 그리고 결국 이 모든 것은 제네바 교회와 사회를 평안하게 지키겠다는 목자의 심정에서 나온 것이리라.

---

31) 비록 "놋뱀에 관하여"의 기록 연대가 표시되어 있지는 않으나, 글의 말미에 고린도전서 10장에 관한 세 개의 소논문 내용을 요약하고 있는 것으로 미루어 볼 때 10개의 소논문 중에서 가장 나중에 기록되었다는 것만큼은 확실해보인다. *Decas disputationum miscellanearum*, 182.

32) Turrettini, *Decas disputationum miscellanearum*, 191.

33) Turrettini, *Decas disputationum miscellanearum*, 182, 189.