Examination of Arminianism

BY SAMUEL RUTHERFORD

TRANSLATED BY ONKU

Samuel Rutherford (1600-1661), *Examination of Arminianism*

Examination of Arminianism

Samuel Rutherford

Translated and edited by Onku, with the help of Claude 3 Opus.

Substack: https://substack.com/@onkuoh?utm_source=user-menu
Twitter[X]: https://x.com/onkuoh

Please do not republish without my permission.

Portrait of Samuel Rutherford (1600–1661), Courtesy of the University of St Andrews Libraries and Museums, ID: HC223

Contents

Examination of Arminianism

Dedicatory Epistle Of Matthias Nethenus

Letter of Robert MacWard to Matthias Nethenus

Nethenus's Preface

Judgment Of Voetius and Essenius

Index of certain errata.

Chapter 1.
On the Holy Scriptures, and their subject matter; Fundamental and non-Fundamental Articles; also on Ignorance and error, and knowledge and faith concerning them.

- John. 5:39.
  Search the Scriptures; they testify of me.
- On Fundamentals and non-Fundamentals
  - Heb. 6:1-2.
    Therefore leaving the elementary doctrine of Christ, let us go on to maturity, not laying again a foundation of repentance from dead works and of faith toward God, of instruction about washings and laying on of hands, and the resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment.
  - 1 Cor. 2:14.
    The natural person does not accept the things of the Spirit of God, for they are folly to him, and he is not able to understand them because they are spiritually discerned.
  - 2 Cor. 4:3.
    And even if our gospel is veiled, it is veiled to those who are perishing.
  - Col. 2:6-7.
    Walk in Him, rooted, built up, and established.
    Heb. 13:9. Do not be led away by diverse and strange teachings.
  - 2 Tim. 3:16-17.
    All Scripture is breathed out by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work.
  - Rom. 14:14.
    I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself, but it is unclean for anyone who thinks it unclean.

Chapter 2. On God.

- Title One, On the Knowledge[Cognitione] of God.
  - Col. 1:10.
    That you may walk worthy of God -- growing in all knowledge.
- Title Two, On God according to his Essence, and his Unity and Essential Omnipresence.

1 Cor. 8:6.
But to us, there is only one God.
Acts. 17:27.
He is not far from each one of us.
Title Three, On the Trinity.
1 Cor. 8:6.
But to us there is but one God.
Rom. 9:5.
Who is God, blessed forever.
Phil. 2:6.
Who, being in the form of God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped.
Heb. 1:6.
And let all the angels of God worship him.
Rom. 9:5.
Who is God, blessed forever.
Matt. 28:19.
Baptize all, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.
Title Four, On the Knowledge[Scientia]of GOD.
Acts. 15:18.
Known to God are all his works from the beginning of the World, or, from eternity.
Heb. 4:13.
All things are naked and open to him with whom we have to do.
Title Five, On the Will Of God, and its certain execution.
Rom. 9:19.
Who can resist his will?
Rom. 9:18.
He has mercy on whom he wills, and he hardens whom he wills.
James. 1:17.
With whom there is no variation or shadow due to change.
Matt. 6:10.
Your will be done on earth as it is in heaven.
Eph. 1:11.
Who works all things according to the counsel of his will.
Luke. 21:18.
But not a hair of your head will perish.
Rom. 11:23.
God is able to graft them in again.
1 Thess. 4:3.
For this is the will of God, your sanctification.
2 Thess. 2:11.

Therefore God sends them a strong delusion.

1 Thess. 2:16.
Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they may be saved, so as always to fill up the measure of their sins. But wrath has come upon them to the uttermost.

Chapter 3. On Election.

Rom. 9:11.

Eph. 1:3.
Even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy.

Acts. 13:48.
And as many as were appointed to eternal life believed.

Eph. 1:4.
Just as He chose us before the foundation of the world, or from eternity.

Chapter 4. On Reprobation.

It is asked, Is Reprobation a temporal act, not an eternal one in God?

Chapter 5. On the State of the First Man.

Eph. 4:24.
And put on the new self, created to be like God in true righteousness and holiness.

Chapter 6. On Original Sin

Rom. 5:12.
Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all sinned.

Chapter 7. On the State of Fallen Man

Rom. 8:7.
For the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God, for it does not submit to God's law; indeed, it cannot. v. 8. Those who are in the flesh cannot please God.

Chapter 8. On the State of Grace.

1 Tim. 2:3-4.
This is good, and pleases God our Savior, who wants all people to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth.

Chapter 9. On Universal Redemption.

1 John. 10:11.
I am that good Shepherd. The good Shepherd lays down his life for the sheep.

Eph. 1:7.
In whom we have redemption through His blood, the remission of lapses, according to the riches of His grace.

John. 3:19.
This is the condemnation, that Light has come into the world, yet men love darkness rather than Light, etc.

Rom. 5:10.
For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son; much more, being reconciled, we will be saved by His life.

2 Cor. 5:19.
God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself.
1 Pet. 2:24.
Who bore our sins in His body on the tree.
1 Cor. 1:4.
I give thanks to my God always concerning you, for the grace, which is given to you in Christ Jesus.
John. 15:13.
Greater love has no one than this, that someone lay down his life for his friends.
Rom. 8:34.
Who is he who condemns? It is Christ who died, yea rather, who is also risen again.
Chapter 10. On the Covenant of Grace.
Heb. 8:8.
For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: v.9 Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. v.10 For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people.
Rom. 9:8.
But the children of the promise are counted for the seed.
Matt. 10:5.
Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not.
Chapter 11. On the Mode of Conversion.
Eph. 1:18-19.
That you may know, what is the exceeding greatness of his power towards us who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, Which he worked in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places.
Chapter 12. The Justification of a Sinner.
Rom. 3:28.
Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith apart from the deeds of the law.
Rom. 4:3.
For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness.
1 John 1:8.
If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.
Rom. 6:23.
The wages of sin is death.
Gal. 5:17.

For the flesh lusts against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary to one another, so that you do not do the things that you wish.

Rom. 7:18.
For to will is present with me, but how to perform what is good I do not find. Verse 23. But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.

Rom. 7:14.
We know that the law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin.

Matt. 3:10.
Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire.

1 John. 1:7.
And the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanses us from all sin.

Acts. 13:43.
To him all the prophets witness, that through his name whoever believes in him will receive remission of sins.

1 Tim. 1:15.
This saying is trustworthy and deserving of full acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am the foremost.

Chapter 13. On the Perseverance of the Saints.

John. 10:28.
I give them eternal life, and they shall never perish; no one will snatch them out of my hand. v. 29. My Father, who has given them to me, is greater than all.

Matt. 13:20.
But he who receives the seed in stony places, is he who hears the Word, and immediately receives it with joy. v. 21. But he has no root in himself, but is temporary, etc.

Heb. 6:4.
For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, v. 5. And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, v. 6. If they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance.

2 Pet. 2:20.
For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning.

1 Tim. 1:19.
Which some having put away concerning faith have made shipwreck: v. 20. Of whom is Hymenaeus and Alexander.

Phil. 2:12.
Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.

Matt. 16:18.
Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

Acts. 2:21.
And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved.
Rom. 7:17.
So then it is no longer I that do it, but sin which dwells in me.
Chapter 14. On the Certainty of Salvation.
Rom. 8:35. Who shall separate us from the love of God?
Chapter 15 On The Church, and its marks.
Matt. 18:17.
If he refuses to listen to them, tell it to the Church.
John. 10:28.
My sheep hear my voice.
Chapter 16. On the Ministers of the Word.
Rom. 10:15.
And how are they to preach unless they are sent?
Chapter 17. On Synods.
Acts. 15:6.
The apostles and elders were gathered together to consider this matter.
Chapter 18. On The Sacraments and Ecclesiastical Discipline.
Matt. 28:19.
Go therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.
Chapter 19. On the Magistrate.
Rom. 13.4.
For he is God's minister for your good. But if you do what is evil, be afraid; for he does not bear the sword in vain; for he is God's minister, an avenger for wrath to the one who does what is evil.
Chapter 20. On The Soul, & the Resurrection of the Flesh.
Acts. 7.59.
Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit.
Matt. 25.41.
Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil & his angels.

EXAMINATION
OF ARMINIANISM,

Written and dictated to disciples
by
The Most Learned and Most Famous Man,
D. SAMUEL RUTHERFORD,
Doctor & Professor of Sacred Theology in the Scottish
Academy of St. Andrew;
Reviewed and edited by
MATTHIAS NETHENUS,
Doctor & Professor of Sacred Theology.

UTRECHT,
From the Workshop of ANTONIUS SMITEGELT,
Bookseller,
IN THE YEAR 1668

Dedicatory Epistle Of Matthias Nethenus

To the Most Noble, Most Eminent, and Most Celebrated Virgin and Lady in Birth, Learning, and Piety, LADY ANNA MARIA van SCHURMAN,

MATTHIAS NETHENUS,
in Christ, Our Lord, sends greetings.

Behold, Most Noble Lady, there comes to you, our Utrecht Minerva; not a pagan but a Christian one; not a Goddess, but a worshipper of the true God; not fictitious, but living and breathing; a Literary, Academic and Theological gift, and therefore not foreign to your intellect, nor abhorrent, born in the fortieth year of this century, in the Scottish Academy of St Andrews: and afterwards, with the Author having died and been received into heaven, Most Renowned for learning and piety, through the banishment of certain of his Colleagues and disciples, transferred to us, offered to me, approved; and now, may God turn it to good, by the will of friends, by my care and effort, into the public light, for the common benefit of all who are eager for truth and piety, and especially of novices in theological schools, produced. The Author of this plan for me was a Faithful Minister and Witness of Christ, and our Beloved Brother in Christ, Mr. Robert Mackward, Pastor of the Church of Glasgow, formerly an intimate disciple of the Most Renowned Rutherford, now with other compatriots and Brothers of his, not entirely unknown to you, on account of his free confession of the truth, and assertion of the cause of Christ, and from the Anglican Hierarchy, now into the native Churches, according to the vow of the Hierarchs, with the grief of many pious people, introduced, his spirit, not only removed from his place and function, but also banished from the Kingdom. For those Brothers, as many as have been admitted to your acquaintance and conversation, together with us, do not so much admire and marvel at, the splendor of your birth, your singular humanity, modesty and courtesy, or even your excellent knowledge of so many languages, arts, and human and divine matters; since God often pours such gifts even into vessels of wrath, fitted for destruction: (although you have surpassed your sex to a miracle in these things) as your remarkable and by no means feigned piety towards God, your serious affection for the Kingdom and glory of God, and the work and cause of Christ, against the Devil and his kingdom, and your Zeal for the Spiritual Jerusalem and house of God; which is so fervent in your virginal breast, that this is your greatest joy, if you see, hear or understand that it is well, and your greatest sorrow, if ill with it: and thus also your exceptional charity towards all pious servants of God and faithful Ministers of Christ, and your Christian grief and compassion towards those same ones afflicted for the sake of Christ, on account of their afflictions; on

account of their faith, constancy and fortitude of spirit, in so good a cause, your joy and congratulation.

This holy disposition, truly divine character and Christian nobility and spiritual generosity of yours, you have testified through pious conversations, sermons, letters about the cause of Christ, and other arguments, as the situation required, both to these Scottish brothers and to others deemed worthy by similar grace of God; nor do you allow it to be obscure or unknown to anyone who knows you, while, before an impious world and this adulterous generation, you are not ashamed of Christ and his cause and afflicted servants; indeed, you acknowledge him as your Lord and King, and these as his true and faithful servants, and your brothers in Christ the Lord; and you judge the despised, afflicted, and miserable state of these in the world, far preferable to that of other False Prophets, who sail with the world, accommodate themselves to the times, are men-pleasers, enemies of the cross of Christ, mind earthly things and seek their own interests and not the things of Christ Jesus, and for that reason make merchandise of the word of God, and, through smooth talk and flattery, deceive the hearts, not only of the wicked, but also of the innocent, and by thes arts withdraw themselves from the cross of Christ, court the favor of the Great and Powerful, and purchase the peace and goods of the world; which is a dangerous and slippery happiness.

Added to these things is that you also highly esteemed the Author of this book, a Most Renowned Man for learning, piety, faith and diligence, in the office entrusted to him, Mr. Samuel Rutherford, known well enough even here among us from other writings, both in the British and also the Latin language, and various labors in the Cause of Christ, and contests for the truth, and purity, and Christian Discipline of the Churches of his Homeland, against errors, heresies and corruptions, repugnant to the Gospel of Christ, and dear to all who are zealous for the cause of God; but now, his labors and contests finished, taken up, as to his soul, into the rest and joys of his Lord, and on the last day of judgment, in that greatest assembly of men and angels, also in his resurrected body, to be adorned with the crown of heavenly glory, by the supreme Judge and Rewarder, Christ his King; and you loved him in Christ, though absent and separated by a long tract of sea, and never seen with the eyes of the body.

For these reasons, therefore, our Rev. Brother Mackward judged that this book especially should be inscribed to you, for the sake of honor and veneration, which the great Author directed, like his Apologetic Exercises for divine Grace, and Scholastic Disputation on divine Providence, against the errors of our age, Pelagian, but familiar and easily besetting to fallen man, and therefore easily transported from our Netherlands into Britain and disseminated, and dictated with the pen in the Marian College of the University of St Andrews, where he was Professor of Theology, to imbue the minds of his hearers with the

knowledge of the Orthodox truth about Providence and divine Grace, and to prepare novices of Theology for contests against the Arminians living in his Britain and here. Nor could he doubt that to you, Most Loving and Most Skilled in the truth which is according to godliness, especially in the cause of God, against Pelagius and his followers among us, the Arminians, and Most Studious of the name of the deceased and now received into heaven Author, both on account of its own worth, and on account of the sacred memory of the blessed Author, and his outstanding merits concerning the Church of Christ, both the book itself and this service of ours would be pleasing.

Indeed, he persuades himself that to the Most Renowned Author and his most deserving Teacher, if he should come back to life and understand the reason for this plan, this dedication of his book, as made according to his own opinion and wish, would be pleasing to hear.

Therefore, I also could resist the advice of this best Man and our Most Renowned Brother all the less, because I saw, not only that once the beloved Apostle of Christ wrote a canonical letter to the elect Lady and her children, whom he truly loved; and afterwards Jerome, the Most Learned and Most Celebrated Doctor of the Christian Church, inscribed commentaries and theological treatises to Paula and Eustochium, Laeta, Marcella, Hedibia, Algasia, and other women distinguished for learning and piety; but also in our time and in the fifty-fourth year of this century, that Most Renowned and Most Celebrated Man, Veteran soldier of Christ, most practiced and proved in the wars of Jehovah, now panting for the end of his labors and the heavenly prize, Mr. Gisbert Voetius, once our Teacher, and afterwards our venerable Colleague in the Profession of Theology, dedicated to you and your equal in the pursuit of manifold erudition and piety, the most noble man, Mr. Johannes Godeschalcus van Schurman, your twin brother, after that time, with firm confidence in the grace of God, and certain expectation of eternal life, translated hence to the Lord and the heavenly society, the second part of his select Theological disputations, testifying that, after he had the good fortune to be admitted into your friendship, he discovered what a shrine of piety, a workshop of all-round erudition, a sanctuary, truly domestic, in this city Academy, a literary Republic in this Republic, and thus also in this city Church a domestic Church, your most noble family was in those times: from which you alone remained a survivor, the rest of your relatives having been promoted to the heavenly Academy and Church. And why not? since even the servants there were exercised in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew letters, in the study of piety, and in the knowledge and meditation of the sacred writings, and were trained for the sacred Ministry of the divine Word, not only in public, but also in that domestic School: one of whom even now performs with praise the duty of an Ecclesiastical Pastor in Zeeland, near Zierikzee.

And to whom should these literary gifts be sent with greater reason than to literate persons, patronesses of letters and the literate, lovers of Orthodox truth and piety, and well disposed towards its Doctors and defenders, and all the servants and handmaids of Christ: who can read with judgment the books of pious Doctors offered to them, and rightly judge of their argument, treatment and worth, and also by the celebrity of their name commend the books inscribed to them to others more unskilled, curious and studious of the truth? But these exceptional gifts of God so concur in you alone, that not only among women, but even among learned men few are found, who can be compared with you: and since they are in the female sex, they easily place the honor and uncontaminated fame and celebrity of your name above envy among all, in whom there is something of humanity.

Many are accustomed to dedicate to Kings, Princes, Magistrates, the Rich, the Noble and the Powerful of this world, and to Men placed in eminence, their own, or others', lucubrations published by their care; that they may invite them to the knowledge and protection of good letters, and of heavenly truth and wisdom, to the reformation of defects, in doctrine and morals, and to the restoration and propagation of divine worship; and that, hiding under the shadow of their name and authority, they may be protected against envious Zoiluses, or even open enemies; or also, that they may oblige them to the promotion of themselves and their own, or elicit some honorarium gift. Which is not to be blamed either, if it is done decently and prudently, and often is not without some desired success. Because God has among them, although rare, yet some, who are his own; and those who are not his own, yet often for the better preservation and propagation of human society, have in themselves, worthy of praise, certain gifts of Justice, prudence, humanity, clemency, benignity and beneficence, even granted to the Heathen and unbelievers from a certain common grace of God. But when False-prophets offer to False-politicians, worldly men to worldly men, and hypocrites to hypocrites books and literary gifts, tempered to their disposition and desires, on account of the kinship of common spirit and character, their hope and expectation almost never deceives them. Yet this can be truly said of Kings, Princes and Magnates of this world in general, that among them very few are of such a disposition, learning, judgment and will, that they themselves read with judgment and profit the books of the erudite, and especially of pious and God- and Christ-devoted men, offered to them, and grant to the authors, according to merit, patronage, protection and rewards. To most applies the censure of the Holy Spirit. Psalm 82:2. "They know nothing nor understand: they walk in darkness: hence all the foundations of the earth totter." Most throughout the world, are either utterly ignorant of the truth, which is according to godliness, or knowing it despise and neglect it, or even laugh at it in their heart. Most serve not God, but the Prince of this world, and their own lusts, ambition, avarice, and their belly: they abhor serious piety and its Doctors, and turn the authority and power, which they have received from God, for their defense, to their persecution and oppression.

In that order of men are tyrants and scoffers, vigilant for injustice. Who, although they themselves are covered with sins and all injustice, and walk proudly in their guilt, without fear, alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance and hardness of their heart, when they cannot oppress in another way a God-fearing man, a Doctor of justice and piety, they make him guilty of sin, on account of some word, and lay a snare for him who reproves in the gate, and turn aside and thrust the just into the void. Jeremiah 29:20, 21. And thus by their very deeds they say to the faithful Ministers and Seers of God, "Do not see," and to the Providers, "Do not provide right things for us: speak flattering things to us; provide illusions: Depart from the way: lead us from the path: cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us." Isaiah 30:10, 11. Thus, casting off reverence for God, they say to him, as it were to his face, "Depart from us: for we do not delight in the knowledge of your ways." Job 21:14. Thus they rise up against Jehovah and his Christ, and say to one another: "Let us break their bonds, and cast away from us their thick cords." Psalm 2:2, 3. Thus they say: "We do not want this man to reign over us." Luke 19:4. Whom, when they have filled up the measure of their sins and impiety, Christ, Our Lord and Judge of the world, will break with a rod of iron, and dash in pieces like a potter's vessel. Psalm 2:9. This has already been done to most of such tyrants and sons of Belial, is done daily to others, and will furthermore be done to the rest until the consummation of the age, when, before the whole assembly of angels and men, even in their own resurrected bodies, by the terrible but just sentence of the supreme Judge, they will be cast into the eternal fire, which is prepared for the Devil and his angels, Matthew 25:41, Revelation 6:15, 16, 17. Now those who in their life, serve not God, but the Prince of this world, laugh in their heart at truth, piety, and its Doctors, and the labors of these for both, or even maliciously hate and persecute them, and believe that the appearance of religion, Justice and piety is useful to them for their own ends, but that truth and power are useless; what from these should a sincere Theologian, and a Doctor and champion of the truth, which is according to godliness, expect by the dedication of his own or another's work, in terms of grace, favor, patronage, defense or promotion? Unless perhaps, as they desire to retain the appearance of piety, on account of the respect and honor bestowed upon them, they show a little grace, with a heart hypocritical both towards God and towards his Ministers and cause. For the gifts and benefits of their money scarcely reach learned, pious and wise men, but fall as prey mostly to Thrasoes, Gnathoes, parasites and flatterers of the court, politicians, ecclesiastics and soldiers. Not otherwise, than figs and similar fruits, growing on high, steep and inaccessible to man rocks and mountains, are devoured by crows, vultures and other rapacious birds, or otherwise falling to the ground or into the waters, are perhaps snatched by some wild beast or fish, or simply rot away and perish uselessly.

With greater reason, therefore, to you, Most Noble Lady, Devout handmaid of God, than to any such Prince or eminent and powerful man as Lord, I inscribe the present book concerning the cause of God, against the Pelagians of our time and our places. For if to

learning, if to virtue, if to piety, honor is to be paid by the dedication of books; these ornaments are lacking in such Princes and Magnates; but they make you admirable in your sex, and raise you not only above common men, but also above most literate men and Princes and Rulers of this age. Or if for the Author, the Dedicator and the Book itself honor, defense and patronage is sought; we expect more honor, defense and protection from you, than from any such Prince or great Lord: who are yourself worthy of all honor and veneration, on account of your manifold erudition, wisdom and piety, which they lack; to be honored on this account only, because they hold an eminent place in the world; and you yourself understand these things and rightly estimate their worth, and can commend them with keen judgment, wisdom and authority, which learning and piety has earned for you, among all, who love them, and defend them against the barkings and bites of Zoiluses. For although, as the Pagans feigned about their Minerva, you are not armed with a warlike breastplate, helmet, shield and spear: nor do you terrify those you meet with the Medusa's head, bristling with serpents, and turn those who gaze upon it into stones; and thus do not wage physical wars, or shed the blood of enemies or overthrow cities; Instead, in this regard, you are a peaceful and unarmed virgin, a calm sheep of Christ, the supreme shepherd, showing Christian benignity, courtesy and gentleness towards all: yet as a good disciple and follower of Christ, a spiritual warrior, endowed with a heroic spirit from on high and armed with the panoply of God, you wage spiritual wars against the Devil and his kingdom, and according to the situation, help others fighting, with counsel, aid, or at least with wishes and prayers. You have your Loins girt with the Belt of divine Truth, no ignoble part of which is also delivered and asserted in this book. You have fortified your Breast with the Breastplate of Righteousness, bestowed by Christ our Lord, and by his Holy Spirit. You have your Feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of Peace: and your Head covered with the Helmet of salvation. You hold the Shield of Faith, to quench all the fiery darts of that Evil One; and the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, to slay and slaughter any errors and sins, and to assert the doctrine of Truth and Evangelical piety, against its adversaries, and the cause of God, against Pelagius, Arminius, and their followers, with the man of God Rutherford, and other heroes. Thus you yourself also faithfully serve Christ our Emperor, and in the station assigned to you by him, fight not in a womanly manner, and applaud others bravely doing their work: praying with all prayer and supplication at all times, through the Spirit, and being watchful to that very thing with all perseverance and supplication, for all saints. Equipped with these arms and thus serving Christ, you are truly a certain martial Pallas, introduced into the world not by the Devil to drive men mad; but by God to destroy the Devil's kingdom; formidable to the Devil and his angels, pleasing and to be honored by the servants of the most high God and the soldiers of Christ; and therefore also by us, in the dedication of this book, with great right to be preferred to other worldly men and Princes, and to all Nimrods, Pharaohs, Sennacheribs, Nebuchadnezzars, Belshazzars, Achilleses, Alexanders, Caesars, Jeroboams, Ahabs, and Herods.

Accept therefore, Most Noble Lady and Most Celebrated Virgin, with a placid and serene countenance this Theological gift, brought to us from Scotland, the posthumous book of the great Rutherford, in which he, even dead in the Lord, speaks, and stirs up new battles against Arminius and his followers, among us and his Britons, for asserting the Grace and cause of God, and instructs and trains novices to successfully wage the same wars of Jehovah, prepared for the press and published by my effort; and furthermore continue, as you have done hitherto, to show yourself a lover and cultivator of heavenly wisdom, orthodox Truth and True piety, and a patroness of me and other servants of Christ fighting for these things, but especially also of those Scottish Brothers, bravely enduring the struggle of affliction, and of all partakers of the cross of Christ Theologians. Thus being a partaker of their grace, you will be a partaker in due time also of their glory. But False-prophets and heretics, whether in the doctrine of faith or of morals, men-pleasing Theologians, betrayers of Christ's Church and cause; False-politicians and tyrants, secret and open haters, slanderers, persecutors and oppressors of Truth and piety and of the faithful servants of God, and soldiers of Christ, genuine Ministers and sons of the Devil, with united minds and efforts, fighting for his cause and kingdom, God will judge in due time, and will give them a reward according to their works. His Grace be with you and with us. AMEN.

I wrote this at Utrecht in my Study, in the Year of the Christian Era 1668, on the 15th day before the Calends of September.

Letter of Robert MacWard to Matthias Nethenus

To the Excellent Servant of God and Most Famous Professor of Theology,
Mr. Matthias Nethenus.
Utrecht.
November, 8.
To the most Famous Man & One Crowned with the Honorable Cross of Christ.

I have transmitted (with this excellent young man, a Candidate of Theology, and a partaker of Christ's cross, together with Father Dom: Tralius) that manuscript of your most distinguished Brother Rutherford, which in the judgment of learned men, but especially in yours, is considered worthy of light. Whatever benefit the Church of God will gain from it, we acknowledge that this is to be attributed to you alone, after the Author. You have promised, great and excellent Man, that you will want to run through and review each page for the last time, before they are described by type, and described by type and now corrected before they are committed to the press. But so that you (who alone are equal to this burden by reason of equality with the Author in sharpness of intellect) may make the Author similar to himself, if ever with a hasty pen, he has either said something otherwise, or omitted something to be said; I have commanded this friend of ours, with whom remains the labor and care of watching over the press, to obey you in all things as you direct. If any little word or phrase less suitable renders the sense more obscure to the Reader, you (just as it was agreed between us) will delete or change it at will, before it is handed over to the Printer. But in what place those things, which are added by the Author in the margin (if any doubt occurs about this anywhere), are to be inserted, you will show. And lest the Reading of the manuscript should cause you any difficulty, or steal too much of your precious time, I have commanded Mr. Tralius to relieve you of this burden; so that with him reading, you may note the things to be corrected, omitted or changed. As for me, I have nothing to repay you for this labor; but we have no doubt that God Himself, whom you serve, and for whom you have suffered so many and such great things, will number and reward this among other things excellently and faithfully performed by you. I also know for certain that the Author's friends will transmit all his works, written and published in the vernacular language, to your Lordship, as a testimony of gratitude. Farewell and live as an excellent servant of Christ, all prosperity, indeed in the most adverse circumstances, wishes and prays for you from God and your Lord.

Your unworthy Brother and most humble servant,

Robert. MacWard

Nethenus's Preface

Preface to the Reader.

Matthias Nethenus,
to the Reader Studious of Truth and Piety, sends greetings.

Do not wonder, Christian Reader, that, after so many contests with the Pelagians and their remnants, both elsewhere and here among us, now to some extent settled, and after so many lucubrations of other most learned men, and also two of this our Author, on this subject, for the cause of God, against the remnants of Pelagianism, in the writings of Arminius and his disciples and followers, which are read by all who are studious of these matters, the Author having been dead for some time now, we bring forth the present book into the public light of the world.

For if the Disciples of Pelagius, the Adversaries of Orthodox Truth, thought that the Pelagian Dialogues of Sebastian Castellio, on Predestination, Election, Free Will and Faith, and similar writings, full of the ignorance, errors, corruptions, calumnies and blasphemies, which that Pelagian dog vomited out against heavenly truth, although, as Felix or rather unhappy Turpio the Prefacer says, the final hand was not put to them by the author, should be published nearly fifteen years after his death; which he himself while living, perhaps from some conscience, or at least from dread of his error and impiety, in perverting Scripture and blaspheming its truth, was unwilling to publish; and if our Remonstrants, the Disciples of Pelagius, Castellio, that unhappy Turpio and Arminius, took care that those writings, as serving their cause, should be reprinted at Gouda, here in Belgium, in the year 1613, not without additions, and afterwards, to seduce and drive the people mad, published some of these translated into the Belgian language: why should not we, the disciples of Christ and Orthodox truth, and the Adversaries of Pelagius and his followers, publish this Orthodox and Antipelagian work of so learned, so pious, so renowned a Theologian, useful for promoting the cause of God among men, and snatching them from the darkness of errors, into the Kingdom of Truth, piety and light, to the glory of God and their own salvation, even if not polished by the Author for this purpose; especially since books written in Latin so fully, so orderly, so briefly, against Arminianism, creeping here and in Britain, have hitherto been wanting among us?

For you must not think that the Pelagian errors, which are so familiar and congenial to corrupted man, can ever or anywhere be so plucked out or extirpated, that they do not again, like unhappy tares, spring up from the soil of corrupt nature, and strive to choke the

wheat and good herbs of truth: or that they can be so vanquished, slain, hidden or destroyed, that they do not again, like the heads of the Hydra, come to life, rise up against God and his truth, and inflate man, with the presumption of his absolute and independent liberty, against God and his Grace, with a pernicious and deadly tumor of pride.

To all times and places belongs that complaint of Thomas Bradwardine, when in the preface of his work, on the Cause of God, invoking God he thus laments: "Behold (which I report not unless touched with grief of heart), as once against the one Prophet of God eight hundred and fifty prophets of Baal and the like were found, to whom also an innumerable people adhered; so in this cause, how many, O Lord, today, with Pelagius, fight for Free Will, against your gratuitous Grace, and against Paul, the spiritual Champion of Grace?" Likewise: "Almost the whole world has gone after Pelagius into error." These things Bradwardine there prefaces to his work not according to rhetorical hyperbole, but according to Theological Truth, proven by experience.
For since, by the fall of our first parents, the nature of man has been depraved, the intellect darkened, and the will and desires wholly inclined to evil; how natural, familiar and easy it is for man to please himself, to err, to fall and to sin; so natural, familiar and easy is it for man to approve Pelagian errors, as truth, and to embrace and defend them for truth.

They creep up on man unnoticed, and most tenaciously adhere to him, and it is the work of divine Grace alone, to think rightly about itself and our Free Will and choice. There are indeed, as of moral virtues, so also of orthodox truth, in these points, some remaining seeds in corrupt nature, which, with the accession of a certain common Grace of God, have brought forth some fruits even among the Gentiles, but outside of Christ, as may be seen in the ancient Sages and Magi of the Chaldeans, Persians, Indians and Egyptians, and in the Stoic Philosophers of the Greeks, and today in the Mohammedans, who have taught and written, teach write and hold many things about the Providence of God and Fate excellently according to right reason, which are also proven to be true by the oracles of the Holy Spirit. But the Holy Spirit himself, in Scripture, delivers the orthodox Truth, received in our Churches, in many places, so evidently, that a man, reading it without prejudice, and taking his intellect captive to the obedience of God, cannot doubt about its genuine sense. Yet these seeds of Truth, remaining in nature, but evidently scattered in many places in Scripture, in most men, not only from the common people, but also from the learned and eminent, with the cooperation of the Prince of darkness, have both of old been suffocated, and today are suffocated by the unhappy tares of Pelagianism, which, of its own accord and copiously, rises up and grows in the soil of corrupt nature.

And what Paul once wrote about the Sages of the Gentiles: "They became vain in their reasonings, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they

became fools. For they changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into the likeness of the image of corruptible man." Rom. 1:21, 22, 23. That can deservedly be transferred to Pelagius and all his predecessors and followers, Ancient and more recent, whose whole wisdom consists in this, that by a more subtly renewed heresy of the Anthropomorphites, they conform the incomprehensible Deity to man, and what they find written in the word of God anthropopathically about God, they understand and apply to God not theoprepontically, but anthropopathically, that is, with the imperfections adhering to man.

Let us hear Castellio, the Master of Felix Turpio, Arminius and the Arminians, and we will see, how the truth sometimes forced itself upon his mind, and was there suffocated and rejected, by Pelagian and Anthropomorphitic speculations. In Dialogue 2, when he had objected to himself the passage Rom. 9:14ff. and indeed rather ignorantly and crudely, so that he could reply with some appearance, he says, "If this passage alone of Paul's writings existed, I would have nothing, to tell the truth, to answer. But since both the justice of God, and the whole sacred writings, and besides other writings of Paul himself cry out against it; it is necessary, that either his words are understood otherwise, or he seems to be contrary to himself; which God forbid!"
p. 95. And on the passage Rom. 9:17, "I wish indeed that both in this place, and in certain others, Paul had set forth his mind more copiously and openly!" (p. 102) But he there sets forth the truth more copiously than was pleasing to the Pelagianizing Castellio. Afterwards, treating desertion, he says from his own sense: "Truly man cannot but sin, if he is so deserted by God." (p. 105) Likewise he introduces God thus speaking from his own sense: "But if you ask, why I created you, if I knew that you would perish? I will answer, Woe to him who contends with his Maker, a potsherd with the potter of the earth! Will the clay say to its potter, what are you doing? Or does your work lack handles?" Likewise: "Since he so openly says that he hoped for right from the Israelites, let us simply put faith in his words, and here cease to be curious." (pp. 109, 110, 111.) As if it were not a manifest imperfection, to have a vain hope! Or as if it were an illicit curiosity, to inquire, how this hope can consist with the foreknowledge of sin and destruction? Likewise: "I ask you, what is more absurd, than to say that there is patience, where things succeed according to the wish and opinion of the mind?" (p. 112.) Indeed, what is more absurd than to attribute to God a patience similar to human? Thus the wretched, with all their wisdom, stumble, strike against, and stick fast, in the byways of Pelagianism, who demand that the reason of all the counsels and actions of God be shown to us, as clearly as they can grasp and approve it by reason: otherwise suggesting calumnious absurdities.

Let us hear also Felix, shall I say, or unhappy? Turpio, the prefacer to those Pelagian Dialogues and treatises of Castellio, also a great Master of the Remonstrants and Vorstius. For he is the same who, in the year 1582, published at Cracow a treatise on the passage of Paul in the epistle to the Romans, chapter 7, in which he tries to prove, that Paul does not

speak of himself, as regenerate, under the name of Prosper Dysidaeus. If you ask the reason for the name; Prosper and Felix are the same as Faustus; Dysidaeus and Turpio, as Socinus. For aurea signifies base or deformed, whom the Italians call Sozzo.But the cause, which moved him thus to conceal his name, was this common one, that so hiding he might avoid the odium of the Orthodox, to be feared by him, on account of heterodox writings, and thus, without impediment, unknown disseminate his errors more widely, as he did in Transylvania and Poland.

But there was also a certain more hidden reason here, which the Polish Knight, the writer of his life, discloses to us, namely, that, living in Poland, by the benevolence and care of Francis the Grand Duke of Tuscany and Isabella de' Medici, he received annual revenues from his goods in Tuscany, and was bidden by their most humane letters to be of good courage for the future also, as long as life should be granted to them (with this condition added) provided that in publishing books he should not allow his name to appear publicly.

He therefore, Faustus Socinus, gives us a clear example and testimony of truth suffocated, in his own mind and that of others, when in the preface to the Dialogues and treatises of Castellio, he thus writes: "Who again can be ignorant, with what anguish of mind they are oppressed, who indeed think that it is free for man, to consent to the divine will: but meanwhile cannot see, how this either detracts nothing from divine providence, or is consistent with not a few passages of the sacred writings?"

Truly man sees, through the light of right Reason and Scripture, and to some extent approves the truth. But on the other hand the Devil, to hinder his sight, opposes dense clouds of doubts, and approves and commends to him Pelagian errors, and while man here must pass judgment, he easily inclines his intellect, accustomed to darkness, to the worse part, so as to embrace errors for truth.

He then puffs up haughty and self-pleasing men with self-confidence and pride, so that they do not fear to blaspheme the way of truth, as the Apostle Peter predicts of false prophets and their followers. 2 Pet. 2:1, 2.

Now also our Remonstrants in the Apology of the seventeenth chapter (fol. 161b) must acknowledge, that God has the right of gifting some of the called, especially those whose work he wants to use for the conversion of other men, with a more excellent and noble Virtue, that is, one which removes all resistance in the called, and invincibly and infallibly effects his assent and conversion: likewise (fol. 183b) they acknowledge a special grace, administered by God with respect to a few certain men, in such a way that the man, who is called through it, never resists it, and this they say was placed beyond doubt by all antiquity.

Finally (fol. 189, 190) they are compelled to acknowledge the free obedience of Christ the Savior, and of the angels, and yet certain through the grace of God and indefectible; which is also praised in Scripture and set before us for imitation. And in the Synodal Writings on the fifth article, p. 910, they do not dare to deny, that God sometimes, by his right, in an extraordinary way, remunerates certain of the faithful, long and much exercised in the study of piety, and proved in various adversities and afflictions, as by fire, with the gift of indefectible perseverance for this, that, as certain luminaries of piety, patience and fortitude, they may shine in the house of God, and serve God for instruments, to animate others, by their example, to the same constancy of faith.

These confessions of theirs, although extorted from the unwilling, by the evidence and force of truth, can suffice, to justify the doctrine of our Churches and purge it from all accusation of absurdity, and the Remonstrants, having conceived and cherished a love of truth, could be led from hence to the knowledge of their errors. Yet they do not cease to accuse and criminate our doctrine, and to cherish and defend their own Pelagianism.

Indeed, how familiar Pelagianism is to corrupt man, and how difficult it is to thoroughly know it and root it out of one's heart, Augustine shows us by his own example, the greatest Antagonist of Pelagius and his followers, in the ancient Church; who although he thought and wrote rightly and orthodoxly about the Grace of God, concerning fallen man, thought perversely and heterodoxly, with Pelagius and his disciples, about the Grace of the Angels and of Man uncorrupted; that Grace was given to them, without which they could not obey God and stand, and with which they could obey God and stand, if they willed; but to none Grace, by which it should come to pass, that they obeyed and persevered: that the good Angels, by that Grace, by their own will, rightly used, stood and obeyed God and merited to be confirmed in good; the evil Angels and first men, not rightly using it, fell into sin and condemnation.

That is, he determined that Grace to have been subject to the free will of men and angels, and determinable by them, and determined by these to good, by those to evil; as the Jesuit Remonstrants and all Pelagianizers today teach concerning the Grace of Christ.
Which Grace necessarily infers and supposes a conditional predestination, or one based on the foresight of the motion of free will, in angels and men.

Which is nothing else than pure Pelagianism, which Augustine never rightly saw or considered, or, after so many years of contests with the Pelagians, openly retracted: which therefore, with the sounder doctrine of Augustine, Cornelius Jansenius adopted and retained, and the Jansenists, in the Papacy, now condemned and oppressed; indeed, what may surprise you, the same Pelagianism, perhaps from an incautious reading of the Papist

Jansenius, or even from a blind zeal for contending, a certain Reformed Theologian here in Belgium has adopted, as I have previously shown him from his own words; and since he has also mixed himself up with the Jansenist cause, and approved it by published writings; these errors, deservedly disapproved by us, he has neither noted nor refuted in them; which however, he could have done, for their greater good, than thus simply to approve and praise their doctrine, most odious in the Papal court, on account of its agreement with ours.

But I, when I saw that Pelagianism is so natural and familiar to man, in the time of my studies, and afterwards of my Theological Professorship, devoted no slothful labor to the right understanding and well judging of these most difficult controversies; but brought forth into the Academic light and at different times proposed for ventilation three fundamental and capital disputations, in this matter; whence all things flow, and into which they are ultimately resolved.
The first on the Decree of God, concerning free contingencies, whether absolute, or suspended from a condition outside God?
The second on Middle Knowledge.
The third on the determining, or determinable concurrence of God?
I also instituted a disputation on the Decree of God concerning possibles, which do not come to pass, and show its use, both for composing the dissension arisen among our men, especially in France, concerning universal Grace or Will of saving, and for utterly overthrowing the Pelagianism of the Remonstrants and others.

And besides these I also held particular disputations on the Grace of God. These things recounted by me, and certain others, if God wills, and a suitable occasion and Typographer offers itself, can be published for the public utility of other studious of truth. If not, let that be done with them, which God wills. To me the reason for well employed duty and time is clear. Now, that we may approach nearer to the matter, which I intend, I have thought these things concerning the present book and its Author to be communicated to you.

The man of God, Samuel Rutherford, a Scot by nation, great in learning, but greatest of all in sanctity, piety, zeal for the house of God and the Kingdom of Christ, which all his writings breathe, but most of all his letters, published four years ago, after his death: having completed his course of studies, quite young, he was promoted to the Professorship of Philosophy, in the College of Edinburgh, where he had been educated, and thence to the Ministry of the Divine Word in the Church of Anwoth. At which time he elaborated, and dedicated to Mr. John Gordon, Lord of Lochinvar and Viscount of Kenmure, his Apologetical Exercitations, for divine grace, against James Arminius and his followers, and the Jesuits, their forerunners and associates. Which were also printed at Amsterdam in the year thirty-six of this century, and afterwards reprinted at Franeker,

and pleased me greatly in the time of my studies, in this Academy, and were of much profit in rightly understanding and judging the Pelagian controversies: as also, in the year forty-three, I publicly professed, in a disputation written and held in this Academy, on middle knowledge. But because, without the consent and approbation of the Bishop of Galloway, whom he was unwilling to acknowledge, he had undertaken the Ministry of the Word in the Church of Anwoth: not only did the Prelates accuse him, on account of the written and published Apologetical Exercitations; but also summoned him to judgment in their Court, on account of certain things said in preaching, concerning the sins of the Kingdom, and when he declined their judgment as of Judges not constituted by Christ in the Church, in the year thirty-six, removed him from his office, and relegated him to Aberdeen, far from Anwoth, and kept him captive: whence he wrote very many letters, to his friends, which constitute the first and by far the greatest part of his printed letters. He remained there captive until the year thirty-eight, when a notable change of affairs having taken place, he returned to his Church, for which in captivity he had been solicitous day and night. Yet he could not long be present with it, preside over it, or serve it, being called the following year, thirty-nine, the fifteenth, from which he had said farewell to Academic studies and exercises, from that Church, by the National Synod, to the Professorship of Theology in the Academy, and at the same time to the Ministry of the Word, in the Church of St Andrews.

In both these functions he remained up until the time of his fatal disease, when a great change was again made in the Government of the native Churches and Schools, by order of the supreme Senate, he was detained at his home, and with the disease growing stronger, in the sixty-first year, on the 4th day before the Calends of April, he was called by his God from this troubled life to a better one, with a great crowd of men accompanying the body of the deceased, buried in the Cemetery there, according to the custom of the place and Kingdom.

But since, on account of the published Apologetic Exercises, his name and doctrine had become known here in Belgium, in the fifty-first year, when the most learned and famous man, D. Carolus Dematius, whose memory is blessed, was taken from this Academy and the Church of Utrecht, the Most Ample Magistrate of our City, having understood his doctrine, piety and zeal for the house of God, sent his brother, who served in our Armies, and afterwards also fell asleep in the Lord here in Utrecht, to St. Andrews with letters of calling, and through him attempted to see if he could not transfer such an outstanding Man from his native land to Belgium, and build up the house of God and adorn the Academy and the Theological Chair with his person and doctrine. But his brother, captured at sea by the English Parliamentarians, and deprived not only of his goods and money for the journey, but also of the Letters of calling, came to St. Andrews with the help and aid of friends and explained to his brother Samuel the will and desire of our Most

Ample Magistrate: but since he had lost the authentic letters of calling, he brought back nothing except the hope of obtaining the man from his native land to here. Therefore, the Most Ample Magistrate, full of the matter, again sent the brother, furnished with sufficient money for the journey and letters. But when in the meantime Oliver Cromwell had defeated the King, crowned in the same year in Scotland, routing his army, and driven him from the Kingdom, now fearing all evils for his native land, he said that he could not, with a clear conscience, desert it in such great dangers; but was bound to be present with the Church of his native land, now breathing its last; and at least to attend the funeral procession and burial. Thus, therefore, he remained in his native land up to the day of his passing from this age, which also embraces his body, brought forth into the light there, in its bosom until the day of blessed resurrection.

During the time of his Theological Professorship he wrote and published ten proper books, for the most part polemical, but some also practical, and a Sermon on Daniel 6:26, for the use of his countrymen, in the vernacular language; which were also sent to me as a gift, with a letter from his pious widow full of kindness, prudence and religion, for the work done in publishing this book, and delivered at the end of July; and which will be valued by me, as long as I live, both on account of their own worth, and on account of the memory of our deceased Brother. But besides the Apologetic Exercises for Divine Grace, in the forty-ninth year, in the Latin language, he published a well-elaborated Scholastic Disputation on Divine Providence, against the Jesuits, Arminians and Socinians. But among other manuscripts which he left behind, there was also this present one, which we now give to you, an Examination of Arminianism. This he wrote in the first years of his Professorship for the use of novices in Theology, to whom he also began to dictate it with a pen, on the nineteenth day of June in the fortieth year, in the Marian Schools; but he did not revise or polish it for publication by printing. When the Reverend Man and beloved Brother, Robert Mackward, one of the principal and most intimate disciples of the Most Famous Rutherford, to whose custody it, with certain other Latin manuscripts, had been entrusted by the Widow and Friends of the deceased Author, had shown it to me to be viewed and explored, although the Author's handwriting was a little more difficult and hindered for me to read, not being accustomed to it; nevertheless from those things which I had read, I judged the book to be worthy of being published in print, and communicated to other students of Theology, especially novices: because I did not know of the existence among us of any complete or extensive Examination of the whole Remonstrant Theology of this kind, written by this method, and thus accommodated to the understanding of novices and also to the easy use of the more learned. The greatest praise is certainly due to the Theologian of profound and accurate erudition, William Ames the Englishman, who not only, before the National Synod of Dort, in a Theological duel with Nicholas Grevinchovius, but also having written and published an Appendix to the Hague Conference, and after the Synod the Anti-Synodical writings, with the whole Society of the

Remonstrants, having refuted their principal writings, fought bravely, prudently and successfully, and showed himself a strong and invincible leader of others in this contest. But all that labor, struggle and contest is confined within the circle of the five articles of the Remonstrance, which were examined and decided in the Synod of Dort: it does not extend to other errors of the Remonstrants. Also to be celebrated, for his great merit, by all zealous students of orthodox truth, is William Twisse, a most learned, most subtle, most studious and most eloquent Theologian, who deserved exceedingly well of the Church of God, who examined and refuted with proper diligence the very writings of James Arminius against William Perkins and Francis Junius, and of John Arnold Corvinus against Daniel Tilenus, on the matter of Predestination: which writings of his, contained in two proper volumes, were brought to light in the thirty-first and forty-ninth years: and besides, in a separate volume, he attacked and destroyed the fiction of middle knowledge, which was published in the thirty-ninth year, and inscribed to the Illustrious and Very Powerful Estates of Friesland. But here also many controversies with the Remonstrants, as not pertaining to the scope there proposed, are not even touched upon. The first, with the Synod of Dort having been finished, was the Most Famous man Peter Du Moulin, a French Theologian, who published a fuller system against the Remonstrants, the Anatomy of Arminianism, which he afterwards reviewed, and enlarged by inserting a refutation of the Synodical Writings. But other principal writings of the Remonstrants, published only later, Du Moulin, as he was then unable to see them, so also could not compare them. John Arnold Corvinus attacked that Anatomy; but Anthony Walaeus defended it. In the twenty-first year the Remonstrants published, in the native language, a public Confession of their faith, and as it were a complete body of their doctrine and Theology, of which the Leyden Theologians, by order of the Estates of Holland and West Friesland, undertook a Censure, wrote it, and in the twenty-sixth year sent it forth into the light, with the Remonstrants' Confession, translated into Latin, inserted. The Remonstrants in the twenty-ninth year opposed to it an Apology of their Confession, or Examination of the Censure, written by Simon Episcopius. When afterwards the Leyden Theologians were called away from the Refutation of this, both by other occupations, and especially by the preparation, and conforming to the original texts, by decree of the National Synod, and illustrating with notes, of a new version of the sacred Bible into the Belgian language; the South Holland Synod desiring it, Isaac Junius, Minister of Delft, undertook this task, and wrote an Antapology, or Animadversions on the first sixteen chapters of the Remonstrants' Apology, which, he himself having been called from this life to the Lord, by arrangement of the Synod, were printed at Delft in the fortieth year. Then from the forty-second year up to the fiftieth, the Reverend man, and one who deserved exceedingly well of the Church of God, especially in the Confederate Netherlands, D. Jacob Trigland, Theologian of the Leyden Academy, most practiced in these controversies, in seventy-four disputations, held successively, completed the Refutation of the whole Apology, and in the following four years of his life, reviewed, enlarged, and digested into a book, consisting of fifty-nine

chapters, that system of disputations, to which he prefixed a Preface, in which he refutes the preface to the Apology, and an Apology, in which he vindicates the Preface to the Censure.

Which work, long desired by learned men, was published in the sixty-fourth year at Harderwijk, by the care of his sons, as he had commanded when dying, under the title of Antapology, or Examination of the whole Apology of the Remonstrants. Therefore in that Censure of the Leyden Theologians, and in this Antapology of D. Trigland, we have what has hitherto been desired, an examination of the whole doctrine and Theology of the Remonstrants; From which anyone can now draw a full knowledge of these controversies. However, it is more laborious and lengthy than can be read, reread and converted into juice and blood by students of Theology, in the course of Theological study. In the fortieth year the Remonstrants published their Catechism, which the Most Famous Men D. Gisbertus Voetius and Abraham Heidanus examined and refuted in the Belgian language, in which it was written, who was also afterwards opposed by Episcopius, and defended the Refutation of the Catechism, published by himself, for the most part in an elaborate lengthy Belgian work on the Cause of God.

Therefore, of all the books which our Theologians have written in Latin against the Remonstrants, I indeed know none which has so fully, learnedly, vigorously, methodically and at the same time as briefly as possible, and thus so accommodated to the use of novices and the more learned, examined the whole doctrine of the Remonstrants and asserted against them the Orthodox doctrine of our Churches, as is this present book of D. Rutherford: which therefore, Christian and kind Reader, I do not hesitate to commend to you with the highest recommendation. Indeed, if we had at most one or another system of this kind of Arminian controversies, written by learned Theologians: nevertheless, as in the Courts of Politicians and Ecclesiastical Consistories it is useful, concerning the same matter which comes into deliberation, to hear and weigh the diverse opinions of many learned and practiced Senators and Pastors: so in Theological controversies, concerning faith and morals, with adversaries of Truth and piety, for a more thorough knowledge of them, and better judgment, on account of the diversity of the gifts of Prophesying, it is useful to hear, read and weigh the diverse opinions, conceptions and judgments of learned and pious Theologians. And therefore, this notwithstanding, a book on these controversies by a Theologian of such proven learning and piety, should not be neglected, but held in esteem. How much more now, when there does not exist, to my knowledge, another similar one. For although the Author's final hand has not been applied to the book: nevertheless, such as it now is, it is learned, accurate, elaborate, worthy of reading and consideration, nor will anyone studious of truth in these controversies regret the money or labor and study expended on it. For you will find here the Author, by the sagacity of his intellect and judgment, penetrating into the innermost folds and recesses of these

controversies, prefixing to the principal controversies some notable passage of Scripture, the seat of the matter: then, diligently investigating everything with careful circumspection, to place the state of the controversy in clear light, with suitable and necessary explanations of terms and phrases, and descriptions and distinctions of things applied, and dexterously applied, and with the adversaries' own testimonies and words adduced: To construct and confirm the orthodox Opinion, against the Pelagianizing, or Socinianizing adversaries, in proportion to the compendium, with a few brief and almost solid arguments, but especially from the passage prefixed; dexterously to overthrow the hypotheses of the adversaries; successfully to vindicate the Words and testimonies of the Holy Spirit, twisted by them to the confirmation of errors, from their corruptions, and faithfully to elicit and show the genuine and true sense, and to fulfill all the parts of a good Teacher and Disputer. Although meanwhile, as from the living Author, and from the lucubrations published by himself, so also from this his posthumous book, especially not revised and polished for publication, it is not to be thought that something of human imperfection is alien to it: which therefore is to be read with the judgment of Christian prudence and charity applied.

But on account of these gifts both of the Author and of the book, perceived by me, having been asked by the Rev. Brother D. Rob. Mackward, to take upon myself the care of the book, to be published in print, to reread, revise the text of the Author, and correct it wherever necessary, and to review for the last time each page now described in type and corrected, before they were printed; he himself promising subsidiary work, of some honest and learned young man, in reading the text, and the first two corrections of the pages described in type; I easily allowed myself to be induced to this work for God and his truth and Church, and also for the faithful servant of God, and honorable Brother, the deceased Author, and for you also, kind Reader: just as it becomes manifest to anyone from the preceding letter of the Rev. D. Mackward, written to me from Amsterdam, where he was then staying, in the previous year. In which what he writes so magnificently about me, so humbly about himself, must be read with a spirit of discretion and prudence. He brought it to me, with the Author's manuscript, a learned, pious, prudent and industrious young man, Mr. Robert Traill, not unworthy son of a father of the same name, an exile for the cause of Christ and the confession of truth, a candidate for Sacred Theology and the Evangelical Ministry, appointed to be my helper in procuring and promoting the publication of this book; who also diligently, faithfully and constantly performed his parts, up to the end: worthy therefore of the praise and love of all lovers and cultivators of orthodox truth, and of the Most Famous Rutherford of pious memory.

But that you may know what has been done by us in this edition, I will explain the matter in a few words. Before all things, as was fitting, we followed the autograph of the Author, in which, for the most part reread by himself, the most learned, most laborious, and most

zealous for the cause of God Man and Brother to be honored in Christ, D. John Livingstone, had already noted more than a hundred places, which he himself judged to require examination and emendation: not to be defrauded of his praise also for that zeal. We employed besides the manuscript of a certain disciple, taken down from the mouth of the Most Famous Rutherford, in the Marian Schools of the Academy of St Andrews, which as it agreed in most things with the autograph of the Author: so also in some things it differed from it: and as in the autograph of the Author we found things which were lacking in the manuscript of the disciple; so also in the manuscript of the disciple we found things which were lacking in the autograph of the Author. Whence since each text was the Author's, the one written by his own hand, the other dictated by mouth to the pens of the disciples; we made no scruple, if we found anything in the manuscript of the disciple more accurate or clear than in the autograph of the Author, to transfer it thence into the book itself; and what was lacking to the autograph pertaining to the matter, to supply it from the manuscript of the disciple. But in the manuscript of the disciple, where it treated of the Church, Synods, Sacraments and Ecclesiastical Discipline, several things were inserted disputed against the Separatists and Independents. These, as not pertaining to the controversies with the Remonstrants, we omitted. But since neither manuscript was well distinguished into chapters and paragraphs, for the use of readers; but the Author's manuscript had only certain titles, and not even all of those placed in a convenient order, and only distinct questions; with the titles arranged in a more convenient order, I distributed the book into twenty chapters, of which the second, which is on God, has five special titles, and in chapter XVIII and XX, I joined two titles, on account of the affinity of the matter, and the brevity of the treatment. And that the book might be more accommodated to the uses of readers, I took care not only that the questions, passages of Scripture, and other human testimonies, should be printed in a character different from the rest; but also divided the continuous text in the manuscripts into several articles and paragraphs; so that also each argument of the Author or of the Adversaries should begin a new paragraph.

In the first chapter occurs a repeated question, with certain things pertaining to it, Whether the Roman Church is a true Church? Because, however, the question is serious, and worthy of just consideration; lest we either justify those whom God condemns; or condemn those whom God justifies and acknowledges as his own; and each treatment has certain peculiarities; but the latter is much more copious, full and accurate than the former; I left both unchanged as I found them in the Author's manuscript. But Mr. Traill, for my aid and that of the typesetters, transcribed the whole text of the Author from the collated copies, in a better and more elegant character, in that order and manner, just as I had shown him, in parts; with asterisks also added in the margin, where he thought something should be examined or corrected; and he offered each page to me to be read and reviewed, before they were brought to the Printer. I, in a matter so serious, applied

that diligence and fidelity which I could and ought. In doubtful places badly, wrongly or obscurely written, or not having a suitable sense, where I could, I applied a gentle remedy; what had a tolerable sense, I left unchanged; if by chance something rejected all remedy, and could be omitted with the rest of the treatment safe, I cut it off: I filled smaller gaps by adding what was lacking, and one or two larger ones, by inserting only what was necessary for the treatment. The freedom of Prophesying, which I would want to be granted to me, I did not begrudge to the Author. And therefore although I disagreed with the Author in one or another hypothesis, or exposition of this or that passage of Scripture; nevertheless I did not change or bend those things to my mind; mindful that I was not writing a book from my own sense, but editing a book of the Venerable Brother, which he wrote from his own sense. Moreover, that this book might come forth into the light as emended as possible, all and each page, now described in type, and read and corrected by Mr. Traill, a second time, I reread, corrected and emended a third time. And since our Savior says: Whatever you want men to do to you, do also to them, Matt. 7:12. I can truly testify that in editing this posthumous book of our blessed Brother Rutherford, I applied that diligence, sincerity and fidelity, which on a similar occasion, I would want to be applied by others, to some writing of mine. And although I would not and could not affirm that this book comes forth altogether spotless and perfect, which cannot be said even of books published by the living Author: nevertheless I can truly affirm that it comes forth much more spotless and perfect than it was either written by the Author himself, or taken down from his mouth by that disciple. For the sake of readers I took care to append to the book three indexes. First of the chapters and questions with the sum of the response added to each, according to the order observed in the book: second of the principal passages of Scripture, adduced in this book and prefixed to the controversies, according to the order of the books of Scripture: third of the principal matters, according to the order of the alphabet. In making which we were also aided by the work of another servant of Christ from Scotland, an exile among us. You, kind and candid Reader, use this labor of the Most Famous Rutherford and ours, candidly, and if you perceive any progress hence in the knowledge of the truth; give thanks, not to Rutherford planting, nor to me watering; but to God giving the increase, and giving and ordering all things for the uses of his elect, and commend me and my studies to his grace.

Here I would make an end of prefacing, but a word more of admonition to our people is to be added to the foregoing. For since the Pelagian errors are so natural to corrupt man; it is ours, as many of us as have been freed from them, to acknowledge in this the Grace of God, and not ascribe it to the goodness of our nature, or the perspicacity of our intellect, or our free will, but to the Grace of God alone; to sympathize with our neighbor, Pelagianizing not from malice, but from natural ignorance and blindness: to apply, according to the reason of our calling, effort, that we may free our neighbor from error, and lead him to the knowledge of the truth: but to sanctify the truth acknowledged by the

pursuit of piety, and to guard it in a good conscience; and thus to demonstrate that our knowledge is not carnal, dead and barren; but spiritual, living, efficacious, fruitful of good works and salutary: and to refute the calumnies of adversaries, inveighed against the doctrine of absolute Predestination, apart from any condition outside God, and of invincible Grace, and determining our free will, not so much by words and subtle disputations, as by our life and works. This is to be diligently inculcated and considered by our people, and with those who are truly predestined to eternal life and its means, by the absolute purpose and decree of God, and according to this purpose, have been efficaciously called by the invincible Grace of God, admonitions of this kind will not lack their fruit. For since, by the grace of God, out of all the Churches of Christians, none have been so defecated from the Pelagian errors as ours; it is fitting that our gratitude towards God, which consists chiefly in the pursuit of holiness, should correspond to the measure of truth revealed to us. And as many of us as profess and dare to boast that they are predestined to eternal life, out of the mere Grace of God, ought to show that they are also sanctified, 2 Thess. 2:13. lest their boasting be found vain. Those who boast that they are partakers of this altogether gratuitous, omnipotent and never vain Grace of God, in Christ, and according to the absolute purpose of election, have been efficaciously called, ought to manifest by their works and whole life the Spirit of Grace dwelling in them, and powerfully working, and mortifying the lusts and operations of the flesh, and drawing the heart and desires to God, Christ and heavenly goods, and work out their salvation with fear and trembling. Because God works in them both to will and to do, according to his good pleasure, Phil. 2:12,13. not only by some moral persuasion, as those Pelagianizing here attribute an equal operation in man to the Devil with God; but also by the real and hyperphysical power of his Spirit, and the concourse of Grace determining; indeed also predetermining, and thus also leading the gifts granted to us into act. But will not the eternal and such great grace, condescension, love, and mercy of God towards us miserable sinners excite us in turn to love, revere, worship and observe him, in whose communion all our happiness consists? will it not stimulate us to walk worthily of so benevolent and beneficent a God and his grace, and to perform all the duties of gratitude with a cheerful mind. If therefore we boast that we are partakers of the Covenant of Grace; let us show that we not only believe the remission of sins; but also hate and avoid sins; that we are new men, have received the Spirit of God dwelling in us, have received a new heart, imbued with the fear of God, on which the Law of God is inscribed: that we are washed from sins, sanctified and justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God, and thus walk in the statutes of God, and observe and do his laws, Jer. 32:32,40. Ezek. 36:25,26,27. 1 Cor. 6:11. If we believe that the promises of the covenant of Grace also concern us; let us purify ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting sanctification in the fear of God. 2 Cor. 7:1. If the solid foundation of God stands, having this seal: The Lord knows those who are his; let us depart from iniquity, as many of us as name the name of Christ. For if anyone purges himself from errors and injustice, he will be

a vessel for honor, sanctified and suited to the uses of the Lord and prepared for every good work, 2 Tim. 2:19, 21. For as the Spirit of God testifies with our spirit that we are children of God; so he also works with our spirit that we may live as generous children of God, Rom. 8:16, 14. If it is granted to us, in the cause of Christ, not only to believe in him; but also to suffer for him; that we conduct ourselves in a manner worthy of the Gospel, standing fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the Gospel, Phil. 1:27, 29. The Spirit of Truth teaches to make these consequences of holiness ; not the consequences of profanity, which the spirit of Pelagian falsehood suggests. For God says to the wicked: "What right have you to recite my statutes or take my covenant on your lips? For you hate discipline and you cast my words behind you"; Psal. 50: 16, 17. Therefore, Brothers, let us rather strive to make our calling and election sure. For if we do these things, we will never stumble. For in this way, entry into the eternal Kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ will be richly provided for us. 2 Pet. 1. 10. 11. May God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, to be blessed forever, give to you, benevolent Reader, and to me, and to all His servants and children who earnestly desire it, this Grace. Amen.

Judgment Of Voetius and Essenius

Thus the name of Samuel Retorfort is deservedly most celebrated, a most solid Theologian, once a most worthy Professor of that Faculty in the Academy of St. Andrews, a most profound Practitioner, a most practiced Athlete for truth and piety. This posthumous Offspring, an Examination of Arminianism, has such a great Parent. But since the Reverend, learned, and pious Minister of the Divine Word, known to us, a fellow countryman of the Great Author, a disciple, and faithful cultivator, considered it a crime to preserve that excellent Deposit with himself any longer, for his private use, and that of a few Intimates; and esteemed that it should be printed for the public good, and thus sent forth into the light: moreover he made up his mind, in letters given to us below signed by name, to seek our Judgment concerning that work; that marked with it the book might come forth into the public more freely in these provinces. But we, thinking that petition not to be refused, unrolled a good part of the said work (which was shown to us while being printed), and weighed it diligently in proportion to our other occupations: but we judge (although it was not permitted to the most learned and most practiced Author to put the final touch to it, and to polish some things more accurately in places, or even to explain more fully and clearly) that the book is nevertheless sufficiently worthy of such an Author, and can be read with great fruit by those studious of Divine Grace and saving truth; and thus we commend it with better mark to our Hearers, and other benevolent Readers.

Utrecht, 13th day before the Calends of September.
In the year of our Lord 1668.

GISBERTUS VOETIUS, Professor of Theology.
ANDREAS ESSENIUS, Professor of Theology.

Index of certain errata.

Page 11. line 7. read articles. p. 29. l. 5. l. not infe. p. 31.l. 7. l. maliciously. p. 36. l. 22. l. of only two. p. 41. l. 11.delete &. p. 45. l. 8. l. for true. p. 74. l. 27. l. in the heavens. p. 75 l. 21. l. external. p. 93. l. 6. l. after death. p. 107. l. 4. l. individual. l. 21. l. Not written. p. 135. l. 23. l. binds positively. p. 154. l. 2. for & if read even if. p. 165. l. 18, 19. l. finally about to believe. p. 175. l. 15. l. may be of God. p. 180. l. 18, 19.l. Word. p. 148. l. 5, 6. l. simple. p. 212. l. 26. l. forbidden. p.247. l. 8. l. cunning. p. 270. l. 20. l. depending. p. 308.l. 12. l. if natural. p. 322. l. 5. l. radically. p. 332. l. 18. l. thus not, p. 352. l. 6, 7. l. divine grace. p. 400. l. 28. l. Redeemer. p. 412. l. 14. delete &. l. 27. l. Heb. p. 425. l. 17. l. persuasion. p. 433. l. 25. l. 1 Cor. 6:16. p. 434. l.7. l. Isa. 54:9, 10.P. 438. l. 23. for 334. l. 33, 34. P. 448. l. 1. l. more obstinate.ibid. l. indulged. p. 463. l. 1. l. King. p. 467. l. 24. l. & οὐ δυνατόν. 508. l. 27. l. for our. p. 540. l. 2. l. Acts 10:43. page 548.l. 18. l. action. p. 557. l. 24. l. seals. p. 560. l. 14. l. judgment. p. 565. l. 9. l. of risibility. p. 508. l. 18. l. but. p. 579l. 23. for 21. l. 23. p. 601. l. 19. for 186, 167. read 190.p. 602. l. 14. for 195. read 161. p. 654. l. 26. l. and to themp. 670. l. 12. read 27. p. 745. l. 17. l. was fitting. p. 746. l. 9. l. 2 Chron. 29. p. 756. l. 20. for id, l. to.

If any other errors occur, especially in the citation of testimonies, and designation of pages; the benevolent Reader will forgive both the Author and us.

Chapter 1.

On the Holy Scriptures, and their subject matter; Fundamental and non-Fundamental Articles; also on Ignorance and error, and knowledge and faith concerning them.

John. 5:39.
Search the Scriptures; they testify of me.

The question is: Whether Scripture, or the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures, is the Judge of Controversies? Or, whether God has left us in his Word no standard coercively binding consciences, but only a standard judging directionally?

The Remonstrants in their Apology, chapter 7, folio 3, say that the Scriptures cannot be the Judge, because the Law and the Judge are distinct, where there is a dispute about the sense of the Law. The Papists make the Church the peremptory and infallible Judge of Scripture, the sense of Scripture, and all controversies of faith. The Arminians, on the contrary, do not even want it to be a Ministerial Judge, or endowed with any coercive Ministerial power, but a mere directing standard, and directing in such a way that the sense of Scripture would suggest itself, so that one who embraces a heterodox sense does not sin. Then they deny any infallible judgment of the Church, even if it judges according to the Scriptures; and they teach that the very phraseology of Scripture, or arguments drawn from the Scriptures by our labor, are only a standard judging directionally, inasmuch as from them each one can form his own judgment about salvation, as to a most certain standard left to us by God, so that one who does not assent to them cannot be compelled by any other infallible judgment as an indubitable standard.

But we teach that the Scriptures are sufficient for coercive decisions of controversies. 1. Because Christ appeals to the Scriptures, John 5:39, "Search the Scriptures; for in them you think you have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me." So John 5:47, "If you will not believe the Mosaic writings, how will you believe my words?" Paul appeals to Moses and the Prophets in controversies with the Jews, Acts 24:14-15 and 26:22.

2. Because conscience would perpetually fluctuate, nor would it have anything in which to rest, unless Scripture were the end of controversies.

3. Because Scripture is a lamp to the feet, and a light to the path, Psalm 119:105.

4. Because if Scripture were a mere Law, and nothing more, the Judge and the Law would necessarily be distinguished. But because Scripture is a standard of judging, and at the same time has the Holy Spirit adjoined to it, who may decide the dispute for men to whom the Gospel is not veiled, and convince gainsayers, therefore it is not necessary that the Law and the Judge be distinguished here, as human law and an earthly judge are distinguished.

5. It is absurd that the judgment of the Church judging according to the Scriptures is not the standard of controversies, because this is to deny God and the Holy Spirit speaking from the Scriptures, which the Church proposes as a Minister; because if it cannot as a Ministerial Judge decide the controversies of faith, then it would leave all doubters.

6. If no standard is left to us coercively judging in the court of conscience but only directing, and leaving men to the private judgment of their consciences, no one would be bound in conscience to believe the Scriptures, but all believers would live in conjectures and private dreams.

7. No one would sin by perverting the Scriptures to his own destruction, which however is said to be done by many, 2 Peter 3:16. For who sins by perverting a Law that binds conscience not at all coercively? For if Scripture does not compel men to receive the true sense intended by the Holy Spirit, he does not act against due obligation who ascribes an erroneous and false sense to it; and therefore he does not sin who, being destitute of the truth, distorts Scripture.

On Fundamentals and non-Fundamentals

Heb. 6:1-2.

Therefore leaving the elementary doctrine of Christ, let us go on to maturity, not laying again a foundation of repentance from dead works and of faith toward God, of instruction about washings and laying on of hands, and the resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment.

With these words the Apostle enumerates the fundamental points, and the catechetical elements of the Christian Religion, and that doctrine which is about God and Christ the Savior. He enumerates the Doctrine 1. Of Repentance. 2. Of Faith, which is of the one God in Essence, distinguished in three persons, and of the Person and Offices of the Savior. 3. Of Sacraments. 4. By synecdoche of laying on of hands, Ecclesiastical Discipline. 5. Of the Resurrection of the dead, and 6. Of Eternal Judgment.

This Disputation on Fundamentals is necessary 1. For an exact definition of the Church; for the true Church is that which holds the foundation. 2. For cultivating communion with the true Church, or separation from the false Synagogue. 3. For dispelling that fiction of the Arminians about the freedom of prophesying. 4. For determining something about the salvation of the Pagans. 5. For refuting that impious dogma of the Innovators about the Reconciliation of Evangelicals with Papists and Arminians, and other impure Sects. 6. For uprooting the Atheism of those who hold that a man can be saved in any Religion. 7. For setting the limits of mutual toleration and fraternal charity among pious men who dissent about non-necessaries. 8. For investigating the marks of the true Church, etc.

The Arminians miserably err about Fundamentals. I here present their Theses on these matters.

1st Thesis. Because Scripture is perfect and perspicuous, therefore only those things are Fundamental which are expressly contained in the Scriptures in words, or by a consequence so necessary and obvious to all as is this, "it runs, therefore it moves." Remonstrants' Apology, examination of the censure of the profession, folio 6, 7, and chapter 1, folio 3, and against Vedelius, book 1, chapter 6.

But to the contrary, 1. Although Scripture is clear, yet the Gospel is veiled to those who are perishing. The Jews are not able to see the Messiah (that is, God's own only-begotten and proper Son, to be incarnate in the fullness of time, to be born in a humble state from the Virgin Mary in Bethlehem, to be despised, to suffer an ignominious, cursed, violent and

bloody death, and by it to expiate our sins, to fulfill and abrogate the Sacrifices and Ceremonies of the Mosaic Law, to rise from the dead on the third day, to ascend into heaven, to sit at the right hand of God the Father until he returns to judge the living and the dead, whose kingdom will not be worldly and corporeal but spiritual, heavenly and eternal - such as he was promised and prefigured in the Old Testament, but was exhibited in the New) in Scripture expressly or by a consequence clearer than the sun, nor can they, since a veil lies upon their hearts in reading the Old Testament, 2 Corinthians 3:14-15. And so, according to them, the Article on Christ incarnate, dead, raised, and glorified was not fundamental.

2. Before the Prophets were written, the resurrection of the dead was not a Fundamental Article. For Christ's consequence from the passage in Exodus 3:6, "God is the God of the living, not of the dead, Therefore the Dead will rise," is not as obvious as this: "it runs, therefore it moves." 3. There is no Fundamental Article which some Heretics have not impugned, as Experience, the Scriptures, and Histories testify. 4. The Arminians say this, because they teach that Socinians, Anabaptists, Anti-Trinitarians, Arians, Tritheists, Sabellians and Papists do not err at all in Fundamentals. For the Arminians dare boldly assert that whether Christ is consubstantial with the Father and the only-begotten, Whether there is one God and three distinct Persons, Whether the providence of God cares for, foresees, determines all things - these things are contained in the Scriptures neither expressly nor by a consequence above all exception.

2nd Arminian Thesis. The dogmas necessary to be known for salvation are very few, indeed only those, as Casaubon impiously said in his Epistle to Cardinal Perron, which are approved by nearly all equally who demand to be called Christians. They say Athanasius exceeded the limit of right when he said of his Creed, "Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the catholic faith," folio 6 of the Apology. And they say that the things controverted among the pious and learned are not Fundamental. They reckon Socinians, Arians, Jesuits, Pelagians, Semi-Pelagians among the pious and learned, as they teach in the Apology, chapter 25, folio 280, and chapter 3, folios 53-54. Then they measure piety by a civil life before men, and the faith of fundamentals not by the word of God but by a civilly honest life; when on the contrary, piety ought to be measured by true faith. This is the piety of the Pharisees: to them, those are pious who are not adulterers, murderers or poisoners, even if they are Arians, Socinians. But the Word of God is the only rule of piety.

2. However few they may be, so that all may be comprehended perhaps under two general heads, namely of Faith and Obedience, or under the one word Theology, yet the things to be believed, done, and asked are not few, if they are enumerated in particular. Gisbertus Voetius rightly notes this in his Treatise on Fundamentals. In this way someone could say

there are few Fundamentals in Astronomy, namely, to know the nature and motions of a mobile body around the center of the world; few Fundamentals in Latin Grammar, namely only this one, to speak Latin elegantly; and few in Agriculture, namely only to sow and reap. But the deceitful man deals in generalities.

3. To sew pillows for all mortals called, equipped with universal grace and the power of believing, redeemed by the death of Christ, loved by God from eternity unto salvation, they have extended the true Church with a bosom so capacious that Arians, Socinians, Papists, Pelagians, Anti-Trinitarians, and all Heretics who demand to be called Christians, as Casaubon speaks, are reckoned in the true Churches; only Jews and Turks are excluded from the Orthodox Churches, and perhaps not even they. For the Jews, not seeing in the Old Testament that the son of Mary is the promised Messiah taught in express words or by a consequence as obvious and conspicuous as the midday sun, err by simple error. But such error, to them (namely the Arminians), is not damnable.

3rd Arminian Thesis. We must not swear to or divinely believe or adhere to any concord or confession of faith any longer than, until from the spirit of freely prophesying, the fundamentals seem to them horrid and absurd to human reason.

But to the contrary. We think it should not be sworn to a Confession formally, and insofar as it is written by the Church, but materially, insofar as it is the word of God, and conditionally, not absolutely; nor is the formula as such, but the word of God, the object of faith.

2. But here the Remonstrants hint that no confession of faith is lawful to which one must swear, except what expresses in mere words of Scripture only the things necessary to be believed for salvation, not what expresses diverse opinions about Religion concerning dogmas not precisely necessary to be believed. For thus, one should not even swear to the eighth and ninth chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, except in this general way: I subscribe and solemnly swear to those chapters, according to that sense, whatever it finally may be, whether known or unknown to the Orthodox Church, which the Holy Spirit intends. In this way, a Jew, Turk, Heretic, boy, idiot, madman, to whom nothing has been revealed about Scripture, can swear to the Apostles' Creed, the Decalogue, and the Lord's Prayer, and meanwhile the one swearing is an Atheist, Arian, Papist, Socinian, Anabaptist, etc. For someone does not swear from faith to a formula not expressed in any words but those of mere Scripture; indeed he does not even swear to the New Testament unless understood and expounded in such and such a way and believed according to the Analogy of faith; otherwise all Heretics acknowledging Scripture to be the Word of God can swear and subscribe to a confession (which alone the Arminians acknowledge as the object of faith), who nevertheless can be Atheists, men of no faith, Arians and Heretics sworn

against Christ and his truth, such as the Jews were, who knew Christ to be the Son of God and truly raised from the dead, but maliciously buried that knowledge and Resurrection with their own lies, bribes, and money.

3. I cannot divine what they mean by "dogmas precisely necessary," or what the other part of the distinction opposed to the word "precisely" may be. For they undoubtedly hint that many are saved without knowledge of the Fundamentals, namely those who have heard nothing of Christ, and they extend this knowledge only to those who are in the visible Church.

4. They clamor that Confessions are set up as Judges of controversies; and we say that Orthodox Confessions are materially Scripture itself. But is it a crime to set up Scripture as the Judge of controversies?

5. The Apostle says in 1 Corinthians 3:11, "No other foundation can anyone lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." One foundation is personal or real, and is Christ himself; the other dogmatic, and is the fundamental doctrine about Christ, the common subject of the whole Theology. But from this passage it follows that there are some things Fundamental and necessarily required for salvation, and some non-necessary, which are built upon the Foundation, as are curious questions (says Calvin), not false doctrine (as Beza observes there), which are not properly said to be built upon this foundation, unless perhaps in appearance. Or (as Pareus notes in his commentary on 1 Corinthians), he means vain, curious, alien, frivolous doctrines, by which indeed they did not entirely take away the Foundation itself, yet they greatly obscured it. It is not to be understood (says Bellarmine on Purgatory, book 1, chapter 5) of heretical or bad doctrine, but nevertheless curious, useless, superfluous. To me these superstructures seem to be what Paul calls in 1 Timothy 6:4 "obsessions and disputes about words."

6. A distinction must be made between articles of faith and Fundamental articles. For the Things of faith and to be believed by divine faith are fourfold: 1. Fundamentals. 2. Supra-Fundamentals. 3. Circa-Fundamentals. 4. Præter-Fundamentals. (Let it be permitted thus to designate them for the sake of doctrine.)

Fundamentals are those which pertain to the vital parts, the soul and life of faith; and the simple ignorance of these damns, not indeed all mortals, but all in the visible Church, if we except the insane, the deaf, infants, who are parts of the Church materially, on God's part, often intentionally and in the first act, not formally and in the second act, because they are not capable of God's active or passive calling. But indeed this ignorance does not formally damn those who are outside the Visible Church, who have heard nothing of Christ, but renders them incurable, as punishment; as a salutary Medicine, spurned, actually and

meritoriously kills the body, so also salutary doctrine about God and Christ his son, the Mediator and Savior of men, delivered and spurned, actually and meritoriously kills the soul, and that contempt casts the soul into eternal death. But salutary Medicine, not offered, not spurned, renders men incurable, as loss, does not meritoriously kill; and so also salutary doctrine about God and Christ not communicated or spurned, kills the soul, but not as fault.

Of the second kind are Supra-Fundamentals, which follow from the fundamentals by a plain and necessary consequence. These also are secondarily and materially Fundamental; and implicit ignorance of these damns, for those who deny such things subvert the Foundation; he who denies clear and open consequences, denies the antecedents, John 8:19.

3. Circa-Fundamentals are all things revealed in the word, such as Occasional, Chronological, Historical things, as that Paul left his cloak, books and parchments at Troas, 2 Timothy 4:13; That Abraham begat Isaac; Astronomical things about Orion and the Pleiades, Arcturus and the Northern constellations, Job 38:31-32. And these indeed are things of faith, to be believed by the necessity of precept, but they are not Fundamental, and necessary by the necessity of means, so that without knowledge of these no one can be saved. And in these three sins are to be considered: 1. Ignorance. 2. Infirmity. 3. Pertinacity, or obstinacy.

Ignorance of these circa-fundamentals in many is a sin, and damns by merit and potentially, but not actually. All in the Visible Church are bound (God giving ability, aids and opportunity, especially Doctors) to know these; but many are saved who are ignorant of them. 2. Many sin in these things, being clouded by infirmity, passions and temptations; and this sin damns virtually and by merit, not actually. 3. There is obstinate and malicious opposition to these things, as if someone maliciously denies and opposes the miracles done by Moses, Elijah, Christ and the Apostles, his error is Fundamental, not indeed because the matter of these is the Foundation of Faith, but because he sins against a Fundamental principle and denies that whatever God clearly and openly reveals in the Word is true; and such obstinacy must be retracted by confession; if not so retracted, it damns actually.

4. Præter-Fundamentals are adiaphora, things which in themselves and by their nature are neither forbidden nor commanded, such as eating meat, marrying this or that woman. And their practice, without faith, as to general rules, that they serve for edification, decency, piety, is limited by the word; and ignorance of them in this way damns by merit; and obstinate ignorance of them, which is said to be of a depraved disposition, damns actually. Where there is also malicious obstinacy, it is a fundamental error, as is obstinacy about

things revealed in the Word; because to resist the light of the Word clearly set forth in most adiaphora is to deny God's Authority in the Word.

7. But those things which are of the third and fourth kind are to be believed with divine faith for the same reason of God's Authority; for the same God who says that Christ came into the world to save sinners, says that eight souls were in Noah's Ark; and yet the former is Fundamental, but the latter by no means. Whence it follows that the essential reason of a Fundamental article is not to be taken from the Authority of God commanding, at least as from the formal reason, but from the necessity and gravity of the article proposed. For that is Fundamental without the knowledge of which no one can be saved; but without the knowledge of many Historical and Chronological things, men can be saved. Thence also it follows that many miraculous acts of God can be unknown by most who are saved; but many moral acts of ours, namely of faith and repentance, cannot be unknown by us; and therefore certain human acts are among the Fundamentals, but certain divine acts are not. Whence the reason of a Fundamental Article is taken not from the excellence of the object, but from the necessity of the thing necessary to be known for salvation.

8. The Necessity of the Knowledge of Fundamentals is twofold: one for obtaining salvation, the other for external communion with the true Church. This twofold necessity is to be discussed here.

Davenant on Ecclesiastical Peace, page 28: I judge that article to be held as Fundamental which, from the Will of God revealing, is so necessary to be known and believed for obtaining salvation and eternal blessedness, that from ignorance of it, and much more from opposition to it, the manifest danger of losing eternal life is incurred.

Estius on book 3, distinction 25, § 2, defines Fundamentals as those of which distinct knowledge is necessary for rightly instituting life. Too narrow a Definition, because true faith is required besides a rightly instituted life.

Potter, on Charity badly understood, chapters 8 and 9, reply to Section 7, defines Catholic truths as such which principally and essentially pertain to faith, which principally constitute the Church, and are necessary in the ordinary course to be believed by any Christian who wants to be saved. But Potter gravely errs in this, that he contradistinguishes from these the non-Fundamentals, which are disputable on both sides, and can admit "it is not clear." But there are many non-Fundamentals which are not disputable, and (as he says) indeterminable by the scriptures, such as that eight souls were in Noah's Ark, because they are openly decided in the Scriptures.

Moreover, to the Papists, Fundamentals are commonly those which are of faith, and whatever things are proposed by the Church as such, as already defined. But to the contrary: 1. An article is Fundamental in itself before it is defined as Fundamental by the Church, just as the Word of God is not the Word of God because the Church defines it to be the Word of God, but because God has revealed it to us as his word. 2. If the Church can make non-Fundamentals Fundamental by its Ecclesiastical definition, then it can make Fundamentals non-Fundamental. For there is equal power of making Fundamentals and making non-Fundamentals; just as there is equal omnipotence of creating and annihilating. But this is absurd; For thus the Church can legitimize Arminianism, and define that Christ being God consubstantial with the Father is not a Fundamental article. 3. The power of the Church defining is not greater than that of God defining in Scripture. But not all things which God defines in Holy Scripture are Fundamental; as he defined that Eve, seduced by the Serpent, seduced Adam, which is not Fundamental.

Bellarmine on the Authority of Councils, book 2, chapter 12: When Councils define, they do not make something to be of infallible truth, but declare it.

Vincent of Lerins, against Heresies, chapter 32: Finally, whatever the Church has striven to do by the decrees of Councils, except that what was before simply believed, this same thing might afterwards be more diligently believed?

Laud against Fisher, 32-33, number 4-5, pages 226-227: An Ecumenical Council cannot easily err in Fundamentals; or if it errs, nevertheless it is to be considered valid, and external obedience is to be shown to it, at least insofar as obedience is in silence, patience and abstinence; until it becomes plain through the Scriptures or demonstration to the contrary that it has erred; or until another Ecumenical Council of equal authority with it overturns it, nor is a General Council to be rescinded by a private Spirit. Reply: He thinks heretically, that a General Council cannot easily err in Fundamentals, or if it errs, faith is to be suspended (perhaps to the end of the world) until another general Council is convened.

Gerson, in his Treatise on the Declaration of truths which must be believed etc., number § 4, part 1, page 414: Not all those things which the Church hands down under judicial definition (in a Council) are to be believed by necessity of salvation; but only those which it so hands down, with the Universal consent of the whole Church concurring, implicitly or explicitly, truly or interpretatively.

9. To me, Fundamentals seem to be defined thus: That they are the principal heads about Christ the only foundation of salvation, which are contained either expressly in the Scriptures, or by a consequence evident to all not maliciously blinded, necessarily

pertaining to those two adequate means of our communion with Christ, namely faith and Repentance, or Christian obedience; without the knowledge of which, a man cannot be saved.

They are 1. Principal heads about Christ, such as are most of the Articles comprised in the Creed which they call Apostolic. Many occasional, Chronological, Genealogical, Topographical, Historical things, therefore, are not Fundamental. For they are not the first and most common elements of the Christian Religion. 2. Dogmas about Christ the Savior, or most closely pertaining to our communion with him, which do not necessarily cohere with this Foundation, are not Fundamental, even if they can become part of faith. For Bellarmine not badly says, On the Church, book 1, chapter 14, § 5: Many things are of faith, which are not necessary for Salvation.

Hence the ignorance of the Formalists is amazing, contending that the Anglican Ceremonies are to be embraced out of conscience's duty towards superiors, because they are not Fundamental, nor necessary to salvation, but in themselves adiaphora. As if this were the adequate division of things to be believed and done - some are Fundamental, others indifferent; likewise, some are Fundamental and necessary to salvation, others not necessary. For to believe that Paul left his cloak at Troas, and that Saul persecuted David, and such things, are not Fundamental, nor necessary to salvation, and yet to all who read the Word of God, they are necessary to be believed for salvation, and to wish to be ignorant of these is not indifferent but a sin, or, these things having been proposed either by reading or by the public preaching of pastors, not to believe them is a sin which damns by merit. Although therefore the Ceremonies are not Fundamental, it does not follow that they are indifferent, or that their practice is lawful.

3. Fundamentals are either expressly in the Scriptures, or by evident consequence. Whence those things which are in themselves, as far as pious and learned men can see, controverted, such as questions about the degrees of the glorified, about the new heaven and new earth after the dissolution of the world, etc., are not Fundamental.

Hence 2. All traditions of the Papists and Jews are expunged from the list of Fundamentals.

3. Thence it is that more remote and obscure conclusions, and those which are less evidently and more obscurely deduced from the cardinal elements of faith and obedience, are not Fundamental Articles.

4. Nor are those conclusions by which the Doctrine of Christ, of faith and obedience, is not overturned; as Camero observes on the Church, pages 272-273. Whence

4. Fundamentals necessarily pertain to the Doctrine of Faith and Obedience. See Beza, volume 2 of Minor Works, on the Marks of the Catholic Church, page 141. For without faith and Repentance no one can be saved.

5. I say without the knowledge of which no one can be saved, namely without the explicit knowledge of some first principles, no one can be saved; but of some Fundamentals deduced from those principles, implicit knowledge suffices, as we shall hear.

Hence these Questions are to be discussed about Fundamentals, for a clearer unfolding of the Definition: 1. Whether the things deduced by consequence from the most common principles are believed by true faith? 2. What sort of evidence of consequence is required, that an Article may be called Fundamental? 3. Whether, because all Fundamentals necessarily pertain to Faith and Obedience, the number of Fundamentals can therefore be determined? 4. What sort of knowledge of Fundamentals is required? what explicit faith, what implicit may suffice for salvation? 5. What is Fundamental error? and what is vincible and invincible Ignorance? 6. Because the knowledge of Fundamentals is necessary for salvation, what and of what sort is this Necessity? 7. How far those can be tolerated, who err in Fundamentals? 8. How far communion with, or separation from, a Church which does not err in Fundamentals, is lawful, and how far damnable? Where, whether the Roman Church is a true Church.

As for the first question, there are two kinds of consequences; some are clear, transparent, and evident, such as "All idolaters are abominable to God; Therefore, even those who bend their knees to Baal." Others are more obscure and less evident, such as "Male Jews, according to the Law, were circumcised on the eighth day; Therefore, infants of Christians should be baptized."

First assertion. There is a threefold light, and therefore a threefold certainty: 1. There is a theological and human light, when from natural reason, or from an acquired habit of theology, I know something to be true; as Judas knew Christ to be the Savior. 2. Scriptural light, when I know something because it is revealed in the Scriptures as the Word of God, from a pious inclination of the will. 3. There is a divine experiential light, yet infallible, as when I know that I know God, because I observe his commandments 1 John 2:3.

By Scriptural light and certainty of faith, I know the major premise of the following syllogism; by divine, experiential, and infallible light (yet not by Scriptural light), I know the assumption to be true; and by mixed and infallible light, I know the conclusion to be true, when I argue thus:

Whoever believes in Christ shall not perish but have eternal life

But I believe in Christ
Therefore, I shall not perish but have eternal life.

The major premise, by certainty of faith, is the expressed Word of God, John 3:16. The assumption is not known formally by the light of the Word, for it is not written in the Word of God that I believe.

You will say: It is written in the Word of God through signs and proofs, thus:

He who overcomes the world and observes God's commandments, he believes; as it is in 1 John 5:4-5 and James 2:18.
But I have overcome the world, and observed God's commandments;
Therefore: I believe.

Response: Still, the minor premise is not known by Scriptural light and certainty of faith, but by experiential knowledge, and by a reflexive act of the Holy Spirit, testifying that I believe, that I overcome the world, that I observe God's commandments. Therefore, these reflexive acts are always resolved into the testimony of the Holy Spirit, or into sense and experiential knowledge.

However, it can rightly be said that these things are known with certainty of faith, if the word "faith" is taken more broadly, for that which God reveals as true in the word expressly revealed; or which he reveals through the gracious acts which he produces in me through the Holy Spirit. For God speaks to us not only through the Word, but also through gracious effects: and both are equally infallible.

The latter is called the testimony of the Spirit: and it is either effective, when the Spirit effectively inspires, operates, and produces certain and infallible acts of faith in our intellect, whence is our plerophory and assurance. To Rom. 4:21 and 14:5. Or objective; and it is twofold. For either the Holy Spirit testifies of the premises, or of the antecedent; or of the conclusion or consequence. Of the premises, while he objectively reveals and manifests to us the acts of faith, love, repentance, produced by him, so that we may feel in our hearts, by sense and experience, that we believe, love, repent. 2. When from these acts, as from infallible and most certain premises, he gathers this conclusion, that we are children of God, according to that; Rom. 8:16. The Spirit himself bears witness with our spirit, that we are children of God. But Paul does not make two numerically distinct testimonies, one of our natural spirit, the other of the Holy Spirit speaking to us: but while the Holy Spirit brings it about that we know and feel by a reflexive act that we believe, repent, hope; he brings it about that from there we conclude that we are children of God.

But that this testimony and experiential knowledge is not fallacious and conjectural, as Bellarmine says with the Papists, lib. 3 de Justific. cap. 8.9.2. Nor theological and human, and with less certainty than faith or scriptural, as Forbes, the pseudo-bishop of Edinburgh, taught: nor uncertain and conditional, as the Arminians teach; but equally certain and infallible as the testimony of God speaking in the Scriptures, is evident from this. 1. That perseverance and eternal salvation are the object of faith of every believer; from the Scriptures Rom. 8:38, 2 Tim. 1:12, 2 Tim. 4:8 and 18. Hence perseverance and eternal life are fundamental articles for the believer by name and in particular, although faith in them often wavers and fluctuates in the saints by the mass of temptations. 2. Because otherwise no one could be certain of his salvation, contrary to the Scriptures. 1 John 2:3, 1 John 3:14, 1 John 5:13, Rom. 8:38, 2 Tim. 1:12, 2 Tim. 4:8 and 18.

Hence those syllogistic consequences, in which the major premise is the testimony of Scripture, the minor premise is experiential knowledge, can be, and in many are, objects of faith and fundamental.

Fasol in 1 part Thom. 10.1, question 1, article 2, doubt 9, figure 51. The doubts and hesitations which the faithful experience do not arise from an intrinsic cause and formal motive of the act itself, or from the infirm adherence of the act with respect to the object, but only argue for intrinsic obscurity and inevidence, and dependence on the free command of the will in the production and preservation of the act.

Hooker in response to Tavei's 5th supplication; and William Chillingworth on the faith of Protestants part 1, ch. 6, p. 311, assert that the articles of faith are equally certain in being and entitatively as the principles of the sciences; but they deny that our certainty of adherence to the promises of the Gospel is equal to the certainty of the senses or sciences. 1. Because faith can be increased; but such certainty is situated in the indivisible, and is most perfect, and cannot coexist with doubt. 2. Because, as Hooker says, God would not prove to us that his promises are true by arguments taken from sensible experience: we ought to be more certain of the proof than of the thing proved. If ten men look at the moon, all would equally know that the moon is the moon: but ten men believing one and the same promise do not all believe with equal certainty. Therefore, the certainty of faith essentially, and which is required of us under penalty of damnation, is not equal to the certainty of the senses.

Response: Our certainty is equal to the certainty of the sciences and senses; and is not equal. It is equal. 1. negatively, insofar as it excludes doubt of unbelief in that act. 2. it is equal, insofar as it equally quiets the intellect concerning the certainty of the object, and equally begets spiritual joy concerning the object known. 3. It is equally certain, that a

Christian would rather suffer death than deny the promises; just as one who sees and is certain with scientific certainty cannot deny that he sees and knows.

But it is not equal in the mode of knowing, nor on the part of the means excluding all doubt of blind reason. 2. Nor is it equal in the mode of duration of such acts: that the senses are never or rarely deceived, the intellect never doubts the truth of well-perceived propositions, because the object is proportioned to the intellect. But acts of faith are not of themselves, with every difference of time, equally durable as to certainty; because more temptations assail the certainty of faith (as being supernatural) than the knowledge of the senses and natural intellect.

But Chillingworth ibid. p. 312, denies absolute and infallible certainty, with the Arminians; because probable motives sufficiently move men to undergo the dangers of death by sea and land, where the hope of gain is only probable, not infallible and equally certain as is the certainty of sense and science.

But rightly Ames on conscience bk. 3, ch. 2, question 15. Faith, not only on the part of the object, but also on the part of the subject (q. 8, th. 14-15), by its nature produces in us a firmer assent than natural science; because it relies on a more certain cause. Yet because the human intellect has a greater proportion to things naturally known and more fully attains them, it does not always use the light of faith with that certainty with which it uses natural science.

Thus from the Papists, Andreas de Vega, in the Council of Trent, bk. 6, ch. 39, says that every proposition which is inferred from propositions of faith is of faith, as it were indirectly and mediately. And certainly he who denies a good consequence denies a premise of faith.

2nd Assertion: Those consequences in which the major premise is from Scripture, and the minor premise is a dictate of the natural conscience applying the law of God to its own deeds, are also of faith; as:

He who defiles the marriage bed with incestuous adultery is liable to the wrath of God:
But I, Herod, defile the marriage bed with incestuous adultery:
Therefore, I, Herod, am liable to the wrath of God.

Proof 1: Because wicked men could never be convicted and condemned by the Word of God in their consciences (contrary to the Scriptures, Rom. 2:15, Rom. 1:20, Tit. 1:11, John 8:9, Tit. 3:11), if it were not certainly evident to them by infallible light concerning the guilt and gravity of their crimes. 2. Those who sin against the Holy Spirit, blaspheme God out of

malice, and despair of salvation, would not certainly know that they had perpetrated such things, which is contrary to experience.

3rd Assertion: All, by reflex faith, ought to be persuaded in their consciences that their moral deeds are in agreement with the Scriptures, and pleasing to God. But those deeds are not known by the light of Scripture (for Scripture directly judges nothing concerning this or that deed; for wicked deeds are known by conscience applying the light of Scripture to these or those deeds), but by the light of conscience. Therefore, what we know by experiential sense, we know by the light of conscience, not of Scripture; and yet we know them by the light of faith and internal persuasion. The major premise is Rom. 14:23. He who doubts is condemned if he eats, because he does not eat from faith; for whatever is not from faith is sin. And ibid. v. 5. Let each one be fully persuaded in his own mind. 2. Because all are bound, from the testimony of a good conscience, to know that their deeds are pleasing to God, 2 Cor. 1:12, Heb. 13:18, 1 John 3:29. 3. Because the testimony of conscience rightly and justly accusing and condemning, or excusing and absolving, is in conformity with the testimony of God; as is evident from 1 John 3:20, John 8:9, 1 Sam. 28:15, Ps. 17:3, Ps. 7:3-4, Heb. 13:18.

4th Assertion: Those consequences in which the major premise is from Scripture, and the minor premise is known neither by the light of Scripture nor by the experiential light of conscience, are not of faith. Such are these consequences:

Whoever believes will be saved:
But these and those Christians believe: (suppose) John, Anna, with whom I am familiar:
Therefore, they will be saved.

Likewise:

He who loves the brethren has passed from death to life.
But Judas, in the judgment of the apostles, loves the brethren:
Therefore, etc.

Two objections can be made here. 1. Natural reason, in a Turk, Jew, or in Aristotle, sees this consequence: If the Son of God was made like us in all things, except sin, therefore, he is a mortal and sorrowful man. Therefore, such a consequence is not of faith: for what is perceived by natural light is not of faith.

Response: I deny the consequence. Because we perceive by both reason and sense the sun, as a bridegroom proceeding from his eastern chamber in the morning; and we know this

by faith, Ps. 19:6. Nor is reason here anything other than an organic cause, and the light of faith is the principal agent.

Objection 2: What is something diverse from the Word of God, that is not the Word of God, and thus is not of faith. But a conclusion deduced from the Word of God is something diverse from the premises, as Aristotle rightly says. Therefore, it is not the Word of God. Likewise: What is of faith is resolved into the first believable, "Thus says Jehovah." But this conclusion ("Therefore I believe") is not resolved thus: for God nowhere in the Scriptures says that I believe, or that Lawrence or Francis believes. Therefore, it is not of faith.

Response 1: That what is something diverse from the Word of God in itself, and by external reason, not internal (as Cameron says, on the Church, p. 359), or in our mode of knowing, not in itself, is not the Word of God, is false. What is diverse from the Word only in the position of terms, and as species from genus, is not the Word of God, I deny. But clear consequences are something diverse from the Word of God, as that which is contained under all and none: For if God says that man is an animal, he says that Peter is an animal. 2. All conclusions which are known partly by Scripture, partly by the testimony of the Holy Spirit, or by the light of natural conscience, are resolved into this: "Thus says Jehovah"; "Thus testifies the Holy Spirit"; "Thus testifies Jehovah through the natural conscience." And therefore, what God speaks through the operations of conscience in conformity with the principles and signs in the Word, God no less speaks than those things which are expressly in the Word. And hence, the subjective certainty of salvation, by which I am certain that I believe and will be saved, is no less an object of faith (whatever the Papists and Arminians may assert to the contrary) than objective certainty.

To the second question, namely, what sort of evidence of consequence is required for a consequence to be an article of faith? I say:

It is one thing to hold a fundamental conclusion closely and narrowly; and another to oppose it by a less clear consequence. Peter truly and by saving faith believes that Christ is the Savior and promised Messiah, Matt. 16:17. Yet he does not see this consequence: Christ is truly that promised Messiah; therefore, he will be delivered into the hands of sinners, and will be scourged and crucified. Yet it was a fundamental consequence, which Peter, not seeing, dissuaded Christ from undergoing death. Thus the Galatians believed that Christ profited them; and yet they believed that circumcision was necessary; because they thought these two could be consistent. Thus among the Papists there are simple people who believe that Christ is truly man; and yet they believe in transubstantiation, and think that by God's omnipotence it is the case that transubstantiation and the true humanity of Christ are consistent at the same time. Such people, from a defect of judgment and depraved education and obstinate opinion, err in errors that are materially, not formally,

fundamental. Their worship is impious in itself, not relatively, as Cameron says on the power of the Church, pp. 214-215. But such errors, after a clear proposition of the truth, become formally fundamental errors.

2. Then, concerning these fundamental consequences: 1. there is a doubtful conscience, which assents to them with trepidation; and this can be in the saints, who believe all fundamentals by habit. 2. There is a scrupulous conscience, which is pressed by slight doubts from a slight foundation: these also can believe. 3. There is an opinionated and conjecturing conscience, which is in atheists, who are touched by no conscience of religion. And in these the error is formally fundamental. 4. Finally, there is a conscience maliciously denying fundamental consequences. These sin most of all and are heretics, even if they concede all the cardinal principles of faith. For violence is done to the conscience as often as evident consequences are denied.

3. Those who have never found faithful teachers, such as the more uncultivated Papists, and from infancy believe that the Church cannot err, and therefore have never entertained a suspicion of error, or of the necessity of examining with judgment the doctrine of the Church, just as we never entertain such a suspicion of examining the clear doctrine of the Gospel, which we believe to be truly divine; these are more remote from formally fundamental errors than the more sagacious, who from the rumor of Protestants attacking Papism raise questions about the authority of the doctors, and about the truth of the principles of Papism. Those who believe in transubstantiation and the humanity of Christ, whose doubt is resolved into a philosophical error, by which they think it probable that extension of parts is not of the essence of body, do not deviate so much as those who can gather from the Scriptures that Christ as man can be in only one place at a time, as Matt. 28:6, "He has risen, therefore he is not here"; and where to depraved education, simple credulity, and faith about Christ being like us in all things except sin, is added dullness of wit, they overturn the foundation less directly. Ames on Conscience bk. 3, ch. 2, question 4, asks whether one can be saved who believes something that conflicts with those things which are necessary to believe for salvation. He responds: If he understands them to conflict, he cannot believe both; but if from error and defect of instruction, he thinks they can be consistent, that error does not exclude from salvation.

The third question is more difficult: about the determinate number of fundamentals. On this I set forth these statements:

1. It is rightly said, with Beza vol. 2 of Opuscules on the marks of the Church p. 141, and with our men, that all fundamental things to be believed are, either expressly or by consequence, in the Apostles' Creed, which as Calvin says, Institutes bk. 2, ch. 16, sect. 18, obtained from the very age of the apostles, in the manner of a public confession received

by the votes of all; all things to be done in the Decalogue; all things to be asked in the Lord's Prayer.

2. There are two kinds of articles in the Creed: some are primary, and to be believed explicitly by all who wish to be saved, as the Athanasian Creed says, and Vigilius Martyr bk. 2, ch. 4, as Dr. Pareus notes, prolegomena 3 on Hosea question 4, such as that Christ is man, died for sinners, rose again, was exalted, etc. Others are such as rather expound the mode of a cardinal article than are themselves fundamental: as the article by which he is said to have suffered under Pontius Pilate explains the mode of the passion; the article on the nativity from the Virgin Mary, and conception by the Holy Spirit, explains the mode of the humanity; the article on the time of the resurrection, namely that he rose on the third day, and on the ascension into heaven, explains the mode of the exaltation. And perhaps many closed their day in the faith of Christ who were ignorant of these modes. I would not therefore assert that all the articles expressed in the Creed are fundamental; and that there are some things which are not in it, such as on the sacraments, which are held to be fundamental by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews ch. 6, as also that Scripture is the canon of faith; that we are born in sins, etc.

3. I would not dare to assign how great a number of fundamentals openly denied either destroys the essence of the Church, or renders the one denying unsavable.

4. The denial of one primarily fundamental article, where malice is added, makes that assembly which is materially a Church, formally not a Church. An example is the Roman Church, miserably erring in many fundamentals, while it subverts the person, natures, and offices of Christ, adores creatures for the Creator; it therefore does not hold the foundation, but to that extent ceases to be a Church, or at least the essence of the Church is damaged in it. But more on these things later.

5. The determinate number of fundamentals is not a fundamental article: because many truly believe and therefore hold the foundation, who cannot define the number of fundamentals, as experience proclaims. That alone is the true Catholic Church, which cannot fail, which believes all fundamentals. But that Catholic assembly which cannot fail to believe all fundamentals, and cannot err in fundamentals, is the true Catholic Church. Hence it follows: 1. Although the Catholic Church cannot fail in fundamentals (otherwise it would not be the Catholic Church), yet it does not follow that it can infallibly determine a certain number of fundamental articles. 2. We cannot consult any determinate assembly about the number of fundamentals. 3. A particular assembly or man can believe all fundamentals, yet not be able to determine which are fundamental, which are not. 4. Those are saved who believe fundamentals materially, although they do not believe them all formally, and under the notion of fundamentals.

To the fourth question, I say that knowledge and faith are twofold: one is express, explicit, distinct, and unfolded, when one is evidently and particularly persuaded that God exists, that the Son of God was incarnate; the other is faith involved and implicit, and is such in two ways: 1. as to the degree of faith, 2. with respect to the intellect or will of the believer. As to the degree of faith, we can in three ways concede implicit faith, according to Calvin, Institutes bk. 3, ch. 2, sect. 4-5: 1. insofar as many things lie hidden to us in this life; 2. insofar as we imperfectly perceive known things in a mirror, and thus faith is essentially implicit, and vision explicit and unfolded; 3. that faith preparing for true faith (by which many seemed to be carried into admiration by the miracles of Christ, John 4:48) is implicit.

2. Implicit faith is either such by reason of the intellect, as one who believes a universal proposition virtually and implicitly believes a particular contained under it. A rustic believes it is unlawful to adore a creature; and implicit faith suffices for him to believe that Vasquez is raving, who asserts that it is lawful to adore straw, and the lips of Judas the betrayer; because they are beings representing the first being.

Or it is implicit by reason of the will, and this in two ways. First, when one in will is prepared to believe more things, if they are revealed by God, than he believes.

Knowledge and faith of the principal fundamentals is necessary for all, even the laity, who wish to be saved, so that repentance for ignorance of such fundamentals does not suffice, unless they are imbued with the contrary explicit faith. Acts 4:12, "And there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved." By the name of Christ is understood Christ himself revealed in the Word, so as to exclude the enthusiasms of good angels: Gal. 1:8-9 and 2:6 and 3:10; John 14:6; Mark 16:15-16, "Preach the gospel to every creature. Whoever believes and is baptized will be saved, but whoever does not believe will be condemned." John 3:36, "Whoever does not obey the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God remains on him"; and v. 18, "Whoever does not believe is condemned already." Rom. 3:20, "For by works of the law no human being will be justified in his sight"; and the preceding verse indicates that this is said of each mortal, "so that every mouth may be stopped, and the whole world may be held accountable to God."

Becanus therefore errs, part 2 on the Theological Virtues, ch. 2, question 3, saying that one who expressly believes the two primary articles (namely, 1. that God exists, 2. that God has providence over men) precisely on account of God's revelation is considered implicitly to will to believe the remaining articles on account of the same revelation. Because salvific faith in the two fundamental articles, precisely on account of God's revelation, cannot be

consistent with faith in more articles. But there are more fundamentals to be expressly believed.

In these fundamentals as known there are three things: 1. knowledge according to the substance of their meaning; 2. more unfolded explanation according to those things which are set forth in the Scriptures for edification; 3. resolution of difficulties stirred up about them. Knowledge of the fundamentals in the first way is necessary by necessity of means for the more uncultivated, and sufficient, as Ames observes, on Conscience bk. 4, ch. 2, question 3. Nor is it necessary (says Beza, vol. 2 on the Marks of the Church) for someone to be a true member of Christ, that he understand the "that it is" [τὸ διότι] most exactly; nor are those things required from the more uncultivated which are required from pastors, who ought to be apt to teach and refute those who contradict. The same negative certainty (i.e., which excludes infidelity and error about the faith) is required from all, both pastors and flock, without exception. Heb. 5:11-12; Rom. 14:5; Col. 1:9; Eph. 1:8. (So Suarez, on the Threefold Theological Virtue, disputation 13, section 6, figure 1.) And it is not required by the duty of a special calling that the whole body be an eye, for then where would the hearing be? 1 Cor. 12:27. But the same positive certainty is not at all required from a pastor and flock, from an infant and father. Hence one obligation is pastoral, which is required in its kind as a maximum by necessity of precept; another is Christian, which is also required in its kind as a maximum. Therefore it is necessary that all Christians abound in all wisdom and knowledge, Col. 2:2 and 3:16, by necessity of precept. But it suffices, by necessity of means, that the more uncultivated believe implicitly, and by a pious inclination of mind, in the fundamental consequences and explications of the fundamentals.

Again, faith is implicit, by reason of the will, when one is prepared to believe what the Church believes, as Estius says, bk. 3 of Sentences, dist. 25, §. 2. Thomas explains the implicit faith of the Romanists more soundly, Summa Theologiae IIa-IIae, question 2, article 5, reply, when one is prepared to believe whatever divine Scripture contains; Suarez explains it more crassly, on the Threefold Theological Virtue, disputation 13, section 6, and calumniously charges Calvin with making each man the rule of his own faith, because we disapprove of their implicit faith, which (says Suarez ibid., figure 4), although it includes some ignorance, preserves from the dangers of errors, because it subjects the mind to the proximate rule of faith, which is the Church. Hence they call the errors of the laity, erring with the pastors whom they implicitly believe, praiseworthy acts of obedience.

To the fifth question, on vincible and invincible ignorance, I say:

Vincible ignorance is that which one can overcome by the ordinary means provided by God, with study and diligence, such as is found in those who are born in the Church,

where the word of the Gospel is preached, who can know the Gospel and yet are ignorant of it. The other is invincible, which one cannot overcome by study and industry; yet if we are speaking of salvific knowledge of all the mysteries of the Gospel, ignorance is invincible to us by the powers of pure nature, because to elevate the intellect, there is always need of salutary grace. Theologians say that ignorance of Christ is invincible for pagans: 1. because Christ is an object not naturally knowable; 2. because the obligation to believe and know Christ arises from a positive command alone, added to the law of nature, Rom. 10:14, "And how are they to believe in him of whom they have never heard? And how are they to hear without someone preaching?"

But these cautions are to be noted: 1. If the sound of Christ has traversed through the ears of the pagans (as Paul says in the same place), their ignorance is not entirely invincible, even if they have not heard of Christ, either by the writing of the Gospel or through preachers; yet if by rumor and report, as the report of the glory of the Creator in heaven and the work of creation is heard, as in Ps. 19. For the Apostle alludes to that passage; for he does not say (as Pareus observes there), "as it is written," nor does he make the fame of the Gospel as common as is the knowledge of the Creator, as the Arminians prattle.

Yet I say that ignorance of Christ is not entirely invincible, if by rumor through sailors or travelers they hear that there is a Christ, in whom alone the lost human race is saved. 1. Because no one ought to be supine and negligent about eternal salvation. 2. Because misery, natural ignorance, and the nature of the immortal soul dictate that man is miserable; and there would be a means of struggling out of misery, if they now hear of a savior.

2. It is not invincible virtually, because all naturally oppose and spurn knowledge revealed about Christ.

3. The pagans do not diligently apply all means to investigate the truth of the Gospel, and for the gravity of the matter; it is certain that God here desires industry.

Yet it is invincible: 1. Where there is no rumor about Christ. 2. Where there is no suspicion, arising from the outward works of God's providence, that a pagan is liable to eternal condemnation, unless he is freed by God. 3. Where the letter of the Gospel is in every way hidden from pagans.

Again, invincible ignorance among the more uncultivated Papists is twofold. 1. From the mere lack of reflex knowledge, and this either from the root of education, or from a strong opinion of the fidelity of teachers, whom they persuade themselves are unwilling to lie. This is in some way invincible, because if some uncultivated Jew thought Isaiah to be

divinely inspired, he would never examine his sermons. Therefore the more uncultivated Papists, believing the very divine oracles which the Church dictates, lacking all suspicion or thought of the deceit of pseudo-prophets, labor under ignorance in some way invincible. Therefore although they err in fundamentals, yet if they believe the articles of faith, and order their life according to the Decalogue, however much they hold things built upon it, which in reality and in themselves overturn the foundation, I would say they labor under a speculative error rather than a practical one. And in this way their ignorance is vincible, because they do not examine the written Testament of Christ, which is among them, when they can and ought, especially when they see the means supplied by God himself (namely, the reading of the Scriptures) taken away by their leaders.

2. Ignorance can be said to be in some way invincible for those who hear that their Church can err. But also when they do not examine its doctrine, but know the way of salvation is opened to them through priests (men who are otherwise profane) who perhaps do not faithfully repeat the mind of the Pope and General Council, and therefore of God himself (as they believe); such ignorance is not entirely invincible, nor does it excuse them.

The purely and simply invincible ignorance of pagans is a cause without which there is no damnation, and it precludes access to the knowledge of Christ, but it is not the proper cause of damnation. The abuse of the light of nature and of more common means is the cause of their damnation. Yet they err in the most common fundamentals of the law of nature, and their errors are truly fundamental. 1. Because knowing God, they do not glorify him as God. 2. Because they do violence to the clear light of conscience, which is to despise the authority of God, speaking through the dictate of natural conscience. 3. Because they err miserably in practical fundamentals.

To the sixth question (namely, in what way is knowledge of the fundamentals necessary for salvation?), I say it should be noted that there is a threefold necessity here: 1. there is a necessity of means; 2. there is a necessity of precept; 3. there is a necessity both of precept and of means.

Necessity of means is when something is so necessary according to the ordinary law that without it the end cannot be obtained. As without Christ being known and apprehended by faith, salvation is impossible for adults; without the grace of God, salvation is impossible for infants. That is necessary by necessity of precept which is necessary, not because the end can in no way, not even ordinarily, be obtained without it, but on account of the obligation imposed on us by the command of a superior. In this way it is necessary that we abound in all wisdom and knowledge of the Scriptures, by God's command, Col. 3:16. Yet salvation is ordinarily obtained by very many who do not abound in such knowledge; yet to be destitute of that knowledge is a sin graciously pardoned in Christ to the elect.

Necessary in both ways is what both constrains us by obligation, if we wish to be saved, and without which God does not ordinarily save us, as he himself says in the Word. Thus faith is necessary for adults both by necessity of means and necessity of precept.

It should be noted, however, that although the constant and diligent observance of God's commandments is a means appointed by God for obtaining salvation, and thus in a broader sense of the term is necessary by necessity of means, yet it is not such in this notion, namely as absolutely and precisely intended by God, without which the end (namely salvation) is not ordinarily obtained. Hence means is twofold: either that which is a means such that it is obligatory for us; or that which, although it is obligatory for us, yet is not, not even ordinarily, obligating God to produce the end without such means.

Necessity of means is often a work of the absolute good pleasure of God, as is the revelation of the Gospel. But invincible ignorance often frees us from the necessity of means, as ignorance of the Gospel frees pagans from the necessity of believing the Gospel; nor is it guilt or our sin that we lack that which is formally necessary by necessity of means, as it is distinguished from that which is such by necessity of precept. Then from necessity of means, necessity of precept always arises in adults (where invincible ignorance has no place), and because this is a means, therefore God enjoins and commands us some operation concerning that means: as because the revelation of the Gospel is a means without which salvation is not obtained, therefore God commands us to believe the Gospel.

It can be asked why all things contained in the Word of God are to be believed under penalty of damnation, when yet not all things contained in the Word, but only fundamentals, are necessary to be believed by necessity of means? Response: Because, in the administration of the covenant of the Gospel, God as supreme lawgiver and judge of the world, infinitely just, forbids all evil under the penalty of eternal damnation, just as he commands all good; yet he so forbids and commands that, as a clement, gracious, and merciful Savior, he leaves room for free remission and grace, by which, on account of the death and obedience of Christ, he can pardon all sins, even of doubt and unbelief, to the one repenting, and thus also the omission of all means to salvation, except that which is of a means absolutely and precisely intended by God for salvation. But it is right that looser reins be left to divine mercy than to sin. Because the way to glory is now evangelical, through pardoning grace; but for Adam, who was to be led to glory by a way entirely legal, whatever was necessary by necessity of means was also necessary by necessity of precept, and vice versa. Perhaps efficacious and confirming grace can be excepted, so that in the covenant of nature the glory of liberty might be God's, just as in the covenant of grace the glory is God's, both of mercy and of justice.

To the seventh question, I say it is one thing 1. to believe fundamental errors, 2. another to profess them, and 3. another to obtrude them by force on the consciences of others.

Many believe fundamental errors who do not know that they believe such, but think they firmly adhere to the Christian religion, as the Marcionites and Manicheans; Ockham, in his Dialogues, bk. 4, part 7, ch. 3, tract 1-2, calls such unknowing heretics, not because they think the false to be true (no one can believe this, because assent as such is a natural act), but because they embrace as true that which is false. I know it is asserted by the Scholastics that the denial of one fundamental article is the denial of all, because as Meratius says, vol. 2, treatise on faith etc., disputation 24, section 4, figures 7-8, when many things are sufficiently proposed to the intellect for one and the same formal reason, namely divine authority, the intellect cannot embrace one and reject another. And certainly one who spurns the dominion of authority which God holds over the created intellect in one thing spurns it in all. But there is a twofold contempt here: one sometimes only virtual, as when the disciples denied the resurrection of the Lord, John 20:9, for as yet they did not know the Scriptures, that he must rise from the dead (yet they believed him to be the Son of God, Matt. 16:16-17); the seed and habit of faith lay hidden in them, but the act of faith was interrupted in this article from the inevidence of the terms, and the force of temptations. And thus the denial of one fundamental article is not the denial of all; for thus one act of unbelief would make a faithful man an apostate, which is not to be said.

The other is formal contempt, when someone opposes a fundamental article because he is touched by no authority of God speaking; and thus one who denies one fundamental article denies all. But from there it is clear enough that many pious people doubt this or that fundamental article, who yet do not err in fundamentals. Hence the Lutherans do not cease to be a true Church, although their errors are such as in some way subvert the foundation. Nor do the Arminians cease to be a Church, when they retain the foundation. But as Arminianism has now prevailed under Vorstinianism, and as it is set forth in the Apology, and especially as it is defended by Curcellaeus and by others, it is a most serious heresy, and destroys the foundation, since they have now mixed themselves with the Arians, Socinians, Jesuits, Anti-trinitarians.

To profess a fundamental error is more serious than to hold it; to propound and defend it is still more serious. But to obtrude it on the consciences of others by tyrannical force is by far the most serious. The Church ought to tolerate those erring or doubting about fundamentals, until they are instructed, 2 Tim. 2:24-26. 2. It ought to restrain those professing fundamental errors. 3. Teachers and seducers of others ought to be ejected from the Church.

To the eighth question (to what extent ought we to separate ourselves from a Church erring in fundamentals?), I first ask whether the Roman Church is a Church? And I set forth my view in these assertions.

Assertion 1: There is an invisible Church in the Roman Church, and under the Papacy, like a woman hiding in the wilderness, who from weakness does not dare to profess the pure faith. This is evident from the confession of many, who secretly admit that the orthodox faith has been graciously revealed to us.

Assertion 2: It is one thing to speak of the assembly professing, defending, and urging Papism on the consciences of others, and of the same visible assembly which professes the Word of God and the two principal sacraments of the New Testament, and that Christ is the God-man, and died for sinners, and professes and defends the fundamental axioms separately from the conclusions, and that the sacred Scriptures are the Word of God; for this is the profession of the Papal assembly, according to these two acts of profession among them.

The assembly professing Papism, as such, is the synagogue of Satan, the Babylonian harlot, not the bride of Christ; nor is there any question whether it as such is not a Church.

But the assembly professing Papism in the concrete, that is, the Word of God, and together with it those false, heterodox, and heretical things built upon it - such an assembly is not a true Church with ethical and moral truth, just as an impure and adulterous wife is not a true, that is, an honest wife. But such an assembly is a true Church, with physical truth, in a certain respect, materially, or (as Junius says) with respect to God, not on the part of men. Thus he, in his singular book on the Church, vol. 2, ch. 17: "On the part of God it is still called 'Ammi', my people, and 'Ruchamah', having obtained mercy, which most truly on its own part can be called 'Lo-ammi', not my people, and 'Lo-ruchamah', not having obtained mercy. But that Church has nothing that is not corrupted, I admit; but what it has that is divine, is all from God; what it has that is corrupted, is all from itself; that it has all divine things, it is a Church; that it has all the same things corrupted, it is a corrupted Church. The Church is not taken away by corruption except total (as they say), which they call perishing; particular corruption does not take away the Church, but weakens it. The Roman Church has all things corrupted, but not entirely; this is not to be called its perishing, but its partial corruption."

Reason 1: An assembly having the Word, and the seal of the covenant, baptism not to be repeated, is materially a covenanted people. But the Roman Church is such. Therefore etc.

2. An assembly in which there is an active calling on the part of God, and a passive calling on the part of certain ones convicted in conscience, and the marriage certificate (the Word of God, of course), the instrument of calling, is a true Church physically. But such is the Roman Church. Therefore etc. "To that extent, therefore," says Tilenus, Syntagma of Disputations 38, on the body of Antichrist, thesis 53, "the name of Church is left to the Pontifical assemblies, so long as among them remains the κλῆσις or calling of God through his Word contained in Scripture, calling them to faith and repentance, and sealing this calling with his sacraments, as with certain tokens and seals. Yet insofar as the Roman Church fails from the foundation, to that extent it ceases to be a Church." But they do not retain the foundation. For as Pareus says in his Commentary on 1 Cor. 3, "They indeed profess the Decalogue of the Law and the Apostles' Creed in words, but in reality overthrow them," as he proves there.

For that assembly is not a true Church which exercises a pastoral act (there is indeed something of the Word there, but not faith), nor is that assembly a true Church in which some pastoral act is exercised. For that passage Jer. 51:9, "We would have healed Babylon, but she is not healed," would thus prove that the Chaldeans were a true Church, because there was an active calling there on the part of the prophet Jeremiah who was calling.

As the κλῆσις [calling] is twofold, so the Church is called in two ways: either an assembly called externally, and thus the Roman Church is in some way a Church; or called internally, or the assembly of the faithful, and thus it is in some degree a Church, on account of certain elect outwardly mixed with the antichristian crowd.

If the Church is taken passively for an assembly called by God through the Word and Holy Spirit, and holding the foundation, and believing in Christ, the Roman Church is not a true Church, either morally or physically, either in the concrete or as Papal.

1. Because in it there is not the foundation of salvation, but their doctrine overthrows all fundamentals with idolatry, superstitions, and heresies.

2. Because the Word, as explained by them, is not the Word of God, nor the certificate of marriage with God, but the word of men and of Satan, contradictorily opposed to it. And the certificate is not of marriage with Christ, but of desertion of Christ and adultery with Antichrist.

If the Church is taken less properly for an assembly called by the Word of God, confirmed by certain sacraments, to that extent the Roman Church is a Church, as the arguments prove which Junius brings forward for this matter from our men; from the Papists or

Papists, Erasmus, Wicelius, Cassander, Grotius, and others who have followed these leaders, whitewashers of the Papistical faith and religion.

If 3. the Church is taken for an invisible and latent assembly, called and convicted through the Word calling, and explained purely by Protestants, and believed by them, who yet from weakness do not dare to profess the true faith - thus it is a true Church, even that which lies hidden at Rome, although weak, which can be called Roman, although not as now the Roman Church is commonly distinguished by theologians from the Church of the Protestants.

Laud against Fisher §. 20, pp. 130-131, no. 4-5: "The Roman Church is not a right, that is, a complete Church; yet it is a true Church with the truth of essence, because it receives Scripture as the rule of faith, and both sacraments as causes and seals of grace. The Church can be harmed (I admit) and mutilated with respect to its integral parts, which remains safe with respect to essence, as long as there remain three or four calling on the name of Jehovah; because where there is an active and passive calling, there is an assembly of the faithful, and therefore a Church." But to oppose one fundamental article maliciously, such as the resurrection of the dead, as Pareus says, is to subvert the faith.

Laud is a forger against Fisher §. 35, no. 1, p. 281, while asserting that our men teach that the Roman Church is a true Church. He cites Luther against the Anabaptists, from Bellarmine bk. 7 on the marks of the Church, ch. 16, "We confess that under the Papacy there is very much good, indeed all Christian good." He cites Field, who indeed says, bk. 3 on the Church, ch. 47, "Some have been found in the Roman Church in such a degree of orthodoxy that we can well hope for their salvation." And this is nothing other than that a Church is under the Papacy.

Just as a false prophet, e.g., Balaam, prophesied orthodox doctrine about the star of Jacob, that is, about the Messiah, and yet remained a false prophet; and as the dialecticians make one logic teaching, another using; so one Church is teaching, another using. I do not deny that Junius acknowledges that the Roman Church is a true Church, but certainly he is speaking of the teaching Church, not the using Church. For it is certain that the Papal assembly in the concrete is thus a Church, which teaches fundamentals, and hands down Scripture as the Word of God, and teaches it, and exercises true pastoral acts; but because it subverts the foundation through heterodox things built upon it, therefore it is not a using Church.

Although, therefore, the Roman Church teaches the orthodox faith in itself, by which many can believe in Christ and be saved, it does not follow that it is a true Church physically, if the discussion is about the using Church.

Although we admit that in the Roman Church there is a possibility of salvation, yet it is not safe to remain there, where the foundation is overthrown, even if there is a possibility of retaining the foundation, and it is actually retained by the more sincere part which is under the Papacy.

Even if all fundamentals are conceded by Papists and Protestants as true, it does not follow that the Papal Church is a true Church, because they are conceded as true in general, but there is a contradictory opposition about the particular sense. For example, both parties believe in the real presence, but one believes it to be spiritual, the other bodily. Both concede the necessity of good works, but one says they are necessary as our formal righteousness, the other as effects of gratuitous justification. Both believe Scripture to be the Word of God and the norm of faith, but one party claims it to be a partial norm, the other a perfect and total norm.

It is one thing to speak of a Church speculatively true, which hands down all fundamentals, from the knowledge of which saving faith can be drawn out, even if it adds other things which are destructive of those fundamentals. And thus the Roman Church is a true Church, as the arguments of Junius prove. It is another thing to speak of a Church practically true, which believes those fundamentals savingly; and thus the Roman Church is not either metaphysically or ethically a true Church, but the Babylonian harlot, and is by no means to be considered the bride or wife of Christ.

Laud asserts against Fisher §. 37, pp. 314-316, no. 9, conclusions 1-2, that the Roman seducers perish, but the simple can be saved; and that the Protestant seducers perish, and the seduced simple can be saved. Whence he implies that our men who oppose pseudo-episcopacy are heretics, and err in fundamentals. But the Arminians must be saved, and the Familists, who oppose our errors, because they oppose heretics.

The Jewish Church is in some way a teaching Church, because they acknowledge the Old Testament, which implicitly is the whole Word of God, as the Word of God, and there is an active calling there in some form. But they reject and detest the one foundation, which is Jesus Christ. And therefore the very essence of the Church is destroyed in that assembly, although they are beloved on account of the fathers and the eternal election of God; yet God expressly ceases to call them, Acts 13:46-47, "Behold, we are turning to the Gentiles," etc. The Word, therefore, which is among them, is not a sufficient means for effectually calling the elect.

Calvin, Institutes bk. 4, ch. 2, sect. 11: "In sum, I call them Churches to the extent that the Lord wonderfully preserves in them the remnants of his people, however woefully

dispersed and scattered, to the extent that some symbols of the Church remain there - and especially those whose efficacy neither the wiles of the devil nor human depravity can destroy. But on the other hand, because those marks are deleted there which we ought to regard especially in this disputation (on the Church), I say that each assembly and the whole body lacks the legitimate form of the Church."

John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, in his Apology of the Church of England: "They are accustomed to boast that they are the Church of God. Aristotle says that bastards cannot make a state. But whether a Church of God can be made from them, let them see. Certainly they are neither legitimate abbots nor genuine bishops... p. 147. What if the law perishes from the priest, and counsel from the elders? What if, as Micah says, night is to them for vision, and darkness for divination? What if, as Isaiah says, all the watchmen of the city have become blind? ... Truly pastoral and ecclesiastical acts can be exercised by one who is not faithful and regenerate, Phil. 1:15-17. Unregenerate pastors can administer the sacraments rightly and according to the institution of Christ. Therefore an unfaithful assembly, which is not truly a Church, can administer truly pastoral acts."

The baptism of heretical and Papistical pastors is a true baptism (with metaphysical virtue), as one baptized by an adulterous minister. For baptism has its value from the institution of Christ, not from the minister, as Augustine responded, Against the Letters of Petilianus bk. 2, ch. 108. Thus we approve baptism among heretics, not of heretics, but of Christ, just as among fornicators, idolaters, etc., we approve baptism, not theirs, but Christ's.

Rivet in his Orthodox Catholic, vol. 1, question 7, treatise 2, no. 8: "When we call the Roman Church a particular Church of God, we do not understand this of the Papacy, which we pronounce to be the plague of the Church; but of the sick body infected with this plague, in which we still observe some obscure vestiges of the Church of God. Scripture, although hidden under a bushel, has remained there, and likewise baptism, although corrupted by various human additions; so that if anything of the Church remains there, it is because something of our marks remains."

It is not absurd for a sacrament to be outside the true Church, that is, outside the assembly of the faithful. It is absurd for a sacrament to be outside an assembly entirely destitute of the Word of God and marriage certificates.

If a minister deprived by the key not erring baptizes, he indeed sins; but the baptism is valid, nor is the infant to be rebaptized.

Objection: But the Church has made the minister a non-minister from a minister, and he is now as it were a layman. Response: He is not entirely a non-minister, because the habitual authority remains; only the exercise is prohibited, because he is only deprived until he repents; and repenting, he is not ordained anew by the Church, but only admitted to the lost exercise.

Objection: The Church can take away ministerially what it gave ministerially. But the Church gave habitual authority ministerially. Therefore, it can take it away. Response 1: The major is not universally true, whenever the Church gives something under God. The Church confers external baptism under God; but it cannot take it away by excommunication. For although the excommunicated person is to be held as a publican, or in the place of a Gentile and publican, he does not cease to be truly baptized with external baptism. 2. The Church ministerially begets a man to God through the preaching of the Word; yet the regenerate can be truly and rightly excommunicated. But it cannot take away the seed of God and the spiritual offspring conferred by it ministerially. Response 2: I deny the minor. The Church in collation does not give habitual authority; God alone gives it. The Church designates to the exercise, and by its power makes it so that he whom God has endowed with both authority and power can rightly perform and actually exercise the ministry divinely given to him.

Before the rise of Luther, the Albigensians and others rightly made a negative secession (for they did not communicate with the idolatry of the Papists), although before condemnation, persecution, and expulsion, they themselves did not make a positive secession, making another new visible Church. Where there are some fundamental errors in the Church, it is not immediately lawful to make a positive secession. Christ commanded to hear those sitting in Moses' seat, although they taught some things that overthrew the foundation, and rejected Christ. Nor does separation from the orthodox Church, on account of some errors in it, separate from Christ, because only separation from the orthodox faith separates from Christ, which is opposed to internal communion with Christ and the Church. But merely external separation is not internal separation; indeed, one who is thus separated retains internal communion with the Church in the orthodox faith, and therefore with Christ.

We consider lame and feeble the argument of the Remonstrants, by which they do not want to separate themselves from the Arians, Socinians, Anti-Trinitarians, Anabaptists, because they do not dare to consign all such to hell, and proscribe them from heaven; as if the rule of our communion with the Church were not the Word of God, but our judgment about the salvation and damnation of men!

However, if we are compelled in external communion to communicate with errors, even non-fundamental ones, in a Church not erring in fundamentals, it is lawful to that extent to make a partial separation from it, not a total one; a negative one, not a positive one. The reason is because it is never lawful to communicate with the unfruitful works of darkness: Eph. 5:11.

False and blasphemous is that saying of Laud of Canterbury, in his Sermon to the Star Chamber, p. 36, that the Christian religion is one and the same in the Roman Church and in ours, and that they are not diverse religions. He adduces a trivial reason, because the learned (he says) recognize only three religions: Paganism, Judaism, Christianity, to which they now add a fourth, Turkism [Islam].

Potter, on the lack of charity, ch. 6, sect. 3, p. 63: "The most necessary and fundamental truths, which constitute the Church, are by no means called into question by either side (namely, both by Papists and Protestants)." p. 68: "We (Protestants) still retain with the Roman Church a true and real union in faith and charity."

But on the contrary: the Papists do not have true faith; they sin against fundamental truths; they do not hold Scripture with us as a sufficient canon of faith and morals, but join their traditions to it and want Scripture to be understood according to them. Nor do they have Christ, but the Roman Pope, that is, Antichrist, for their head and Lord, for the infallible teacher of the faith, interpreter of Scripture, and judge of religious controversies. They flatly deny that God alone is to be religiously adored and invoked, and therefore they adore creatures, angels, men, bread, images, and idols. They take away the mediatorial office of Christ, while they join other mediators and saviors to him. They deny the satisfaction of Christ, rendered by his bloody death, and the obedience rendered for us, while they want to satisfy God for sins by themselves and through others, and join the bloody sacrifice of Christ with the unbloody sacrifice of the antichristian Mass fabricated by them, as useful and necessary for placating God, satisfying for sins, and taking away sins and punishments; and they contend that man is justified and saved in the divine judgment, not freely by the mere grace of God, on account of the obedience of Christ rendered for us and applied by faith, but by their own inherent righteousness and the merits of their own works. We do not have union in faith with those who thus subvert the faith.

2. Laud trivially enumerates four generically diverse religions, as if there were not more in the lowest species, and as if the Christian religion were one in species - true, sound, in fundamentals - among us, Papists, Socinians, Arians, Anabaptists, Libertines, Antinomians, and in all impure and diabolical sects peddling the Christian religion.

3 Perhaps he is satisfied with that saying of Medina, On Right Faith in God, bk. 4, ch. 6, that the faith of the Decalogue is preserved in these things implicitly known: "What you do not want to be done to you, do not do to another," and "Whatever you want people to do to you, do also to them." And that of Soto on Book 4, dist. 5, unique question; and Vega, bk. 6 on the Council of Trent, ch. 20, that no more fundamentals are required for salvation than to believe that God wants to help the world, and to reconcile it by ways pleasing to his providence. And that saying of the Turkish Qur'an, ch. 2, that in any religion a man can be saved, provided he does nothing against his own conscience. Yet in chs. 28 and 47 they teach that man's blessedness consists in food and drink.

4. These innovators, who measure all faith from the courts of kings, and regard gain as godliness, think that a Catholic catechism can be written, containing a sum of fundamentals to which all can subscribe. For thus Jews and Christians can subscribe to the sum of the Old Testament, which certainly implicitly contains the New Testament and all fundamentals, and constitute one true Church. For if we swear to the fundamental articles confusedly and implicitly, understood according to that vague and indefinite sense which the Holy Spirit intends, even if it is unknown to us in particular, then certainly Jews and we can thus rightly and duly subscribe to the Old Testament. But if each sect has its own contrary and mutually opposed senses about those articles, then there does not stand one fundamental catechesis in which we all acquiesce; but there are and will be as many catecheses with respect to senses as there are diverse opinions of different sects. For doctrine is to be accepted according to the sense, not according to the letters and syllables; otherwise it would be permitted for anyone to subscribe to a general doctrine; and thus the Arians would swear that Christ is God, but they would understand him to be God only nominally, not essentially.

I do not deny that there is a broad distinction between one who hates and detests a fundamental dogma of the faith, and one who subverts such a dogma by a fairly plain consequence, as the Arian denies and detests this (Christ is God consubstantial with the Father). Likewise also this (Christ is true man, like us in all things except sin) the Marcionites not only deny, but also hold in hatred and detestation. The Papists and Ubiquitarians deny this proposition by evident consequence (Christ is true man), but they confess it in words, and love and embrace it. If there were not a depraved disposition toward evident consequences, they would by no means be erring in fundamentals; therefore it is an error by consequence, not a direct one.

Before the law was given, there were fewer fundamentals; Adam was bound to believe his own misery, and the remission of sins and salvation through the Savior to be incarnate, the last judgment, and the resurrection of the dead, about which Enoch prophesied: Jude v. 14. Yet there was no time in which Adam was bound to believe only the fundamentals of the

law of nature, unless perhaps in that interval between the first fall and the revealed Gospel. William of Paris in his treatise on faith, and William of Auxerre, bk. 3, tract. 3, ch. 5, as Bañez says in Summa Theologica IIa-IIae, q. 2, art. 8, taught that in the time of grace it is not necessary to believe explicitly any article of faith, but it is enough to believe all that mother Church holds and believes. But this opinion is shameful to Domingo Bañez, Gregory of Valencia, and others. Not badly, however, Aquinas, ibid., q. 1, art. 7, reply: "The articles of faith have grown with the succession of times, not indeed as to the faith, but as to the explicit and expressed profession; for those things which were believed explicitly and under a greater number by later generations were all believed implicitly and under a smaller number by the earlier fathers."

Perhaps rules can be given for distinguishing fundamentals from non-fundamentals.

1. A fundamental article is one that is about Christ the Mediator, and about faith and repentance, and has such a necessary connection with these that if this is overturned, the doctrine of Christ, of faith and repentance collapses. Hence there is error in the foundation: 1. When the deity is denied. 2. When we think heterodoxly about God and the Trinity. 3. When we imagine three gods. 4. When Christ is denied expressly or by evident consequence. 5. When an idol is substituted in place of Christ, as when the idol of bread is adored for Christ. 6. When hope and trust are placed in creatures, providence being trampled underfoot. 7. When something is taught that is directly opposed to a fundamental head concerning faith and Christian practice.

2. Rule: Knowledge of those things without which one can believe in Christ is not a fundamental article. Hence knowledge of the miracles of Christ is not a fundamental article. These were instituted only so that we might believe: John 20:30-31. Because therefore many savingly believe in Christ who have known little or nothing of his miracles, some Papists wrongly deny that the Apostles' Creed does not include all things to be believed, because it has nothing about the miracles of Christ, and his circumcision and baptism.

3. Rule: The Apostles' Creed, the Decalogue, and the Lord's Prayer, as to the letter and pure, are not an exact rule for recognizing fundamentals. Because all heretics - Papists, Arians, Socinians - willingly subscribe to these. 2. Nor are these three, as to the more ample explication of all doubts and questions emerging from the Apostles' Creed and the Decalogue and the Lord's Prayer, a safe rule, but only a rule as to the explication which is had from other creeds - the Athanasian, Chalcedonian, etc. - and as to the easier and plainer heads explained in these.

4. Rule: It is one thing for something to belong to a fundamental dogma, another for the dogma itself to be fundamental. Whatever is a part in the Word of God is something of a fundamental article, because it is the Word of God, which is resolved into a fundamental principle, namely that sacred Scripture is the canon of faith and morals; and therefore every error about what is in the Word of God in some way and remotely fights against the fundamental articles. The fundamental dogma itself is either express, or by a most clear consequence in the Scriptures, and such that ignorance of it excludes from salvation.

Is the Roman Church truly a Church?

For the resolution of the question, these distinctions are to be considered:

1. It is one thing to speak of the Roman curia, another of the seduced multitude, another of the crowd of the weak.

2. It is one thing to speak of the Church materially true, another of the Church formally true.

3. It is one thing to speak of the Church in the concrete, another in the abstract.

4. It is one thing to speak of the Church true physically or metaphysically, another of the Church true ethically and morally.

5. It is one thing to speak of the calling assembly, another of the called assembly.

6. It is one thing to speak of the teaching Church, another of the using Church.

7. It is one thing to speak of the Church in becoming, or according to pastoral or ecclesiastical being, and another of the Church in its completed being, or according to Christian being.

8. It is one thing for the Roman Church to be saved, another for salvation to be in the Roman Church.

9. It is one thing to speak of the Church considered speculatively, another practically.

10. It is one thing to speak of the Church secundum quid [in a certain respect], another of the Church simpliciter [simply].

11. It is one thing for a pastoral act to be ratified by formal consent, another for it to be ratified ecclesiastically and finally.

12. It is one thing to speak of a mark of the Church in becoming, another of a mark of the same in its completed being.

13. It is one thing to speak of a Church professing the rejection of the foundation, like the Jewish Church; another to speak of a Church professing the foundation, like the Roman Church.

Assertion 1: Theologians do not assert that the Roman Church is entirely and completely null. Junius, vol. 2, in his singular book on the Church, ch. 27: "On the part of God it is still called Ammi" - see the rest cited previously; likewise Calvin, Tilenus while still orthodox, Rivet. We do not count as ours the innovators who strive to reconcile us with the Roman Church; they teach that the Roman Church, simply and without qualification, is to be called a Church, and this truly with metaphysical truth, although it is a languishing and sick Church, just as a diseased man is called a man simply. Potter, on charity poorly understood, ch. 6, sect. 3, p. 63: "The most necessary and fundamental truths, which constitute the Church, are by no means called into doubt by either side, Papists or Protestants." p. 68: "We (Protestants) still retain a true and real union in faith and charity." So Laud against Fisher, §. 20, pp. 130-131: "The Roman Church is not a right, that is, a complete Church; yet it is a true Church with the truth of essence, receiving Scripture as the rule of faith, and both sacraments as causes and seals of grace." But in this way the Roman Church is not complete, but liable to errors, although it has the true essence of the Church, and thus for Laud, the Church of England, the Church of Scotland - indeed, no Reformed Church is true and free from errors; because thus perhaps the Church triumphant in heaven alone is the true Church. But this does not prevent the Roman Church from being just as truly a Church with metaphysical truth as is the Church of the Protestants. Laud cites in §. 35, p. 281, no. 1, some of our men asserting that the Roman Church is truly a Church; he cites Junius, whose mind we will consider; he cites Luther against the Anabaptists from Bellarmine, On the Marks of the Church, bk. 4, ch. 16: "We confess," he says, "that under the papacy there is very much good, indeed all Christian good." He cites Richard Field, On the Church, bk. 3, ch. 47, saying, "Some have been found in the Roman Church in such a degree of orthodoxy that we can well hope for their salvation." But these say nothing other than that a Church is under the papacy, which is not in question. So with them teach Joseph Hall, Shelford, William Chillingworth, and other theologians in England striving for episcopacy. Others say their errors are reductively, not per se fundamental. But Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, speaks otherwise in his Apology for the Church of England: "They are accustomed to boast that they are the Church of God. Aristotle says that bastards cannot make a state; but whether a Church of

God can be made from them, let them see. Certainly they are neither legitimate abbots nor genuine bishops... p. 147. What if the law perishes from the priest, and counsel from the elders? What if, as Micah says, night is to them for vision," etc.

Assertion 2: It is one thing to speak of the Roman curia, another of the whole multitude miserably seduced, another of the assembly of the weak; just as it is one thing to speak of the assembly professing, teaching, and imposing papism on the consciences of others, another of the papal assembly following blind leaders, and another of the crowd of the weak groaning under the papacy.

Assertion 3: If the word "church" is taken for the assembly of the faithful, for whom Christ gave himself (Eph. 5:25-26), then the Roman Church and papal curia as such do not even retain the essence of the Church. 1. Because that assembly pertinaciously errs in fundamentals, transmutes the Word of God into the word of men, subverts the natures and offices of Christ, and professes and teaches open idolatry. 2. Because even if that assembly professed all fundamentals in words, and acknowledged the Word of God as the norm of faith, it would not thereby be proved that the Roman curia is metaphysically a Church and bride of Christ, who adheres to Christ the bridegroom by true faith. Because there is no impure Christian sect that would not subscribe to the Apostles' Creed, the Decalogue, and the Lord's Prayer. Would that subscription overthrow errors formally fundamental? And even if a most impure sect believed only so much of the Word of God as could save a man, as the Jews today profess to believe the Old Testament, it is not thereby made to be truly and physically a Church. Because it is one thing for salvation to be in the Word, which some assembly acknowledges as the Word of God, and another for that assembly to be an assembly of true believers; because for true faith, not only the material object but also the formal object of faith is to be considered.

Assertion 4: The blind multitude miserably seduced, following blind leaders, is no otherwise a Church, insofar as it follows them, than the unconverted, deaf, and insane among us are considered materially in the Church, that is, in the assembly of believers, but not formally believers, nor formally members of the invisible Church. I say insofar as it follows those leaders, because it is to be decided otherwise about what can happen to the seduced through the Word of God, which is, and in some way sounds and is read among them, even if they live and die in the papal assembly.

The members of the curia are materially of the visible Church, as the wicked in the true visible Church are materially, and can be called such. You will say that the Jewish assembly is thus a Church, because the Jews can be called. I respond: It does not follow, because potentially and proximately they are not called, not even externally, but are to be called. But the curia itself is an assembly externally called, and thus materially and the proximate

matter of the Church; nor do we deny that some from the curia, as some formerly from the Pharisees, are internally called to Christ.

Assertion 5: A true Church, both with metaphysical truth and with ethical truth, is under the papacy. 1. Because that crowd groans under papal tyranny, calls us blessed who have departed from Babylon, and detests their idolatry and errors from the heart. Nor does this assembly cease to be a true Church because it lacks an essential mark of the Church, which is the pure profession of the Word of God, because profession is one thing potentially, another actually. That crowd is prepared in first act to profess Christ, and to die for him, and actual profession is a mark of the true visible Church. Nor did Christ himself profess his illustrious testimony at every moment of time, but only in the due place and time, before Pontius Pilate. I add that profession is one thing negatively, when the pious in hiding do not profess idolatry, nor bend the knee to Baal - and this profession is a mark of the invisible and hidden Church; profession is another thing positively, when one openly resists idolatry and openly testifies that corrupt doctrine is hateful to him from the heart - and this is only a mark of the visible Church. Negative profession is of infirmity, and sometimes of pious prudence; positive profession is from zeal for the faith.

Assertion 6: Hence it is no wonder that the Roman Church in the concrete is sometimes called a true Church, even physically, since the denomination is often made from the more excellent part; while papalism in the abstract can no more be called a Church, or the essential form of the Church, than gangrene, fever or gout is called a man, or an essential part of man. Hence it is one thing to speak of the Roman Church materially considered, consisting of men to whom the essence of the Church belongs, and to whom the name, but not the essence and definition, belongs - insofar as there are various men believing and subverting the faith in that assembly; and another to speak of the Roman Church formally.

Assertion 7: The Church is taken in two ways. 1. In becoming, according to pastoral being, or ecclesiastical being, or the calling or teaching Church through the Word and sacraments - for all these are the same; or according to Christian being, or internal being, or by reason of faith, or the Church in its completed being, and in its constituted essence. The reason for this distinction is: 1. Because the external form of the Church is one thing through pastors calling, and people called; or the external κλῆσις or calling is one thing, the internal form of the Church and internal calling another. 2. Its foundation is in the Scriptures, because Zion and Jerusalem are sometimes denominated from the pastoral act, which belongs to the Church by reason of the external form, by reason of the rulers of the Church, whose role is to bring the message of salvation: Isa. 40:9, "Go up to a high mountain, O Zion, herald of good news; lift up your voice with strength, O Jerusalem, herald of good news, lift it up, fear not, say to the cities of Judah, 'Behold your God!'" Isa. 54:1, "Sing, O barren one, who did not bear; break forth into singing and cry aloud, you who

have not been in labor! For the children of the desolate one will be more than the children of her who is married, says the Lord." Gal. 4:26-28. Isa. 49:21, "Then you will say in your heart: 'Who has borne me these? I was bereaved and barren...'" Isa. 66:11-12. John 20:21-23. To the rulers is given the power of loosing and binding; and the Church is denominated from what is proper to the rulers, a woman giving birth to children for God, Isa. 66:8-12, Rev. 12:1, a woman clothed with the sun, on whose head is a crown of twelve stars; and from what chiefly pertains to the rulers, 1 Tim. 3:15, "the church of the living God, a pillar and buttress of the truth." Therefore, an assembly offering the breasts of ministry to Christ's children, Song of Sol. 8:1, and mother Jerusalem, Gal. 4:26, according to Scriptural phraseology, is called a Church; at least the Church is denominated from that act as a Church.

If the Church is taken for the teaching Church, or the Church externally calling, or the Church according to pastoral being, and insofar as by external ministry it exercises certain pastoral acts, and acts of teaching the Word, admonishing the erring, correcting the scandalous, and converting some to God, and administering the sacraments, especially baptism (which is deemed valid and ratified, even when administered by the Roman Church) - in this way also the Roman Church, as it is distinguished from the invisible crowd of weak believers groaning under the papacy, but not reduplicatively as papal, but in the concrete, is called a Church by Junius and some of our men. Nor in this sense would I entirely deny that the Roman Church is a Church. "What it has that is divine," says Junius in the place cited, "is from God; what it has that is corrupt is from itself; that it has all divine things, it is a Church; that it has all the same things corrupted, it is a corrupt Church."

Whitaker, Controversy 2, question 3, chapter 2: "For the papists had certain things which pertain to the true Church: baptism (even if not rightly administered), the Scriptures also, and a certain ministry." And Calvin, Institutes bk. 4, ch. 2, sect. 11: "I call them Churches to the extent that the Lord wonderfully preserves in them the remnants of his people, however woefully dispersed and scattered, to the extent that some symbols of the Church remain there - and especially those whose efficacy neither the cunning of the devil nor human depravity can destroy."

In this way, with metaphysical truth, the Roman Church is a Church: 1. Because an assembly having the Word, even if hidden under a bushel (as Rivet says), and the marriage certificates, and the seal of the covenant, baptism, ratified and valid, is physically a Church. But the Roman Church is such. Therefore, etc. The reason for the major premise: Because in an assembly retaining nothing at all of the essence of the Church, like an assembly of pagans, there is neither a marriage contract nor a seal of that contract. But that assembly has something of the essence of the Church according to ecclesiastical and

pastoral being, which has that by which it is essentially discriminated from an assembly which has nothing at all of the Church. It is true that our men (especially Whitaker, Controversy 2, question 6, chapter 3) contend by various arguments that the Roman Church is not the true Church of Christ. But it should be known that the Roman assembly is to be considered in two ways from its hierarchy and its members: 1. as pastors; 2. as such pastors, namely antichristian bishops distinct in species from presbyters. 3. An assembly in which is the formal organ of active calling on the part of God (namely, Word and sacraments), and in which is passive calling (namely, men begotten and reborn to God through that organ), is with metaphysical truth truly a Church, according to pastoral and ecclesiastical being. But the Roman hierarchy or curia is such. 1. Because they actively call through the Word, and through the Word sounding among them, some children are begotten to God. Therefore, the curia itself in this way is a Church. 2. It is confirmed by the fact that papal bishops and doctors are capable of the sin against the Holy Spirit, which falls upon them alone where there is an active calling and the Word of the Church. 3. It is confirmed because unfaithful men rejecting the foundation can exercise truly pastoral acts; they can preach Christ, Phil. 1:15-17; they can truly administer the sacraments and pastorally exhibit the seals of grace and the covenant to the people.

3. Because the Word of God, however it may sound, and the sacraments of God, however they may be vitiated - when they remain the Word of God and sacraments as to essence, they do not have efficacy from men, even if they are most holy, nor do they lose efficacy, even if the instruments are impious and unfaithful; but they have their efficacy from God and divine institution. That this may be explained more fully, it should be noted:

1. Certain promises are made to the Church only with respect to true believers, such as these: "The Holy Spirit will guide you into all truth"; "I will be with you to the end of the age"; "I will give you a new heart." These are set forth to an assembly consisting of goats and sheep, but they are by no means made to the goats. 2. Certain promises belong to the assembly gathered from goats and sheep, with respect to each and all, such as to hear the Word and receive the sacraments. 3. Certain promises also belong to the impious which are yet truly ecclesiastical, such as, "Whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven," as Augustine says on Ps. 61, "It is known that evil citizens of a good city administer certain acts of the good city" - acts of preaching, administering the sacraments, binding and loosing often belong to the impious. These acts are ratified in three ways, even with ecclesiastical validity: 1. Finally, for the grace and saving good only of true believers, because God wills the Word and sacraments and discipline to be in such an assembly only for the sake of believers, not for the sake of impious pastors, or those who reject the foundation. 2. They are ratified by the virtual ecclesiastical consent of believers, even if formally they do not give consent, nor are they agents there. 3. They are ratified chiefly by virtue of divine institution, whatever sort of men the ministers may be. Hence the papal

Church, as calling and acting, but with a habitude and relation to believers hiding there, is rightly called a true Church, with physical truth. Augustine, Enchiridion chs. 5-6, and Against the Donatists bk. 7, ch. 50: "The reprobate can be called the house of God on account of external calling and external profession, but they are not of the structure of the house, even if," says Gregory, Moralia bk. 28, ch. 9, "they seem to be within the boundary of faith." But it should be known that the external Church is called such in two ways: 1. With respect to the faith required in the true Church, and thus the Roman curia is a Church externally and in name only, as a painted man is called a man. 2. Externally it is called such in habitude to ecclesiastical being, and thus the Roman curia is not a Church externally, but a Church essentially and with metaphysical truth.

This is also what we say: it is one thing to speak of a Church speculatively true, another practically true. In the former way, the Roman Church is truly a Church, because it hands down and teaches all fundamentals, from the knowledge of which saving faith and the practice of the Christian life can be drawn out, even if it adds other things which are destructive of those fundamentals. Thus a Church speculatively true is true with metaphysical truth, as a diseased man is truly a man. But it is not true with ethical truth, but impure and corrupt. But this is a partial corruption, which does not take away the essence of the Church, as a diseased man on account of diseases does not lose the essence of man. Thus the baptism of heretical and papistical pastors is true with metaphysical truth, as one truly baptized is one who is baptized by an adulterous and wicked minister. For baptism has its value from the institution of Christ, not from the minister. Thus Augustine responded, Against the Letters of Petilianus bk. 2, ch. 108: "Thus we approve among heretics baptism, not of heretics, but of Christ, just as among fornicators, idolaters, etc., we approve baptism, not theirs, but Christ's." Thus Balaam the false prophet prophesied orthodox dogmas about the star of Jacob, that is, the Messiah, and yet practically remained a false prophet. So the Roman Church practically is not a true Church, because it does not savingly believe the fundamentals it hands down.

And it is similar to this distinction, by which the dialecticians distinguish logic into teaching and using. For the Church is one thing teaching, another using. And if the Church in its completed being, and according to Christian being, is considered, or according to union with Christ the head through faith, thus the Roman Church is no more a Church than a wooden or leaden hand is truly and essentially a part of the living body.

Assertion 8. Hence it is asked whether Christ the husband has given a bill of divorce to the Roman Church, as he has now to the Jewish Church? I respond: Christ has legally given a bill of divorce by right, so that in the court of God it ceases to be a wife, and is now Babylon and that purple harlot, with whom the marriage is now plainly dissolved, if we are speaking of the papal assembly as such. But in fact God has not entirely given a bill of

divorce, because he still has the marriage certificates, the Word of God; he still has the seals of the covenant, and holds many fundamentals about the one and triune God, and about Christ and his natures. 2. There is an assembly of the faithful hiding among them. 3. There is an active calling there, because we (Protestants) by voice, writings, martyrdom call and pray through the Lord that they return to the husband and the husband's house, and forsake idols and lovers. But truly, since one pastoral act does not formally make a Church a teaching Church, or a Church according to pastoral being, just as the external profession of matrimonial consent makes a marriage, not one or another kiss - as is evident in Chaldea, in which Jeremiah prophesied, according to that, "We would have healed Babylon, but she is not healed," and there was an active calling there on the part of Jeremiah the prophet - so Paul preached Christ at Athens, and neither the Chaldean nor the Athenian assembly is therefore a Church. And although in the Jewish Church there is the doctrine of the Old Testament, which implicitly is the whole Word of God, and which they acknowledge as the Word of God, yet two things are lacking which make a teaching Church, or a Church according to ecclesiastical and pastoral being, which are in the Roman Church. 1. Virtual consent to the marriage, and therefore in no way or sense can they be called the bride of Christ, except improperly and as in the decree of God, because they are beloved for the sake of the fathers, Rom. 11. For the Jews do not even externally profess that the Messiah or son of Mary is the Savior, which however the Romanists do. 2. They directly and professedly oppose the cardinal principle and unique foundation of the Christian religion. For no one can lay any other foundation besides that which is laid, Jesus Christ. They profess that Christ is an impostor and false prophet. But the doctrine of the person, natures, and office of Christ can be had in the Roman Church. Add that the active calling to the Christian religion as Christian has now ceased expressly and formally in the Jewish Church, Acts 13:46, "But since you thrust it aside and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, behold, we are turning to the Gentiles," says Paul. Therefore there is not even an external calling to Christianity among the Jews, except virtually and in the bare letter of the Old Testament; but there is an external calling in the Roman Church, as said before. Therefore the essence of the teaching Church, or of the Church according to pastoral and ecclesiastical being, is preserved, which is not in the Jewish assembly.

Assertion 9. Therefore salvation is in the Roman Church, and the orthodox faith is in it, as in seed. 1. Because the whole Word of God is among them. 2. Because they hand down many fundamentals, especially that Church before the Council of Trent, and the Lateran and Florentine Councils, from which sound faith can be drawn out; and therefore many are saved in the Roman Church.

But in these points we depart from the innovators. 1. That they want the Roman Church itself indeed to teach errors, but not fundamental ones, except reductively and improperly, and which overturn the foundation; but truly our men - Perkins, Pareus, Whitaker - have

proved that the papal Church as such does not teach the doctrine of salvation, but overturns the very fundamental principles of the Christian religion.

2. That the controversies between us and the Romanists are not fundamental, nor does this or that view, neither ours nor theirs, shake the fundamentals, but both can be held and defended without loss of faith and detriment of salvation. But we judge the errors of the papists to be so formally fundamental, especially their idolatry and pagan superstition and blasphemies against the person and offices of Christ, that we think a papist, as a papist, overturns the very foundation.

3. That one must not repent of papal errors as of other errors about religion, because many have held dangerous opinions against the holy Scriptures who can nevertheless be saved, provided they repent confusedly and in general, even if they are never imbued with the contrary truth; because if they hold the foundation, their errors like hay and stubble are to be burned, but they themselves repenting are to be saved, 1 Cor. 3. But those who believe it lawful to adore a creature, and invoke the saints, so ignore the fundamentals, namely that God alone is to be adored, that unless they are imbued with the contrary truth, and repent of such things in particular, they cannot be saved - as God prophesies through Zechariah that the Jews will repent of piercing and crucifying Christ, so that it is necessary that they repent of that sin in particular, and be instructed in the contrary truth; therefore he says, "They will look on me, whom they have pierced," that is, they will see me with the knowledge of true saving faith, Zech. 12:10. Thus it is necessary that a papist who wants to be saved repent of primarily fundamental errors, such as the adoration of creatures, of divine graces and glory attributed to the Virgin Mary. For idolaters God expressly excludes from the kingdom of heaven, 1 Cor. 6:10, Gal. 5:19-20, and for repentance the acknowledgment and abomination of it will be required, Ezek. 36:25,31-32, Isa. 2:20.

Assertion 10. Therefore our men rightly teach that the essential marks of the Church do not belong to the Roman Church, because (says Calvin in the place cited), "on the other hand, those marks are deleted there which we ought to regard especially in this disputation (on the Church)." For the preaching of the Word and active calling through the Word of God is a mark of the Church in becoming, and considered according to ecclesiastical and pastoral being, because in it is the voice of the bridegroom alluring the virgin, even if it has by no means advanced so far as to obtain the girl's consent by praying. In this way the promulgation of the Word, and the active calling through Protestants inviting Romanists to return to the husband, and through the Word of God which is among them, is a mark of the Church. But the preaching of the Word, with fruit, is a mark of the Church considered according to Christian being, according to that in John 10:27, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me." This mark is not a mark belonging to

the papal Church, as it is distinguished from the assembly of weak believers in the Roman Church. The Church according to ecclesiastical being, insofar as it is distinguished from the Church according to Christian being, is less properly a Church. Therefore simply and without qualification, and with a distinction being made, the Roman Church is not to be called a Church.

Assertion 11. Even if the Roman Church taught all fundamentals as true, in general, yet it is not a true Church. Because those things explained and understood in its sense are no longer the Word of God, but the word of the devil; nor of Christ, but of antichrist; nor fundamentals of the Christian religion, but destructive of the fundamentals.

Assertion 12. We Protestants do not have (whatever Potter and others may assert to the contrary) a real union with the Roman Church in faith and charity. 1. Because our faith and theirs differ in formal objects, because the papists want the interpretation of their Church to be the infallible testimony of the Holy Spirit, on which their faith rests; our faith rests on the Word of God, insofar as it is the Word of God. 2. The essence of faith is not preserved in that assembly which believes things that subvert the foundation. But the Roman Church believes such things.

1 Cor. 2:14.

The natural person does not accept the things of the Spirit of God, for they are folly to him, and he is not able to understand them because they are spiritually discerned.

The apostle here teaches three things about the natural man: 1. He denies to him actual knowledge of the things of the Spirit of God. 2. He posits in him an ignorance of depraved disposition about them, for they are folly to him; his mind is disposed in a hostile way toward them. 3. He denies the power of knowing them.

Hence it is asked whether the Arminians rightly teach, Confession sect. 14 and Apology ch. 1, fol. 33, and Arminius in private disputation 8, thesis 4, that the Scriptures can be perceived by all, even the simplest, provided they have the use of reason, and are endowed with common sense, in meanings necessary for eternal salvation, as much as suffices. And Episcopius, disputation 5, thesis 3, that supernatural light, potentially infused, elevating the mind to understand and believe the Scriptures, is not required. And ibid. in the Apology they deny that there is need of the light of the Spirit, or spiritual evidence, to understand the meanings of Scripture. And fol. 29, that there is no need of the internal

testimony of the Spirit to believe that the Scriptures are divine, because men believe before this testimony is given to them.

But on the contrary, we teach: For revelation to me is threefold. 1. Of the letter. 2. Literal. 3. Spiritual and supernatural. The first is of God alone, who devised the doctrine of the law and gospel from the treasury of his infinite wisdom. No created wisdom could invent so perfect a doctrine of law and gospel. And although the doctrine of the law is in some way natural to a rational creature, as is the rational soul itself, yet to invent it primitively is a work of infinite wisdom, no less than the creation of the rational soul is of infinite wisdom and omnipotence. Literal revelation is information and instruction about the literal and grammatical sense of the literal Word already devised. And this can be done by a pastor and doctors of the Church, in men lacking supernatural revelation. The Pharisees, heretics, profane doctors, can both expound and understand the meanings of Scripture; but this knowledge does not suffice for salvation. There is another supernatural revelation, which is indeed a detection and opening, not of a new meaning of Scripture distinct from that meaning which is grammatical and literal, as the Remonstrants babble (for Scripture has only one genuine meaning), but it is a spiritual opening and declaration of the literal meaning, which flows from the superinfused spirit of revelation, which is given to the intellective faculty: Eph. 1:17 and 2:9, Col. 1:9, and from actual concurrent grace.

And thus we are taught that the Arminians err, who deny that the superinfused light of the Holy Spirit is required to understand the Scriptures, as much as suffices for salvation. 1. Because only he who has the Spirit, 1 Cor. 2:12-13, not the natural man, knows the things of the Spirit of God.

2. Because in vain would Paul pray for a spirit of wisdom and revelation, through the knowledge of the truth, that they may know what is the hope of Christ's calling, and what are the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, etc., Eph. 1:16-18, if this knowledge were had through grammatical and acquired knowledge of the literal meaning. For thus there would be need of that spirit to understand Aristotle's esoteric works. Those who thus argue are destitute of the Spirit.

3. Because it would be no privilege that Christ sends the Holy Spirit to the saints to teach them all things, John 14:26, and that he gives them that anointing which teaches them all things. But this action is openly distinguished from the literal instruction which we have from pastors or teaching men, 1 John 2:27, "But the anointing that you received from him abides in you, and you have no need that anyone should teach you."

4. Because in vain would Christ give thanks to the Father, Matt. 11:25-26, for literal information. For this was not lacking to the wise and prudent of this age; for otherwise, if

they did not grasp the doctrine of the cross even by literal knowledge, they would in no way spurn it and make light of it. Therefore, he gives thanks to the Father for supernatural revelation.

5. Because Christ would wrongly say, Matt. 16:17, that flesh and blood had not revealed to Peter that Christ was the Son of God, but only the heavenly Father, if there were no need of the Holy Spirit to spiritually perceive the Scriptures. For as for literal revelation, this is revealed through flesh and blood, and literal knowledge was not lacking to the Pharisees and all who contumaciously denied that Christ was the Son of God.

6. Nor would it be necessary for us to pray for Christ's eye salve, Rev. 3:18, and the opening of the eyes of the mind, Ps. 119:18. Nor would it be necessary for pastors and doctors to implore the light of the Holy Spirit to give sacred sermons, and to teach publicly in the schools. Because sufficient revelation would be had through truly human instruction.

7. If there were no need of light superinfused into the intellective faculty, but a clear proposition of the truth sufficed, as they say in Scripta Synodalia, articles 3-4, p. 164, to understand the Scriptures, the natural man would no more be blind in grasping the mysteries of the kingdom of God than an uncultivated disciple in grasping Aristotle's esoteric works, metaphysical and logical disputations; and to learn Aristotle's Organon there would be need of Christ's anointing, and the eye salve of the Holy Spirit, and a spirit of wisdom and revelation. For in these things there is especially need of a clear proposition of the truth.

8. Because the whole corruption in the will is from the darkening of the mind, and if this darkening is not so great that there is need of the superinfused light of God, now the natural man will be able not only to grasp, but also rightly to judge, approve, will, and do the things of the Spirit of God. But the natural man is dead in sins in that way, and unfit to understand, judge, approve, believe, and do all true and spiritual good, in the way that an uncultivated recruit is dead and impotent to understand, explain, and defend Aristotle's first philosophy, natural and moral.

9. Turks, Jews, Americans, and none at all, according to this Arminian theology, can understand and believe that the Scriptures are divine. There is no need of the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit, if the Remonstrants are to be believed.

10. This is the doctrine of Ostorodius the Socinian, who derides the internal illumination of the Holy Spirit, Institutes bk. 1, ch. 5.

2 Cor. 4:3.
And even if our gospel is veiled, it is veiled to those who are perishing.

It is asked whether our men defend the obscurity of holy Scripture with the papists, because we teach that no one can understand them, as much as suffices for salvation, without the internal light of the Holy Spirit. The Remonstrants affirm this, Apology ch. 1, fol. 33, bk. 2 against Voetius, ch. 2.

We deny it. 1. Because the question between us and the papists is about the literal and grammatical perspicuity of Scripture, not about its supernatural perspicuity. 2. Because we teach that the Scriptures are in themselves perspicuous, but yet the gospel is veiled to the one who is blind and to the one who has perished, and a veil lies over the heart of the Jews in reading the Old Testament, 2 Cor. 3:15.

2. Because the Remonstrants teach that the Scriptures are so perspicuous that they want nothing to be required for their internal and spiritual understanding, besides literal knowledge, which belongs even to devils, heretics, and those in whom Satan the god of this age has blinded the minds, lest the light of the glory of Christ should shine on them, 2 Cor. 4:4. But we teach that the Scriptures are obscure to devils and blinded reprobates, in the way that the sun is obscure to a blind man, which yet in itself is very clear and visible.

3. Because the Remonstrants calumniously teach that we feign two meanings of Scripture, one literal and grammatical, the other supernatural added to it. Most false. For because the same sun is seen in one way by one who is bleary-eyed, and in another way by one who is lynx-eyed, we do not say either that there are two suns, or that there are two perspicuous visions of the sun. But we hold and believe that both believers and reprobates grasp one and the same meaning of Scripture by natural understanding; but that a believer grasps the same native meaning of Scripture in a more eminent way, and by an infused power, and by a spirit of revelation, in a way that a reprobate never perceives it. And so we assert two modes of seeing one and the same literal meaning. Hence the Word of God in itself is perspicuous to a believer, clear and obvious in both ways, both by natural and by supernatural evidence. But to a reprobate it is perspicuous by natural evidence, which we say against the papists; but veiled and obscure by supernatural evidence, against the Arminians.

But the Remonstrants say against Voetius, bk. 2, ch. 10, that the papists concede that the Word of God is not obscure to the illuminated, but perspicuous. But I respond: This is false. For they say that it is not to be read by any laity, even the truly reborn; because on

account of its obscurity it can beget heresies in them; and therefore it is to be expounded by the Church alone, i.e., by the pope, and councils, and doctors.

Col. 2:6-7.
Walk in Him, rooted, built up, and established.
Heb. 13:9. Do not be led away by diverse and strange teachings.

It is asked whether a solid faith in the Scriptures can consist with the liberty of prophesying, by which it may be lawful daily to search out new interpretations of Scripture, and perpetually to doubt all controversies, or things that can be controverted. The Remonstrants affirm this, Apology ch. 24, fol. 275.

We deny it. 1. Because thus it would be necessary that we always be carried about by new doctrines, which the Apostle forbids.

2. Because it behooves us to be rooted and established in the faith, and to abound in all knowledge of Christ, nor is it fitting that we be carried about by every new wind.

The Remonstrants cite for their liberty of prophesying that saying of Paul, 1 Thess. 5:19-20, "Do not quench the Spirit. Do not despise prophecies." From which they conclude that it ought to be permitted in the Church that anyone may teach that to be the meaning of Scripture which he believes by his spirit of prophesying to be true, and if anyone is impeded, either by the magistrate or by ecclesiastical discipline, from teaching and disseminating such prophecies, then the force of the Spirit is extinguished and prophecies are despised, and they teach that the voice of the Spirit is taken thus, 2 Thess. 2:2, "not to be quickly shaken in mind or alarmed, either by a spirit or a spoken word," 1 John 4:1, "do not believe every spirit." But this is, as Beza interprets, to dream and invent.

We say there is a threefold liberty here. 1. One is of pure knowledge. 2. Another is of conscience. 3. Another of profession or exercise, both publicly and privately. Liberty of pure knowledge ought to be conceded in all republics, in this sense, that the magistrate can compel no one to think this or that in religion. This belongs to God alone; the magistrate can command the information of the mind, through ministers and doctors, not opinion.

2. The magistrate cannot deprive the conscience of the liberty of rightly thinking about God; a king cannot, a tyrant cannot, no created power can compel or inhibit the conscience. 3. But insofar as conscience betrays itself in the exercise of the liberty of

religion, the magistrate can establish and defend the profession and public exercise of the orthodox faith; prohibit the exercise of heterodox religion; command subjects to hear the Word of God from the mouth of orthodox doctors - this he can command primarily, and hence secondarily and consequently right belief about God.

This is our opinion on the liberty of prophesying; but we condemn the Remonstrant license of prophesying.

1. Because thus the Holy Spirit would forbid quenching spirits, i.e., false dreams and inventions, and hence God wants us to revere fanatical and false interpretations of the Word, which is blasphemous.

2. A false prophet who sells his dreams as God's oracles ought not to be rebuked, but honored, and this by God's command ("do not despise prophecy").

3. Because they want us to pray for this reason, that God may open the eyes of the mind, teach us his statutes; they want us to be admonished by God to hear, attend, judge, prove the Scriptures, that we may be wise, prudent, not children, but adults in knowledge; that we may thus inquire into new prophecies and new opinions in religion, having abdicated those prophecies which we previously cherished. This is to say, they want the Spirit of God to suggest to us an annual, monthly, hourly faith. For wisdom which is opposed to childhood is the fruit of the Spirit. But this spirit of wisdom is the Spirit of God, who today suggests this to be the true meaning of controversial Scripture. But we ought to relinquish that interpretation, if the spirit of wisdom suggests a new one opposed to it. For this is the doctrine of the Remonstrants, that no one is so certain in his faith about anything controverted that he is not prepared to believe a better interpretation (which he himself, by his spirit of prophecy not to be despised, believes to be true), unless he dares to oppose himself to the spirit of prophecy, and therefore to God himself teaching true things - and thus the Holy Spirit suggests contradictory things to be true, namely, that this interpretation was true last year, but now its contradictory is true.

4. Because if a man so fluctuates about controversies, and that is true which each one in his private conscience thinks to be true, the Scriptures are convicted of being obscure and insufficient to decide controversies, and every controversy here is resolved into an erroneous and erring dictate of conscience, and man through a dreaming spirit, not the Holy Spirit himself in the Word, is established as the judge of controversies.

5. Those controversies are either of useful or useless truth. If the former, an infallible norm of knowing all useful truth has not been left to us, which is injurious to the Holy Spirit and the Scriptures; if the latter, how is it that God has written so many useless

things in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and has written only four or five fundamental articles? This seems unworthy of God's wisdom.

6. It is lawful to doubt controversies, and to incline to this or the contrary opinion. But they teach, Apology ch. 24, fol. 276, that by controversies are understood things which either are controverted or can be controverted. But it can be no less controverted whether there are three gods, as there are three persons of the Deity, than it is controverted whether Christ is true God, and the tritheists have as much color from the Scriptures as the Arians do; and whether the felicity of the glorified and the torments of the damned are eternal in that way in which in the Old Testament circumcision is called eternal; and whether the soul is not mortal, as Smalcius says, bk. 1 on the errors of the Arians, ch. 14; and John Geisteranus the Arminian said that he did not know whether souls after death are living or dead, mortal or immortal. Nor does it remove the argument that they say fundamentals are not by their nature such that they can be controverted, because no heretic ever was who called into doubt whether thieves, drunkards, robbers, revilers, the covetous, idolaters will obtain the inheritance of eternal life. For this is proved false by the Antinomians or Libertines recently arisen in England, who contend to prove from the Scriptures that the regenerate cannot sin, and that they can lie, get drunk, rob, shed innocent blood, and remain ingrafted into Christ, and will be saved. 2. The papists, idolaters, strenuously hope that they will obtain the kingdom of God, and indeed they alone. And what is so controverted as what idolatry is? what theft is in the category of usury and restitution? What fundamental article is there which cannot be controverted with as much color of reason as the article on the perseverance of the saints, on original sin, on the irresistibility of grace, on the absolute decree of contingencies, on the divine predetermination of the human will, and many other things which the Arminians call controverted non-necessities?

To this question is related that one: Cannot anyone be saved in any religion?

This the Remonstrants must consequently teach, against Voetius bk. 1, ch. 2. 1. Because they teach that a Church holding things necessary to be known and believed for salvation, which for them are very few, even if it errs in all things which they call controverted, is a true Church. But those who are in the true Church can be saved.

2. Because if the Arians, Socinians, papists, anti-Trinitarians, Sabellians, tritheists believe necessary things, and hold their heresies by a mere simple error of mind, they can, according to them, be saved. For heresy to them is innocence and piety. But many of them believe all things necessary for salvation. Therefore, in any of those sects there will be salvation. Indeed, who denies that among the Jews, who acknowledge the Old Testament as the true Word of God, many by a simple error of mind, drawn from depraved education,

believe that the son of Mary was an impostor and false prophet? And they believe the whole Word of God, although more obscurely.

It is not undeservedly asked whether Arminian liberty of prophesying is not Libertinism and atheism. The Remonstrants deny this, against Voetius bk. 1, ch. 1. We prove it.

1. Because it is Libertinism and atheism to teach that a man is obliged to believe a meaning repugnant to Scripture, because his conscience dictates to him that it is true. For a Libertine would thus be obliged to believe that the regenerate cannot sin, are not subject to any law, that it is lawful for them to fornicate, commit adultery, kill the innocent, from 1 John 3:9, because Christ is our sanctification. But the former is taught by the Remonstrants.

2. He is an atheist and Libertine who believes his erroneous conscience to be a guide, and not the Word of God.

3. He is an atheist and Libertine who thinks he is not obliged in conscience to follow the true meaning of God's Word, because his conscience dictates to him another meaning to be more true.

4. He is an atheist and Libertine who believes himself subject in his conscience to no censure, either civil or ecclesiastical, no determination, no confession, no formula of concord, either of the Church or of a synod, even if made according to God's Word; and thinks believing this to be innocence, and openly defends it for piety. But the Remonstrants believe this.

5. He is an atheist and Libertine who believes he can be an Arian, an anti-Trinitarian, a Socinian, as his conscience dictates to him, and that he can wander through all impure sects, because his conscience dictates that they hold fundamentals.

6. He is an atheist and Libertine who believes he can dissimulate the truth which he believes to be divine, and that he can tolerate false and erroneous opinions about God in others; indeed, those who conceive God to be like wood, stone, and four-footed beasts - provided they believe this by a simple error of mind, and are otherwise good and honest men. But this the Remonstrants believe.

7. He is an atheist and Libertine who thinks that the liberty of prophesying can be extended not only to controverted things, but also to things that can be controverted. But the Remonstrants respond, bk. 2 against Voetius, ch. 10, that things necessary by their nature are not controverted, but those things are controverted which are not clearly and

perspicuously defined in the Word of God. But many raise the question about things which are clearly defined in God's Word. For that Christ is consubstantial with God, that there are three Persons of the Deity and one God, that men are justified by faith alone without works - these things are clearly and perspicuously defined for us in the Word. But for the Arians, Socinians, Arminians, anti-Trinitarians, papists, these things are not clearly defined in the Word. 2. There are serious controversies about things which are express in the Scriptures, such as these: "This is my body"; likewise, "the heavens must receive Christ until the day of the restoration of all things."

8. They are atheists and Libertines who teach that no mortal, when it is a matter of eternal salvation, voluntarily and deliberately holds heresies or false opinions about God, and therefore they do not commit a crime deserving of punishment - against Voetius, bk. 2, ch. 8. Those who sacrifice their sons to Molech, who blaspheme God, do not sin. The Jews who hold that the son of Mary is an impostor do not sin, because (ibid.) a crime is not committed except by one who knows that what he commits is a crime and deserving of punishment. But not a few of the Jews are ignorant that it is a crime to sacrifice their sons to Molech, and to call the son of Mary an impostor. Paul also, thus sinning from ignorance while he was in Pharisaism, was not a sinner.

2 Tim. 3:16-17.

All Scripture is breathed out by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work.

Hence it is clear that the Scriptures are so full and perfect that not only the traditions of the papists, but also all human ceremonies and whatever there is of positive observance devised by antichrist or by false prophets in divine worship - all that conflicts with the fullness of the Scriptures. You will say, reader, that the Arminians do not sin in this matter. But I say that they sin shamefully here, but with an evil conscience, as I believe, in order to gratify the Anglican bishops who now hold power (although the Arminians in England deliberately defend this error against the perfection of the Scriptures), because they teach, Apology ch. 21, fol. 232, that the government of the Church by presbyters and elders is not illicit and to be condemned; yet it was not instituted by the apostles. They say it is presumption to condemn the degrees of deacons, archdeacons, presbyters, archpresbyters, bishops, archbishops; and yet they do not dare to assert that these are of divine right or apostolic institution. Likewise, they contend that paedobaptism is not illicit, and yet it has no foundation in the Word of God. Whence they hold that ministers in

the Church are lawful, and that some things are lawful which yet have no foundation in God's Word - which derogates from the perfection of the Scriptures.

Hence against the Arminians, whether in Belgium or in England, we defend this thesis:

All new offices, such as the pseudo-episcopate; all sacred rites and ceremonies of positive observance; all mystical signs, such as the surplice, square cap, feast days, and the rest of the profane juggleries and trifles of antichrist - for this very reason they are illicit and to be condemned, that they have no foundation in the Word of God.

1. Because in these things the negative argument from the authority of Scripture stands firm, as: This is not in the Scriptures. Therefore, it is illicit - as in Acts 15:24, the apostles commanded no such thing. Therefore, you ought not to be circumcised. Heb. 1:13, God said to none of the angels, "Sit at my right hand." Therefore, it is not lawful to attribute this to angels. Heb. 7:14, Moses said nothing about anyone from the tribe of Judah ministering at the altar. Therefore, it is unlawful for anyone from that tribe to be a minister of the altar. The fire of Nadab is illicit, Lev. 10:1. Why? Because God did not command it. Thus Jer. 7:31, etc., 19:5, 32:35, the high places of Baal and the sacrifice of sons to Molech were not commanded by God, nor did it ever enter God's heart to command them. Therefore, they are illicit. 2 Sam. 7:7, "In all the places where I have moved with all the people of Israel, did I speak a word with any of the rulers of Israel, whom I commanded to shepherd my people Israel, saying, 'Why have you not built me a house of cedar?'" Therefore, the building of the temple by David is not lawful. Thus God might say, I have said nothing in my Word about bishops usurping majority and power of jurisdiction over presbyters; nothing about the sign of the cross, nothing about the surplice, nothing about feast days, nothing about archdeacons, archpresbyters, archbishops; nor have I said to my pastors, "Why do you not serve me in these things?" Therefore, all these things are illicit. Then, of the same category is that argument: This is of human institution in the worship of God. Therefore, it is illicit - as 1 Kings 12:32-33, Jeroboam's feast day is illicit. Why? Because it was in the month which he had devised from his own heart. Thus Jer. 18:12, according to their own imaginations. Therefore, vain. Acts 7:43, figures which you made. Therefore, abominable. Hos. 10:6, 13:2, idols of their silver, according to their own understanding. Therefore, vain. Hence Zanchius gravely comments on v. 6 there: We gather from this that all worship which is not from God, from the will of God, taken from his Word and law, but devised from ourselves and other men, without the Word of God, is condemned. For if anything is done in the Church about which the Lord could say, as he says here through the prophet, "This is not from me, but from Israel, but from men," that is disapproved by God. Jer. 18:12, "We will follow our own plans." Isa. 50:11, "Walk by the light of your fire, and by the brands that you have kindled!" Ps. 106:39, "They became unclean by their acts, and played the whore in their deeds."

They reply: 1. This argument holds for worship held to be necessary, in the opinion of the worshiper, such as the high places of Baal and the calves of Jeroboam; but not for accidental worship, as in the sign of the cross and surplice, which we hold in no necessity, with no opinion of necessary worship, but only in the place of indifferent ornaments of divine worship; for they do not bind consciences.

I respond: 1. God's argument in the Scriptures is not from the adjunct of worship, or from necessity; but from the efficient cause of worship - thus, this lacks the due efficient cause, namely, God as author. Therefore, it is illicit. Scripture does not say: This does not have God as author, and is held as worship binding the conscience. Therefore, it is illicit. Therefore this is to do violence to the argumentation of the Holy Spirit, which rests on this, that the will of the lawgiver is the formal reason of legality in everything that is commanded - as the reason why eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge is illicit is the prohibiting will of God; and the reason why Abraham could rightly sacrifice Isaac is the commanding will of God; and if God had commanded eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge, it would have been lawful. Whatever our opinion may be of the necessity or indifference of the thing commanded, the commanding will of God alone makes a thing lawful, and the prohibiting will makes a thing illicit.

2. God's consequence will be vain - thus, the calf is not from God, therefore it is illicit; Jeroboam's feast day is not from God, but from the heart of Jeroboam, therefore it is illicit. For if the calf and those feast days were held to be adiaphora, and as things not binding the conscience, they would be lawful. But thus the ark under the New Testament, circumcision, sacrifices, abstinence from such foods, and all Mosaic worship would be lawful, if indeed we used them as worship not binding the conscience. But thus Jeroboam did not believe the worship of the calf to be obligatory on consciences, because he instituted it only to preserve the kingdom. And yet Jeroboam worshiping the calves was an idolater, because his calves were not from God commanding, although he thought their worship was not religious, but only of political necessity.

Obj. 2. It suffices that ceremonies be conformed to God's Word in general, and therefore thus lawful. But it is not required that they be in the Word of God in particular. This consequence suffices: Let all things be done decently and in order. Therefore, ceremonies are lawful.

I respond: 1. If by a general foundation in the Word they understand a major premise in the Word without an assumption, then I will demonstrate that it is lawful to adore the devil, thus: All worship commanded by God in his Word is lawful. But the adoration of the devil is worship commanded by God in the Word. Therefore, it is lawful. The major premise is

most certain, but for the minor premise I cannot answer. But if ceremonies are thus conformed to God's Word, they say nothing; because thus the adoration of the devil is conformed to God's Word. But if ceremonies are conformed to God's Word because they have both the major and minor premises in God's Word - O how we long to hear such a syllogism! But such a syllogism is a town on the lunar orb, or a goat-stag [i.e., a mythical beast].

2. But if the whole foundation of ceremonies is in this consequence - let all things be done decently and in order, therefore the surplice, signing with the cross, feast days, etc. are lawful - this consequence either can be proved by the Word of God, or not. If the former, we ask to hear the proof. But if the consequence can be proved by natural light, therefore also by God's Word; because the light of reason is contained in God's Word, as a part in the whole; and thus the Word of God will still prove the consequence. But if the consequence is proved by natural reason which is not in God's Word, how we desire to hear such an invincible demonstration! But if the consequence is proved by the mere will of the governors, then this consequence will be valid: Let all things be done decently and in order. Therefore, let Aaron's calf be made, which may be worshiped in the temple, provided it seems good to the governors. The goodness of the consequence stands in the indivisible; therefore, either it is a good consequence, or it is not a good consequence. There is no mixed truth of consequence here, which depends partly on reason, partly on the will of men.

But our adversaries say that your circumstances are no more approved in God's Word than our ceremonies. Therefore I add: 2. Concerning any action according to moral specific difference, it can be said καθὼς γέγραπται [as it is written], it is determined in the Word, either expressly or by good consequence, even if all the circumstances of place, time, person are not expressed in the Word. But concerning all our moral actions which are lawful, whether of faith or morals, whether of the first or second table, it can be said καθὼς γέγραπται, even if the circumstances are not expressed in the Word.

Therefore, all our moral actions are determined in the Word, even if their circumstances are not in the Word.

The major premise is proved: 1. Because the action of Joseph and Mary offering turtledoves and pigeons for their son Christ is καθὼς γέγραπται, Luke 2:23, yet the law in Ex. 13:1-2,13-14; Num. 3:11-13, 8:16-17 has nothing about the circumstances - Joseph, Mary, the priest, the doves, the hour of the offering. Thus in the second table, the deed of Amaziah, who did not kill the son for the father's sin - that deed (I say) of mercy and justice was as it is written in the book of the law of Moses, 2 Kings 14:6. And yet the law in Deut. 24:16 says nothing about Amaziah, about that particular deed, about the sons whose lives he spared.

Therefore, the actions themselves are so determined in the Word, even if there is no mention in the Word of the circumstances, that it can be said of them that they were done as it is written. Thus Zechariah and Elizabeth walked in all the commandments of God, Luke 1:6. Yet their particular actions, and their names, place, time are not had in the Word.

But concerning ceremonies it cannot be said that they were done καθὼς γέγραπται [as it is written]. Thus the public confession of those who are in a public place of the Church on account of public scandal, from which their confession can be more easily heard by the people, is καθὼς γέγραπται, even if the Word has nothing about the penitential chair. Thus a public sermon in a place from which the whole assembly can hear the Word is according to what is written, 2 Tim. 4:1-2, Titus 2:1, even if the name of the preacher - John, Thomas - and the particular assembly, and the pulpit, and such a context, and the day and hour of preaching are not expressed in the Word.

The assumption I prove: If the Word is the directive rule of the actions of a young man, Ps. 119:9, if it is a lamp to the feet, v. 105, and if wisdom causes us to understand righteousness and justice, and whatever is right, and every good path, Prov. 2:9, and makes us walk securely in our way, and not stumble, Prov. 3:23, and if the words of God teach the way of wisdom, and lead through the paths of uprightness, so that those who walk will not turn aside their step, and those who run will not stumble or stagger, Prov. 4:10-12 - then the Word so determines all our actions, both of the first table, namely whether pastors ought to be clothed with a surplice to signify pastoral purity, whether infants are to be signed with the sign of the cross, etc., and of the second table, so that all can be said to be done καθὼς γέγραπται, as it is written. But Scripture asserts the former. Therefore, also the latter.

But concerning all our acts of worshiping God, preaching, singing psalms, praying, reading, administering the sacraments, it can be said that they are done according to the written Word of God. But concerning ceremonial acts, this cannot be said, which I show in these diagrams. And first I posit the category of acts of the worship of God:

1. Worship of God... as it is written.

2. Sacramental worship, or administration of a sacrament... as it is written.

3. Participation in the sacred Supper... as it is written.

4. Participation in the sacred Supper by John, Mary... as it is written, 1 Cor. 11:23, Matt. 26:26, etc.

Thus concerning the ministers of the New Testament, in this way:

1. A legitimate minister of the New Testament... as it is written.

2. A presbyter preaching the Word of God, or a pastor... as it is written.

3. Archippus, Thomas, John, pastors... as it is written.

Thus in ecclesiastical discipline, in this way:

1. An act of Christ the King in the Church... as it is written.

2. An act of discipline... as it is written.

3. An act of ecclesiastical censure, and exercise of the keys... as it is written.

4. A disciplinary act of the Corinthian Church, excommunicating the incestuous man... as it is written, 1 Cor. 5:4.

Thus concerning the acts of the second table, in this way:

1. Love toward the saints... as it is written.

2. An act of charity toward the afflicted... as it is written.

3. An act of charity by which alms are shared with the poor saints... as it is written.

4. An act of charity of the Corinthian Church, giving generously to the poor saints in Jerusalem... as it is written, 1 Cor. 16:1-3.

If a moral action is proved in the ultimate specific degree, and according to individual being, as it is proved here, all the subaltern and supreme degrees are also proved. As if I prove this thing to be Peter, by the same operation I prove it to be a man, an animal, a body, a living thing, a substance. But it is not immediately the case that because I prove this to be a substance or a body, I also prove it to be Peter. Because from the inferiors in the same category, the consequence is valid; but not the other way around.

Now if we apply this open truth to the doctrine of our adversaries about ceremonies, it will immediately appear that they have written a funeral ode for the Scriptures. Let there be, therefore, this ceremonial category:

1. Order and decency... as it is written. 1 Cor. 14:40.

2. Significant and weighty signs, such as women's veils... as it is written.

3. Ceremonies of human institution... as it is written.

4. Mystical or symbolic sacred signs instituted by men... not written.

5. The surplice, signing with the sign of the cross, the square cap... not written.

6. The surplice with which Thomas is clothed, the signing of this infant, in this place and time, by him whose whole hope is fixed on a fat bishopric... not written, except in the papal code.

You see here our "as it is written" is lacking four times. Whence it is vain, what our adversaries say, that their ceremonies are conformed to sacred Scripture in general. Rightly so! This conformity vainly flatters the reader with empty hope. And it is much more trivial when they say that ceremonies are conformed to the Scriptures in the same way as all our moral actions, both of the first and second tables. Why then is not every degree in their categorical ladder, especially the ultimate and specific one, proved by this means ("because thus it is written"), as we contend that all lawful actions ought to be proved?

Hooker objects, On Discipline bk. 2, pp. 55-57: If wisdom teaches every good path, then Scripture will teach all arts and sciences; for those are good ways. But how ridiculous it is to prove that all acts of arts and sciences - of plowing, dancing, singing, making mathematical demonstrations, speaking Latin - are lawful by this ("because thus it is written in the Word of God"). Is it not enough that such acts are negatively lawful, that is, not illicit, nor against God's Word, seeing that they are neither commanded nor prohibited by the Word?

I respond: 1. It is nothing against us that certain acts of arts and sciences are not taught by the Word. For: 1. Certain actions belong to man as he is living and acts. 2. Certain actions belong to man as he is an animal. 3. Certain actions belong to man as such a man, as he is subject to the law, and as he is a moral agent.

Of the first kind are growing, breathing, sensing, hearing, etc. Such things are not regulated by the Word of God; for in these, the concept of lawful or illicit has no place.

Actions of the second kind are eating, drinking, sleeping. These actions have two things in themselves. 1. That they are animal actions, and thus natural in themselves and not regulable by the Word of God. But truly, 2. As they are in Christian man, who ought to be ruled by the Word and Spirit of God, they are regulable by the Word in two ways. 1. According to the substance of the act in general; for the law of nature, which is part of the divine Word, commands man to eat, drink, sleep; and to abstain from these things entirely would be to kill oneself, and to offend against the law of God. 2. Then as to moderation they are also regulated by the Word; therefore one must eat, drink and sleep sparingly and soberly, according to the Word of God, Eccl. 2:24, 3:12-13, Luke 21:34, 1 Thess. 5:6-7.

Actions of the third kind are those which belong to man as man, or as an artistic agent, or a scientific agent. And these actions, as such, are referred to the principles of arts and sciences, and to the ends of intellectual virtues, as such. As to plow according to the precepts of agriculture, to sing according to the precepts of music, to speak Latin according to the rules of Despauterius, to make geographical, geometrical, astronomical demonstrations according to the elements of Euclid. And such actions as such, because they are not moral, nor proceed from man as he is a moral agent, but as he is an artistic or scientific agent, are not regulable by the Word. For Scripture certainly does not thus teach us every good path, nor does it hand down the precepts of arts and sciences, and Hooker is dreaming when he objects to such a thing, since our thesis is about actions especially of the fourth kind, which belong to man as he is a moral agent, and a subject of Christ's kingdom, in relation to the ultimate end, such as to worship God in this or that way, with these Aaronic vestments or other symbolic ones; all ritual actions in the sacraments; to hear the Word, and to help the poor, to honor the king. The common principle of these actions is conscience, which ought to be informed and actuated by the theological virtues, faith, hope, and charity. And our thesis is about these, very badly understood by Hooker. And conscience has some influence on the actions even of arts and sciences, not indeed as they are such and flow from intellectual habits in man, but as they are (so to speak) moralized, or (if the grammarians would grant pardon) theologized, and contracted to moral being through conscience. Thus the actions of arts and sciences, not indeed according to artificial and scientific being, but according to moral or spiritual and theological being, are regulated by the Word of God. For example, to speak Latin and ornately, I do not consult the Scriptures, but the grammar of Despauterius; to make mathematical demonstrations, I do not consult the apostle Paul, but Euclid. But truly, to refer arts and sciences to the glory of God, and not to base gain or vain glory; so that while I speak Latin, I do not lie; while I make mathematical demonstrations, I do not defend any false conclusions against the light of conscience. Here the actions are moralized, and must be regulated by the Word of God.

Obj. 2: Wisdom does not teach us every good path through Scripture, but through Scripture a certain good way; a certain way through spiritual influence; a certain way through experience; a certain way through sense - as it taught Thomas the resurrection of Christ, and the Jews through miracles.

I respond: This is nothing against us. For God teaches all moral good through the Scriptures. We do not say that he teaches men only through the Scriptures, and through no other means. He teaches fools by scourges; but from this it is not gathered that the Scriptures are not sufficient to teach us all moral good. And in alleging the example of the apostle Thomas, he stumbles miserably, as also with the Jews, who were taught through miracles. Were not the Scriptures in themselves sufficient both to instruct Thomas about the resurrection of Christ, and to teach the Jews, apart from all miracles? As if more means took away the sufficiency of the Scriptures! But neither the sense of Thomas, nor miracles, but the Word of God alone was the formal means of faith, both for Thomas and for the Jews. 2. Let him teach by what means God instructs us about the surplice, about the sign of the cross, about feast days. Not by Scripture, as is evident from this, that Hooker accuses the Scriptures of imperfection, and therefore takes refuge in other means. But is it evident that ceremonies are lawful religious rites by sense, sight, hearing? But do they move laughter in the spectators? By experience? Therefore, still by sense. By spiritual influence? Therefore the Holy Spirit teaches ceremonies. In what school? In arts and sciences? Nothing of the sort. Certainly we have been taught ceremonies by the superstitious will of the bishops alone.

Obj. 3: Hooker, ibid.: When many dishes are set before me on the table, it is indifferent to me which ones I eat. I choose these, not because Scripture says these are better than those (for thus they would not all be indifferent to me), but because it so pleases my discretion.

I respond: 1. Eating is a mixed action in man; partly natural, and as he is a natural agent he is led by appetite; and our thesis is not about such actions. And partly it is an ethical and moral action; and thus, to eat foods that harm health, or serve to generate calculus [kidney stones], is against the sixth commandment of the Decalogue. 2. Even if the Word did not minister light here to us who are inexpert in healthy foods, it does not follow that in sacred ceremonies, and in the worship of God, which is a purely moral action, the Word of God leaves us in darkness.

Obj. 4: Parents and masters would command sins to their children and servants; nor would they be bound to obey, unless they had a reason from the Scriptures. But masters, under the seal of silence (says Robert Sanderson, in an English sermon on Rom. 14:23), often find it necessary to command servants about the fairness of which it is not for them to inquire.

I respond: 1. Brothers, would you be angry with Paul, who commands servants and children to obey their superiors only in the Lord? Eph. 6:1, Col. 3:20,22-24.

2. When parents and masters command artificial actions, economic actions, or works of the sciences, then the matter is outside the state of the question. When they command moral actions, in which God is offended or obeyed, it is necessary that even in the most secret things, they know as much as concerns their consciences in practice.

Objection 5: Sanderson, who in this matter begs everything from Hooker, argues thus: There are many affairs daily in our vocations, about which to find testimony in the Scriptures would trouble the most practiced theologians; which would be an impediment to the works of our vocation, and drive consciences to desperation.

I respond: 1. This vexation torments few consciences; for the ignorance of men, who cannot see the reasons of legality and expediency in their actions, ought not to prejudice the fullness of the Scriptures. 2. Those who acknowledge God in all their ways, and consult the sacred oracles in the smallest affairs in the fear of the Lord, will have abundant light in all things.

For it is certain that Scripture is as exact a rule of justice and mercy toward our neighbor as of religion toward God. 1. Because although in civil matters there seems to be greater obscurity in things, as are all positive and political human laws, yet neither is human will more the rule of justice and equity than of religion; because thus it would depend on the authority of men what is lawful, fair and just in political laws, in contracts, in military stratagems; which is absurd. 2. Therefore Scripture is the perfect norm of religion, because the will of God the lawgiver alone, not of men, is that which formally constitutes something licit and pious in religion. But this reason holds in the acts of the second table, because the will of God, not of Abraham, makes the act of child-sacrifice a just act. 3. Because ἐθελοπραξία [self-chosen action] is as illicit as ἐθελοθρησκεία [self-chosen worship].

Obj. 6: Seth, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, who lived before the written Word, and had revelations for the Word, could not laugh, nor eat, nor drink, nor walk, nor speak, except through revelations made from heaven, if men dare to do no actions without a reason from God's Word. For what the written Word is to us, that revelation was to them.

I respond: The light of natural reason, which is contained in the Word, as a part in the whole, made their natural actions licit.

Obj. 7: If it is necessary for all particular actions to be conformed to the written Word, what will become of the Indians? For they have no written Word. Has God left them without law, without a norm of living? But where there is no law, there is no transgression. But if it must necessarily be said that they sin, therefore a law has been given to them. But this is the law of nature, not the written Word.

I respond: Who here would endure a neighing horse, rather than a disputing theologian? For the law of nature is to them in place of the written Word; indeed, it is a part and principle of the written Word. Nor do we want the written Word, because it is written, but because it is just, to be the norm of all human actions. Nor does the written Word obligate the Indians, for indeed it has not been revealed to them.

Obj. 8: The Word of God is as perfect in the acts of the second table as of the first; nor is it more capable of addition here than there. But in the acts of the second table, we cannot always give a reason for our deeds from the Word; for thus all human laws, and the laws of military discipline, ought to be proved from the Word of God. But this is impossible. Therefore, in the acts of the first table, the Word is not absolute in this way. For no obedience could be rendered to rulers, to commanders in war, unless all laws were concluded syllogistically from the Word of God.

I respond: 1. There are two things in human laws. One is moral; the other is not moral per se, but only κατ' ἄλλο [according to something else], insofar as it is a means of order, justice, peace, and avoiding slaughters and confusion; as for example, carrying arms at night in the city. Subjects in these things are mixed agents, partly moral, partly political, or (if the name were more apt) positive agents; who often act according to art, as happens in war, when the law is that he who is in charge of the watch should suggest such a word in the ear of the chief of the city; and the law is that he to whom the right to lands is given should take a clod and stone in his hand. And these acts are of themselves indifferent, and as such, and of themselves, are not moral, nor regulable by the law of God. It suffices that these acts be conformed to God's Word negatively, i.e., that they not be disconformed to the Word of God. Therefore subjects, as to the morality of acts, cannot obey laws unless they know that they are just and in agreement with the Word of God. But as to that which is merely positive human in these, or artificial or economic (I labor here from a poverty of words), subjects, to that extent, are agents through art, through custom, not moral; and therefore it is not necessary that they thus have reasons for their actions from the Word of God.

Obj. 9: Thus decency in the worship of God is moral, and commanded by the express Word of God. But that this decency is expressed by the surplice, sign of the cross, feast days, is indifferent, and depends on the judgment of the Church. Therefore in the Church there

are here mixed agents; and thus it is not necessary that the use of the surplice, or signing of the cross, be proved to be licit by the Word of God. It suffices that they are conformed to the Word of God negatively, i.e., not disconformed.

I respond: 1. In no way is the case equal here and in those things. Because the physical use of the surplice itself, namely that it be fitted in this way to the arm and shoulders by a tailor, is not what we blame; but the ethical, theological, moral, indeed sacred and religious use is what we blame, because it cannot be proved from the Scriptures. For it is not from human judgment what is decent or not decent in the worship of God.

For there is a twofold decency in the worship of God. One is natural or civil, and this is merely negative; namely, it is required that nothing be done in the worship of God against good morals, against gravity. This decency depends not on the judgment of men, but on custom, on nature; nor can any human authority determine what is decent, what not decent, in this way. In this way the surplice, signing by the cross, are not decent. The other is spiritual and religious decency in the worship of God. This is from the will of God alone; for eating and drinking in the Church, for this very reason, is decent and grave, because Christ instituted such actions; and bread is a decent element signifying the body of Christ, in preference to other foods, for no other reason than because Christ instituted it. If men instituted beef, mutton, milk and eggs for sacramental signs, they would not be signs of the body and blood of Christ; much less would they be as decent signs as bread and wine. Ceremonies are symbolic rites, and significative symbols of divine things; as the day of the Nativity is a commemorative sign of the Nativity of Christ; the surplice, a symbol of pastoral sanctity. But these, if indeed they are decent, have a sacred and religious decency. But whence? No created will can impart religious decency to things. It is necessary, therefore, that they prove to us that ceremonies are decent, both by their nature, and religiously and positively in the worship of God, and this through the sacred Scriptures. For it does not suffice that they are decent and licit, negatively, and not disconformed to the Word of God. For thus eggs, milk, butter are negatively conformed to the sacred Supper; they do not repugn the nature of the Supper.

To these things I add that saying of Paul, Rom. 14:23, "Whatever does not proceed from faith," i.e., from firm persuasion and πληροφορία, as Paul expounds it in v. 5, by which I know that what I do is in conformity with God's Word, "is sin." But it is not certain that using ceremonies is in conformity with God's Word. Therefore, to use them is sin.

Robert Sanderson responds, English sermon: "Whatever does not proceed from faith is sin" is true in the substantial things of divine worship, and in the exercise of spiritual and supernatural grace, either in things to be believed or in things to be done, under necessity of salvation. Whence we detest all traditions and additions to supply the defect of sacred

Scripture, against the papists; but it does not obtain in all actions of human life, even in the lifting of a straw.

I respond: Nor do we urge the text in actions which are done by imagination alone preceding the act of reason, such as lifting a straw, rubbing the beard. But we urge the text in all moral actions, in all our steps, as Solomon says expressly, Prov. 2:9, 3:23, 4:10-12. Because in all moral actions - eating, drinking, speaking, walking ten miles to accompany a friend, doing this or that at the command of masters and parents - it can happen that we stagger and strike our feet, as the Wise man speaks, while we do in such trivial actions what is against God's Word. Therefore, here there is need of a lamp for the feet. 2. Sanderson very badly asserts that the Word is perfect in things to be believed and done which are necessary for salvation, and is defective in regulating the acts of daily life; because this is for the Word to be perfect, and not to be perfect.

3. The papists teach that most of their additions are not necessary for salvation; indeed the great Suárez, On the Threefold Theological Virtue, treatise 1, disputation 2, section 6, figure 3, says, "It must be said that faith, as to the substance of things to be believed, was always the same from the beginning of the human race until now." Vásquez, vol. 2 on I-II, disputation 154, ch. 3: "It is responded that the pope indeed, neither outside a general council nor in it, can establish anything concerning faith which is not contained in the principles and articles revealed, and most certainly collected from them." Bañez, vol. 3 on II-II, q. 1, art. 10, doubt 2: "It should be noted that neither the supreme pontiff, nor the whole Church, can coin a new article or new dogma, as to substance; nor can they institute a new sacrament." Scotus, Prologue to the Sentences, q. 3, art. 3: "Our theology in fact is only of those things which are contained in Scripture, and of those things which can be elicited from them."

4. If we can sin in these things which are of daily life, which no sane man denies, then in these are contained things to be done, under necessity of salvation.

2. Sanderson responds, ibid.: Faith as certain as logical faith is not of these things which are of daily life, and indifferent; ethical and conjectural faith suffices. Indeed, nothing else is needed in these things than negative faith, that we know they are not contrary to the law of nature, or to Scripture, and therefore are not prohibited. Hence they make two kinds of licit things: some which are positively conformed to God's Word, for indeed their equity can be proved syllogistically from God's Word; but others are conformed to God's Word negatively, i.e., they are not disconformed, for indeed they are neither commanded nor prohibited by the Word of God. And in this way ceremonies are conformed to God's Word, according to their opinion.

But this distinction has a place in merely natural actions, such as hearing sounds, seeing colors, and in actions of art and the sciences, such as making a syllogism in Barbara; they are neither commanded nor prohibited in the Word of God. But in religious ceremonies, such as being clothed with a surplice, signing with the cross, and in those acts which are commanded or prohibited by the rulers of the commonwealth and the Church, it is absurd and profane.

1. Because good and licit negatively is what is neither good nor evil. But ceremonies and what is commanded by rulers is good; what is forbidden is evil. Therefore, ceremonies and what is commanded by rulers cannot be good and licit negatively. The major premise is evident, because whatever is licit to be done and is commanded, is good; because rulers cannot command to others what they themselves cannot embrace by their own will. But rulers cannot embrace by their own will that which is neither good nor evil, for that is the object of no will. Nor can ceremonies be commanded if they are not good and serve for edification.

"Whatever does not proceed from faith is sin" cannot be understood thus: whatever does not proceed from logical and conjectural certainty is sin. For: 1. Thus to sin in most acts done from ignorance would be from faith. 2. If it were from faith, what is negatively licit, then our moral acts would be from faith in that way in which the making of a syllogism in Barbara would be from faith; which is absurd.

2. If rulers can command one thing which is negatively licit, they can command all things which are negatively licit. But the latter is absurd. Therefore, the former. The reason for the major premise: Because they either command because it is negatively licit, and under this formal reason, and thus everything negatively licit. For what belongs καθ' αὐτό [per se] belongs κατὰ παντός [to all]. And thus they can command, in the worship of God, the lifting of a straw, the rubbing of the beard, which is absurd; for such things would be idle, ridiculous, and unfit for edifying. But rulers govern for the good, Rom. 13:4. But if they command what is negatively licit, not as such, but as good, therefore they command what is negatively licit because it is positively good and conformed to God's Word; and thus ceremonies, insofar as they are commanded by rulers, ought to be proved syllogistically from God's Word, or from some natural reason in agreement with God's Word, which is the same thing. And thus they take refuge in this distinction in vain.

3. Rulers can rightly command nothing unless the people can do it from faith; because what does not proceed from faith is sin, Rom. 14:23, even in the most indifferent acts, such as were the observance of days and the distinction of foods, in the use of which Paul requires more, namely in v. 5 πληροφορία [full assurance], than Sanderson, who contends that conjectures and ethical or probable faith suffice. But things negatively licit do not

proceed from faith, because they cannot be conformed to any Word of God. And to do something from faith is to do what I know is pleasing to God, and service to Christ, v. 18, "Whoever thus serves Christ is acceptable to God." And v. 22, "The faith that you have, keep between yourself and God." But that faith cannot be knowledge by which I know this to be neither commanded nor forbidden by God; because thus in faith I would rub my beard, lift a straw, close my eyes, cough while speaking; for all these things are negatively licit. But no one would say that these things are done from faith, unless he exposed all theology to laughter and mockery. Then, to eat in faith, of which Paul speaks there, would be to eat with that full assurance and persuasion of conscience by which I cough while speaking, or by which I rub my beard; and in that way I would serve Christ in the use of indifferent things, in the way that I serve Christ while I rub my beard; than which nothing more absurd can be said. But who would believe that Paul calls that faith before God, and faith which does not condemn, but makes a man blessed, as in v. 22, which is nothing other than conjectural knowledge by which I know that rubbing the beard is neither commanded nor forbidden by God in the Word?

4. If things negatively licit are truly licit, which can be done by us and can be commanded by rulers, then another ark to represent Christ incarnate, another circumcision than that which was Jewish, other sacrifices insofar as they represent Christ now dead, the slaying of a lamb, the Paschal lamb, and all the Mosaic ceremonies can be introduced into the Church, provided 1. the Jewish intention and signification were absent, 2. provided they were held as not necessary, nor binding the conscience. For all these things are negatively licit, i.e., neither commanded nor prohibited, unless prohibited in that way in which things are prohibited which are not commanded; which is our opinion. For we maintain that this is a good consequence: This religious observance is not from God, therefore it is illicit.

5. What is negatively licit, i.e., what is not repugnant to the Word of God, is also not repugnant to natural reason and the law of nature, which is a part of the Word. But what is not repugnant to natural reason can in no way be commanded by rulers. 1. Because if rulers can command that which is negatively conformed to natural reason, then the will of rulers, destitute of all practical and natural reason, would be the reason and law of all constitutions and canons; and thus their mere will, without reason, would be law - which is absurd. For then there would be no more natural reason for ceremonies than if they commanded that all should dance in the cemetery, and all approaching the temple should shout, "Twice three are six."

6. If that which is neither prohibited nor commanded by the Word, nor by natural reason (such as signing with the cross, the surplice), can be rightly commanded by rulers, then they can rightly command idle actions, and therefore sins - which is blasphemous. I prove the major premise: An action which is supposed to be moral, which is formally from a

subject of the kingdom of Christ, who in that action is bound to regard the edification of his neighbor and the glory of God, which yet is neither commanded nor prohibited, either by Scripture or by the practical light of natural reason, is idle - like deliberate dancing every day in the morning before such a sepulcher in the cemetery. But actions negatively conformed to the Word of God are such. Therefore, etc. I prove the major premise: Because Scripture and the light of natural reason either command or forbid all moral actions. Indeed, it implies a contradiction for an action to be moral, such as being clothed with a surplice to signify pastoral innocence, and yet to be commanded neither by Scripture nor by natural reason (which is rightly a part of Scripture, as the law of nature is a part of the moral law). For thus the making of a syllogism in Barbara would be a moral action by the same reason, and yet it flows from a principle not at all moral, but from a habit of art. And signing with the cross proceeds either from the light of natural reason, which no one would say, or from the light of Scripture, which the adversaries deny, or from a habit of religion, and thus from the Word of God, which they would also not say.

7. That moral action is not morally licit to which that is lacking which formally constitutes the licit or legal. But in a moral action which is negatively conformed to God's Word, i.e., which is neither commanded nor forbidden by God's Word, that is lacking which formally constitutes the licit or legal. Therefore, a moral action negatively conformed to God's Word is not licit. The major premise is certain. I prove the minor premise: Because if the will of God commanding in the Word is lacking to an action negatively conformed to God's Word, that is lacking to it which formally constitutes the licit or legal. But the will of God commanding in the Word is lacking to an action negatively conformed to God's Word. Therefore, etc. The minor premise is that of the adversaries. The major premise is evident: Because the will of God commanding is the formal reason of the licit, and the will of God forbidding is the formal reason of the illicit, as the slaying of a son by a father is licit if God commands it to Abraham; but the same slaying is illicit by this reason alone, that God forbids it. To eat the fruit of the tree of knowledge is in itself indifferent, before the divine prohibition revealed to Adam; and to eat it, when God prohibits it, is illicit; and to eat it, if God commanded it, would have been licit.

They reply: In doctrinal or substantial things, the will commanding or forbidding is the formal reason of the licit or illicit. But I respond: 1. The doctrinal is defined by them as that which God has commanded in the Word, in the way that rituals in the Lord's Supper - such as bread, wine, eating, drinking - are doctrinal; and if God had commanded signing with the cross, it would have been doctrinal. And the ritual, again, is that which human authority commands, in the way that if human authority commanded circumcision, it would have been ritual. And thus they say the will of God commanding is the formal reason of the licit in those things in which it is the formal reason of the licit; and in those things in which it is not the formal reason of the licit, in those it is not the formal reason of the

licit. For they cannot otherwise define the doctrinal than thus: it is that which God teaches us in the Word. 2. With no reason is human will established as the formal reason of the licit; because thus some sin will be a transgression against human will. But theologians teach that John rightly defines sin as transgression of the law, namely the divine law. But this definition will not be accurate thus, because some sin against God will be a transgression of human law.

Rom. 14:14.
I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself, but it is unclean for anyone who thinks it unclean.

Interpreters commonly teach on this passage that it is said here that foods in themselves, now under Christ, are not some clean, others unclean; but to him who in his conscience thinks that a clean food is unclean, to him it is unclean, so that he would sin if he ate it, no less than if it were forbidden as unclean by God's law.

It is asked whether the Remonstrants rightly teach, Apology ch. 25, fol. 289-290, that the Word of God, although of itself and through itself it has the power to obligate, yet does not actually obligate anyone unless it is understood; and thus as it is believed to be understood with all possible diligence and prudence applied, because no one is obligated to follow the true sense of the divine Word against his conscience, even if erroneous. It is a pernicious question whether the Word of God obligates to assent, or conscience does. The Remonstrants want conscience actually to obligate, so that someone is bound to embrace for true that sense of Scripture which he himself in his conscience, although erroneous, believes to be true.

We, on the contrary: 1. Men are punished who do not want to believe God speaking in the Scriptures, even if their conscience either badly or not at all understands what the sense of the Word is. Num. 14:11-12, Luke 1:20, 1 Kings 13:21-22.

2. No one is obligated to sin. But to follow an erroneous conscience is to sin. How blasphemously therefore the Remonstrants say, against Voetius bk. 1, ch. 2: "When conscience is erroneous from invincible ignorance, which is either necessary in man, or remains in him after all possible diligence has been applied, then man is obligated to follow the dictate of that conscience, just as if it did not err - about to sin if he acted against it, because the act of the will ought to be conformed to its proximate rule." But from this I assume: But conscience dictates to a father, from Zech. 13:3, that he ought to pierce his son who speaks lies in the name of God. Therefore, the father is obligated to stain his

hands with the blood of his son, just as if he rightly understood that passage of Zechariah - and indeed he would sin if he did not perpetrate that horrible child-murder. But he applied, as I suppose, all possible diligence to understand. 1. He prayed. 2. He compared the antecedents with the consequences. 3. He carefully considered the phraseology. 4. The scope. Thus from many Scriptures of the Old Testament a Jesuit would be obligated to pierce our king with a sword, because he thinks he is obligated by his conscience to kill a heretical king, because the act of the will ought to be conformed to its proximate rule.

3. Our erroneous conscience does not absolve us from the binding law, which the Word of God holds over our consciences. For the Word holds primacy and authority over us, to captivate the intellect in obedience to God. For one sin does not give us the right to commit another sin. To feel and judge wrongly about the Word of God is a sin. Are we, therefore, obliged to commit another sin, namely, to follow that erroneous judgment?

4. Necessarily there is in us, after the fall, the wisdom of the flesh, most hostile to God, which the Gospel proclaims to be foolishness. Rom. 8:7, 1 Cor. 2:14. Therefore, we are obliged to distrust Christ, and to reject Christ, sinning, if we do not follow an erroneous conscience.

5. The Remonstrants indeed concede that man is obliged to lay aside an erroneous conscience, when the error is about necessary things, obvious to all; for that error is conquerable and culpable. But truly with an erroneous conscience remaining and standing in error, and dictating that Christ is not the Savior of the World, and that human affairs are whirled around by chance, not by providence, still no one is obliged to follow the true sense of the Divine Word (by which it is truly said that Christ is the Son of God, and the World is ruled by Providence) against conscience, even though erroneous; indeed, the Word not understood does not actually oblige. 2. In all things conscience is the proximate rule of actions, to which it is necessary for the will to conform, as they teach. 3. In necessary things, no one is obliged to blind and implicit obedience, no more than in controversies; for the understanding of which, men often apply all possible diligence.

6. The right which the Word of God has over men is absolute, not depending on the error of the mind or our knowledge, as if it were a condition without which it would not actually oblige us to assent to the Word of God. The judgment of conscience is indeed a necessary condition, and a due approximation of the Word to the mind and will; but it is not that which formally obliges us; nor is it the condition of the obligation which the Word obtains in our consciences, but it is the condition of our due understanding. Therefore, theologians rightly teach that an erroneous conscience binds, but does not oblige. It binds, because a man cannot act against an erroneous conscience without sinning. Therefore Bonaventure, 2 Sent., disp. 39, says: "He who acts against conscience, by which he believes

God has prohibited something, even if he errs, despises God; because to despise the King's Legate is to despise the King. But conscience is the Legate and Judge deputed by God; therefore, to despise it is to despise God." Therefore, the pagan Menander said, "To all mortals, conscience is God." Therefore, conscience can render an action otherwise good, evil; as when someone maintains that God rules fortuitous things by His providence, it is a true and pious opinion; but if someone maintains it against the light of his conscience, and believes it to be false, that opinion is impious and unlawful per accidens, to him who maintains the true opinion against the judgment of his conscience, even though erroneous. But truly conscience, as conscience, does not oblige; but as it is well informed by the Word of God. And therefore the formal reason for obligating is the Word of God; and the light of conscience is only a necessary condition, not of obligation (for obligation is absolute), but the due condition of understanding and true practice. The Remonstrants reply there, cont. Ved. 1.2, c.2: "This right always remains whole and inviolate. But the right which the Word of God has over men is not a right by which man is obliged to assent to the sense of the divine Word without judgment, much less against the judgment of his conscience; that is, with it standing and remaining, that that sense is false. For thus the Right of God would oblige man to that which is per se sin."

I reply: The right which the Word of God has over men is indeed not a right by which man is obliged to assent to the Word of God without judgment, or against judgment, that is true; but I give a third option. It is a right obliging men to assent, indeed with judgment, but a right, true one, and agreeing with the Word of God; and although men do not have such a judgment, but a contrary one, namely, a false and erroneous one, the actual Right of the Word of God over men does not perish on account of their erroneous conscience, which is a grave fault in them. Because God reveals His mysteries to the humble, and to those diligently searching His Law. 2. If the absolute obligatory right to assent to the sense of the Word of God in any way remains, whether with right judgment or with erroneous judgment, then the actual Right remains, by which we are obliged to sin; which is to fall into Scylla, when they wish to avoid Charybdis. For let them say, I ask, whether the Word of God has the right to oblige a man, who in his erroneous conscience thinks that the Son of Mary is an Impostor, to assent to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, which seem to his erroneous conscience to assert that Christ is an impostor. Therefore, the Word has a twofold right: one potential, by which men are obliged to assent to the Word of God; the other actual, by which they are obliged to assent with right judgment.

7. The right and obligation to assent to the Word of God, even with an erroneous conscience standing, is founded in that grave error, by which they want the mind not to be subject to the Law of God, because it is a purely natural power, which is absurd. And therefore a man would be obliged, without sin, to believe that chance and fortune

dominate; because it seems to his erroneous conscience to be done from the Word of God, while the good are oppressed, and the wicked flourish.

8. That conscience does not oblige to practice, to lay aside which we are obliged. But we are obliged to lay aside an erroneous conscience. Therefore... The major is from the Adversaries. The minor is clear, because to have a culpable conscience is a sin; therefore, we are bound to lay it aside. The Remonstrants do not deny there, "when a judgment is culpably erroneous, both assent and judgment are evil and displeasing to God." Therefore, either God (I say) obliges men to sin, and to that which is displeasing to God, and evil; or no one is bound to follow an erroneous judgment.

But they say that an erroneous conscience is not a fault, but it is a fault to have an erroneous one by one's own fault.

I reply: If having an erroneous conscience is a fault, then following it as a guide is a fault. 2. It is false that a man does not sin by following an erroneous conscience. And if a man is bound to follow it, as they say, then a man is bound to sin; and he does well by the very fact that he would sin. For he does well by doing that which he is obliged to do.

9. The injury to the Word of God will not redound to God Himself, if man is obliged to a false and erroneous interpretation of the Divine Word.

They object: "What will he do," say the Remonstrants there, "who believes this to be the true sense of Scripture, which nevertheless is false: either he will receive it as true, although it is false; or against conscience, he will reject the sense of the Word, which he thinks to be true."

I reply: I give a third option. He is bound to do neither; but he is bound to lay aside the erroneous judgment, and to follow the true sense.

It can be objected: If an erroneous conscience does not oblige, but binds, insofar as a man cannot act against its dictate, then if an erroneous conscience dictates that one should not pray, then a man is obliged not to pray; if it dictates to a Judge that a murderer should not be punished by the sword, then the Judge is obliged not to punish the murderer by the sword. Because if a man does not abstain in such a case from prayer, and from punishing the murderer with the sword, then an erroneous conscience will not even bind, because he will act against the dictate of an erroneous conscience.

I reply: Even if an erroneous conscience says that one should not pray, it does not follow that a man is obliged not to pray simply. An Arminian Magistrate believes, in his erroneous

conscience, that it is not lawful to kill a murderer; and he does not dare in conscience to act against the dictate of an erroneous conscience, because it binds; therefore, he is bound to be lacking in his duty, and not to kill the murderer. I deny that it follows. He is bound not to kill, with respect to his errant conscience; but he is not bound, by an erroneous conscience, to kill him. But it must be proved that he is bound not to kill simply. He is bound to lay aside his erroneous conscience, and to kill.

Although an erroneous conscience binds negatively to a non-act, in such a way, namely to an erroneous one, which is in the act; or it does not bind to the error of the act; nevertheless, it does not bind in any way. Therefore, the Scholastics say that an erroneous conscience suffices for vice, not for virtue; and it ensnares, it does not bind.

There is one kind of binding to an act, another to an erroneous mode of acting. An Arminian Magistrate is bound to abstain from punishing a murderer, with respect to a binding erroneous conscience; that is, he is bound not to punish in an erroneous way and with an erring conscience; nevertheless, he is obliged not to abstain, but to punish, simply.

It is objected: If an erroneous conscience imposes an obligation and bond, or binding, of not acting against what an erroneous conscience dictates should be done, then the knowledge of conscience has the force of law. Rom. 14:14: "To him who believes" (even with an erroneous conscience) "something to be unclean, to him it is unclean." But what obliges is an immediately constituted rule from God. Therefore, an erroneous conscience is to me per accidens, although not per se, a Law. So Thomas Goodwin, in an English treatise, On the Aggravation of Sin, p. 45.

I reply: I distinguish the Major. If an erroneous conscience imposes on a man an obligation of not acting against what it dictates, then it has the force of a negative Law, that is, obliging to a non-act, or to abstinence from an act, in such a way; that is true. Then it has the force of Law simply, and of a positive and immediate rule; that is false.

John Gerson, 1st part, on the nature and quality of conscience, treatise on three things contributing to the gravity of sin. "But when," he says, "conscience dictates those things which are beyond the Law of God, conscience itself binds and obliges, but not absolutely; rather, in a certain respect, and under a certain disjunction or alternatively. It binds to doing what it dictates, or to laying itself aside. But in those things which it dictates against the Law, it binds, but in no way to those things dictated, but simply to laying itself aside."

Error does not bind, does not oblige, but entangles; or (if you prefer) obliges to laying aside the error. An erroneous conscience binds to suspending the act, where the act is not necessary. It binds to the negative, not to the affirmative. It so binds, that to oppose

oneself to an erroneous conscience is a sin; but not so that it is a virtue to follow it when it errs.

Lodo. Meratius says, tom. 1, tract. on the goodness and evil of acts, disp. 3, sect. 2, fig. 8, that it is the common opinion that a vincibly erring conscience obliges both negatively and positively, and indeed to sinning; not indeed per se and absolutely, but per accidens and hypothetically, because it would not want to lay it aside, since it is in its free power to lay it aside. And he proves it from Gal. 5:3: "I testify to every man who circumcises himself, that he is a debtor to do the whole Law."

I reply: This opinion is false. For that to the doing of which someone is thus obligated is a sin, whether he is obligated to it per se or per accidens; and it is either a sin per se or per accidens. But God has given no obligating force to sinning in any way to conscience. 2. That in Gal. 5:3 does not conclude it; for Paul does not want the circumcised to be obligated to sinning, because he is obligated to fulfill the whole Law. This is foolish; for to fulfill the whole Law is to obey God, not to sin.

Meratius's other reason is: because if an erring conscience obliges negatively to not abstaining from lying, by an erroneous conscience, it is obligated positively to lying; because to not abstain from lying is to lie.

I reply: My good man, you err by a mile. For an erring conscience is not obligated to not abstaining from lying simply and according to the substance of the act, but to not abstaining in such a way, namely, with an erring conscience; and thus it is obligated to abstain from the mode, not from the act.

Chapter 2. On God.

Title One, On the Knowledge[Cognitione] of God.

Col. 1:10.
That you may walk worthy of God -- growing in all knowledge.

It is asked, Is not true and right knowledge about God commanded, and the conformity of the mind with God? The Remonstrants, cont. Ved. 1.1, c.1, say: "Speculative knowledge is nothing but a passive reception, which no more falls under precept than feeling, seeing, hearing. But the mind is not capable of precept. The will alone is capable of precept. Knowledge, besides holy attention, pious care, and praiseworthy zeal for inquiring into divine truth, is commanded to us; because knowledge is commanded not for its own sake (says the Apology, c.2, fol. 40), but for the sake of worship and piety."

But to the contrary: 1. Knowledge itself, per se and for its own sake, is commanded. 1 Chron. 28:9: "And you, Solomon my son, know the God of your father, and serve him with a whole heart." Eph. 4:23: "And be renewed in the spirit of your mind." Therefore, the mind itself ought to be renewed to the image of God.

2. Because Paul prayed to God that he would give the Ephesians the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him, Eph. 1:17. And he gives thanks to God that the Corinthians were enriched in all knowledge, 1 Cor. 1:5.

3. Because knowledge in the mind is part of the image of God, Col. 3:10. It is a virtue of man, pleasing to God, Jer. 9:24, Hos. 6:6, and salutary for man, John 17:3, pertaining to the first commandment of the Decalogue; and it is even reckoned among the very virtues of Christ our Savior, Isa. 11:2. And the Law, Matt. 22:37, requires that the whole soul, and the whole of the soul, and whatever is in it of powers and inclinations, be conformed to God.

4. Because ignorance of God, and a false concept of God, when we think him to be like wood, or any created thing, is a grave sin, Isa. 40:18, Acts 17:24, 29. Otherwise, neither would he sin who would conceive God in the manner of an old King, clothed in gold and purple and gems.

5. Because ignorance of God is the cause of all other sins, and of the temporal and eternal ruin of men, 1 Sam. 2:12, 1 Cor. 2:8, Hos. 4:1, Luke 19:42, 2 Thess. 1:8.

6. Because it is Socinian and heretical to think that we can be saved by keeping God's commandments, even if we wrongly conceive God in our mind, and are ignorant of God and his Nature and Attributes and Operations, insofar as they are revealed in the Scriptures.

7. Because they would not sin who would believe in their mind that God is delighted by the slaughter of infants.

8. Because the very knowledge of Christ, of his Natures, Offices, and Person, and right faith, as it is distinguished from practice, would not be the worship of God. But the very knowledge of God, One and Triune, is a worship commanded per se.

9. Because if only that which would fall under an act of the will were commanded, in vain would first thoughts, inclinations of the soul, and the mind need to be conformed to the Law of God.

10. If the mind is not subject to the Law, and all corruption of the will and affections, now after the fall, is from the darkness of the mind, and the less clear proposition of the object proposed to the mind, which I will demonstrate later to be the mind of the Arminians, it seems to me that man is from birth an animal of plainly angelic purity and innocence, in whom only the mind, which cannot sin against any Law of God, is somewhat obscured.

Title Two, On God according to his Essence, and his Unity and Essential Omnipresence.

1 Cor. 8:6.
But to us, there is only one God.

Where there is perfect Unity, there must necessarily be perfect Simplicity. Hence it is asked, Is God most Simple in his Nature, and lacking all Composition, from act and potency, from subject and accidents, and all Multiplicity and Diversity?

The Remonstrants deny it, Apol., c.2, fol. 41, 42, following the impious Vorstius, On God, in notes to disp. 3, thes. 1, 2, p. 146. And Apol., c.2, p. 4.

We, to the contrary: 1. God is absolutely perfect and immutable. Therefore, there are no composing parts in God, no mixture, no composition; because parts are more imperfect than the whole. He who is essentially Jehovah, i.e. essence simply, first, perfect, having being from himself, absolute, and independent, He is most Simple. But the former is true of God, Exod. 3:14: "I will be who I will be, sent me." Gen. 15:7: "I am Jehovah." Amos 9:6: "Jehovah is his name."

2. In whom there is no multiplication, dissolubility, in him there is highest simplicity. But these are not in God.

3. All Composition has something of potency and perfectibility mixed in. There is nothing that perfects God.

4. Attributes, Relations, and Modes of subsisting are not in God in the manner of a form qualifying, actualizing, or informing God, as white is in milk, justice in man. But they are God himself, considered in another and another way, and presented to our Intellect; as a man remaining in the same position, in no way changed, is right to this one, left to another. And the distinction of Attributes and Essence from modes is not formal, in the way that diverse entities and essences are distinguished; nor modal, as being and the existence of being are distinguished; nor potential, as parts and whole; but it is a distinction of Reason, and indeed reasoned; as we distinguish Socrates into subject and attribute. Thus the Intellect understands, not the Will, etc. And therefore they also differ by the formality of our imperfect and inadequate concepts.

5. Something real would be added to God, and there would be an accession of a new real entity in him, when in time he becomes Creator, Shepherd, Father, Redeemer, Protector, Savior, Lord; and if he would annihilate Creatures, as he can, new entities would be taken away from God.

6. If something real were added to the Essence of God, through Decrees, Creation, Redemption, Personal Relations, it would either be created or uncreated. If created, at least the decrees of God will be created entities, coeval and coeternal with God; and God will not be simply eternal; and new creations will accede to God and recede, which would be a true change. But if it is uncreated, then something uncreated is temporal (for to be Creator, Redeemer, Shepherd accede to God in time), which implies a contradiction.

If it could be (as Smising rightly says, tom. 1, On God, tract. 2, disp. 3, On the Immutability of God, q. 2, fig. 18) that some relation or form could newly come to God, it would be some entity not of necessary being; there would also be a composition from subjective potency

and formal act; since things entirely really distinct could not coalesce into one without the composition of act and potency.

Acts. 17:27.
He is not far from each one of us.

It is asked, Is God not only by Power and operation, but also according to his Essence, omnipresent? Because if so, it would be necessary (as the Remonstrants say) for the Essence of God to be diffused, and to be everywhere in sewers, flies, idols, devils, and in Hell. The Remonstrants therefore deny it, and say, Apol., c.2, fol. 43: "And good God! who would not define that atopic and atomic presence of the divine Essence, and of the three divine persons, not only, I say, in Heaven and Earth, in sewers, in most foul Idols, in Devils, in Hell itself; but outside Heaven and earth, etc." Vorstius, resp. to Apol., c.6, pp. 10-11. Socinus says the same, fragment, Catech., On the Knowledge of God, c. 11, f. 58.

We teach that God's essence is present everywhere: 1. Ps. 139:8: "If I ascend to heaven, there you are; if I make my bed in the grave, there you are," etc. Jer. 23:23-24: "Am I a God near at hand, says the Lord, and not a God afar off? Do I not fill heaven and earth?" Isa. 66:1: "Heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool." 1 Kings 8:27: "But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold, heaven and the highest heaven cannot contain you; how much less this house that I have built!" Acts 17:27: "Yet he is actually not far from each one of us." Eph. 4:6: "One God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all."

2. If the essence is not everywhere, it is in some certain and determinate place; and it is so here that it is not elsewhere. I ask about the place in which the essence of God is not: Either it can be there, or it cannot be there. If it can be there, then the Essence of God can begin to be anew in a place where it was not before. But this is a true change of place.

If it cannot be there, then 1. There is some creature that excludes the Essence of God.

2. It is not even repugnant for creatures to be where their power and operation are. It is absurd, therefore, for God to operate there where he himself cannot be.

3. There is no reason on the part of God why he cannot be in that creature, since he operates in it; nor is it repugnant for him to be there on the part of the creature, because he could have created the heavens in the same place in which is the center of the earth.

4. Because God would not operate in the Elect, if he were not in them; nor would he know the minds and thoughts, if his thought and operation were where he himself cannot be; and essence would be torn from power.

5. Because nothing is more perfect than the divine Essence. But essence in all things and everywhere is more perfect than essence which is only here, so that it is not elsewhere.

6. Because Christ walking on earth was not true God, if the Essence of God was not wherever the Humanity was.

7. Because God could not create infinite worlds outside these imaginary spaces; because it would be necessary for him to begin to be where he was not before.

8. Because it is a crass dream to imagine that the Essence of God is polluted by sewers and devils, since this does not even happen to the rays of the sun shining in dung. They imagine that from the physical contact of hell, God is tainted with a curse; from the contact of Idols and Devils he is morally polluted; from the contact of sewers he is physically polluted. But the very light of the sun, because it has no contrary except darkness, does not suffer from a dunghill.

9. If God is polluted by presence with the vilest things, he would also be polluted by operation in those nefarious and vilest acts. Hence he would not thus concur with the entitative acts of Devils, Flies, etc. Why not?

10. Devils, Idols, etc., are either conserved immediately and proximately by the divine essence itself, or mediately, by the conserving force of God. If the former, the Arminians err shamefully. If the latter, this conserving force is either God, and thus the essence of God, and the point still stands; or a creature. If a creature, the same question returns about conserving it. If a creature, either it conserves itself, and equally creates itself, because Conservation is continued creation; or it is conserved by God, and that either mediately, which is absurd, or immediately; and why is this not equally said of Devils and idols, which are without doubt creatures of God?

It is asked, Is it blasphemous, as indeed some of ours say, that God is freely good? Arminius says, resp. to art. 2: "We say that ours do not say this about the intrinsic Goodness of God, by which God is essentially good; but about the extrinsic Goodness of God, by which he freely communicates his goodness to creatures. Because God is good in this way, by creating the world, giving faith to Peter, and communicating entity and goodness to creatures, so that he could have been not good in this way, if he had not created the world, nor given Faith to Peter, and annihilated creatures."

Title Three, On the Trinity.

1 Cor. 8:6.
But to us there is but one God.

It is asked, Are there three Essences in God? Or only one? The wicked Vorstius says, resp. to Apol., art. 1: "Where there are three truly distinct among themselves, and to whom certain proper actions belong to each one, there certainly are three distinct beings, and therefore three distinct essences or entities. Add that the divine Persons are true hypostases and substances, not only modes of subsisting." Thus the impure Smalcius, resp. to Smiglecius's refutation, c.4, f. 39: "Where there are two, there must necessarily be two essences."

We, to the contrary, with the Orthodox, hold that there is only one Essence in the Trinity: 1. Because there is only one God, one in Essence and number, and besides him there is no other God, Deut. 6:4 and 32:39, 1 Cor. 8:6.

2. If there are three distinct Divine Essences, there are three distinct natures of Deity, and three gods; and Vorstius is a Tritheist. And Arminius asserted this impious dogma, resp. to 31 articles spread about him and Borreus and the declaration of his opinion, p. 125: "For the Son, both as Son and as God, has Deity from the Father. For if the Son, as God, has Deity from the Father, he has another Essence and Deity distinct in number. For Deity, as Deity, not connoting Personality, begetting; and Deity, as Deity, begotten, are two Deities in number." And the same must be said of the Holy Spirit.

The Remonstrants impiously assert this in their declaration, c.3, th.3: "The Son, therefore, and the Spirit are truly sharers of the same Deity with the Father; or of the divine Essence and nature, considered absolutely and in common." Deity considered in common is like a genus with respect to species, as the impious Vorstius taught, that God is a genus to the three Persons. But it is certain that three men are sharers in animal, but they are not the same and one animal in number. But they say that the three Persons are sharers of the divine nature, considered absolutely and in common; but they do not say that they are one essence and deity in number, but sharers of Deity, as if there were three Deities.

3. But if here there are three distinct Essences, here there are three Infinites, three Omnipotents, three Intellects, three Wills; not three having the same Infinity, the same

Omnipotence, and the same Intellect and Will. But truly, although the Persons are not bare modes of subsisting, but connote substance, they do not connote three substances, and each one a single substance, but all one substance in number.

Rom. 9:5.
Who is God, blessed forever.

It is asked, Is the Son Autotheos and from himself and by himself God? Arminius in his declaration, pp. 124-125, denies that he is Autotheos, either as Son or as God, because the Essence of God can in no diverse respect be said to be communicated to the Son; because these are contradictory. And he carps at the younger Telcatius for calling the Son, as God, Autotheos; because thus the Father would differ from the Son only in name (which Sabellius asserted), and we would fall into Tritheism, because thus there would be three gods, who would have the divine essence together collaterally. So also Vorstius in Apol. 4, p. 46. The impious John Geisteranus, in his confession, says that in time, the Son received Deity from the Father. So Socinus in Theol. Prelect., f. 106, 107, who denies that he is true God, c.18.

We, to the contrary, [hold] that Christ is essentially and truly God, Isa. 9:6: "He will be called Mighty God." John 1:1-3: "The Word was God." Rom. 9:5, Col. 1:15, 1 John 5:20. Therefore, he is God from himself, and as God, he has the divine nature from no one.

2. If the Son, not only as Son, but also as God, has the Essence communicated from the Father (because the communicated Essence is distinct from the communicating Essence), there will be two Essences here, the communicating and the communicated. And the same must be said of the Holy Spirit; and thus three Essences, and three Deities, and three Gods; and Arminius, not Trelcatius, is a Tritheist.

3. If the Son, as God, is not God from himself, he is not God essentially. For to be God, and to be from another, is to be God and not to be God, because God is essentially independent. And thus the Son will be a God of lesser nations than the Father. There will be one supreme God, and two little Gods, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

4. It is customary for Arminius to imagine contradictions in his own brain. But if the Essence can in no diverse respect be said to be communicated to the Son, and not communicated to the Son, as Arminius dreams, in no diverse respect is the Essence in the Father unbegottenly, and in the Son begottenly, which the Church constantly taught against Sabellius; in no diverse respect is the divine Essence incarnate in the Son, and not

incarnate in the Father. In the Son, it is incarnate personally; in the Father, taken absolutely, it is not incarnate.

Phil. 2:6.
Who, being in the form of God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped.

It is asked, Is Christ to be acknowledged as true God, consubstantial with the Father, according to the mind of the Arminians?

Some of them affirm it in words, but deny it in reality; and therefore we rightly hold them as too suspect of Arianism.

1. When the most illustrious Professors of Leiden blamed the Remonstrants because in their Confession, which ought to contain the heads of the Faith and the Fundamental Articles, they abstain from the word homoousios and consubstantial, they say nothing in response in their Apology; indeed they say that they do not want to pronounce Anathema on those who think wrongly about the Trinity, and about the person of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; and that the ancient Church maintained communion with those who believed that Jesus Christ was nothing but a man from men. And Apol., c.3, fol. 50: "An irrefragable argument," they say, "for proving the Deity of the Son cannot be taken from divine worship."

2. Vorstius, resp. to Apolog., art. 10, c.3, says that the Father in the Scriptures is rightly called God par excellence, and is truly the fountain of the whole Deity, and has a certain prerogative before the Son. This is the prerogative of Deity, by which he is the fountain of the Son, as the Son is God, and not God par excellence. The Remonstrants, in their explanation of the Lord's Prayer, want that true God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, to be sanctified, saying nothing about the Son and the Holy Spirit. And that in Isa. 6:3, "Holy, Holy, Holy," they refer to the Father alone.

3. Apol., c.18, fol. 190, they expound that glory which Christ is said to have had (John 17:5) with the Father before the world was, not of the glory of Deity, but of the glory conferred on Christ in time, which Christ had from eternity in the decree of God, not actually and really. Confess., c.19, sect. 2, they assign to Christ only the tribunal of the Father, as if by this very fact, that he was the Judge of all, he was not that only true God.

4. They say in Apolog., c.2, fol. 39, that they do not care about such vanities: Whether the worship to be given to Christ is the same as the worship of God? 2. Whether the Foundation of that worship is the divine nature of Christ, or also some other dignity, of which the human nature is also a participant? Then, whether it is terminated in the Person, as such? Or in the Person, insofar as the Divine nature is in it? Certainly, if it is vain to say that Christ is adored because the Divine nature is in him, they sufficiently indicate that the excellence of the divine nature, on account of which he is adored, is not in Christ. And if it is true that the same adoration is due to Christ as is due to the Father, they doubt whether there is the same divine nature in Christ as is in the Father. Because their mind is that an inferior adoration is due to Christ, and a sub-veneration; and therefore they institute a peculiar Chapter, on the Veneration of Jesus Christ. From which it is clear that they hold that he is a God less than the Father, and to be adored with a lesser adoration; which kind of adoration, the Arians thought, was due to that most holy man. So Smalcius, resp. to new monsters, c. 23, p. 207. Socinus, against Wieck, c.4, f.160: "For no other cause is confidence to be placed in Christ, than as in a second or as in an instrumental cause of our salvation."

5. Apol., c.121, fol. 138, they say in the express words of Socinus: "For that honor (given to Christ) is not the honor by which Christ, as Mediator, is adored above God himself; or, as the highest and supreme Lord, to whom that honor is due from himself; far be it. God always keeps this honor, this glory, whole for himself alone." If they acknowledge that Christ is God, consubstantial with the Father: 1. Why is the honor shown to Christ not the honor which is due to him as the supreme Lord? 2. Why do they not say that God (not naming the Son, but understanding the Father) always keeps this glory whole for himself and Christ as God? But they say that God always keeps this glory whole for himself. 3. They say it is vain to dispute whether mediatorial honor is due to him insofar as the divine nature is in him, or insofar as the human nature is in him. But here they say it is sacrilegious, with the protestation "far be it," and therefore idolatrous, to give to Christ the Mediator the same glory which the Father keeps for himself. But it would not be Idolatry, unless they believed that the Deity which is in the Mediator is a participated and created Deity.

6. If it would be idolatry to adore the Son, unless there were a positive precept in the New Testament about adoring him, then the Son is not to be adored on account of the Deity which is in him, but on account of the command of God. But Arminius expressly says the former, priv. disp. 39, 1, and disp. 34, 1, where he says that for Christ to be religiously worshiped, two things are required: 1. The command of God about honoring the Son. 2. That the Son should perform some duties in favor of men, for obtaining salvation for them. Therefore, Christ is not adored for the same reason for which God the Father is adored, i.e., not on account of Deity. Because the Father would have to be adored by virtue of the

first Precept of the Decalogue, even if there were not a new command in the New Testament about adoring him, nor would he perform any duties in favor of men. God alone is to be adored with religious adoration, Matt. 4:10. Therefore, if Christ is not to be adored, unless he performed some duties in favor of men, he is not God; but he is adored on account of those performed duties, and the positive command of the Father. And Arminius there wants Christ to be only the secondary object of Religion; but God the primary object. But if Christ is God to Arminius, he is also the primary object of Religion.

7. Arminius, disp. 4, has nothing about the Essential kingdom of Christ, which belongs to him as God, in common with the Father; but he only speaks of the Mediatorial kingdom.

8. Arminius says, disp. 44, th. 3, that we must trust in Christ, as in him who was made the author of salvation, as he could propose to us in the covenant the way to eternal life. But thus we must trust in Moses, as in one proposing the way to eternal salvation.

9. Arminius denies that Christ, as God, is Autotheos, as we saw above.

10. The Remonstrants say that many of the Fathers deny that Christ is consubstantial with the Father. But I think this was done for two reasons: 1. Hilary, in his book on the Synods, and Athanasius, in his epistle on the Synods, teach that the Fathers in the Council of Antioch denied that the Son is homoousios with the Father according to participated Deity, as Samosatenus said. And I believe the Arminians think this way; but thus he is homoiousios with the Father by grace. 2. Because Jerome writes against the Luciferians that the whole world was amazed to find itself Arian. By the command of Constantius, a Synod was held at Nicaea in Thrace, in which it was decreed that the Son is not consubstantial with the Father, but similar. When the Ariminian Fathers, led by fear of the Emperor, had subscribed in the Synod of Sirmium, they decreed that the Son is neither homoousios nor homoiousios with the Father, but only similar in all things; and this Synod was entirely Arian, to which Pope Liberius and Osius, Bishop of Cordoba, subscribed. I add that Hilary, by homoiousios, understood homoousios; and Augustine, against Pascentius the Arian, explained it through similarity in substance.

Heb. 1:6.
And let all the angels of God worship him.

It is asked, Is Christ adored as man, and as man, is he the formal object of adoration? The Remonstrants affirm it, c.16, 134.

We deny it: 1. Because no creature, but God alone, is to be adored, Deut. 6:13, Matt. 4:10. But Christ the man, or the humanity of Christ, is a creature; and adoration is the glory proper to God, which God does not want to give to another, Isa. 42:8.

2. Because the Humanity of Christ is not an Idol.

3. Because it favors the Arians and Socinians, to snatch away from us the argument by which we prove that Christ is true God, because all the Angels adore him, Heb. 1:6.

If they say that an inferior worship is due to the Humanity:

I reply: 1. This is said against the Scriptures, if it is understood of the worship of religious adoration, as it ought to be understood here.

2. Against the consensus of the Orthodox Church, which taught that Christ is to be worshiped with the same honor as the Father.

3. A window would lie open to all Idolatry of Images and Angels, if it were permitted to give the honor of inferior adoration to creatures.

4. Scripture does not acknowledge some honor of religious adoration due to Christ by reason of the Office alone imposed on him by the Father, or conferred on him by mere grace, on account of the Mediatorial office.

Rom. 9:5.
Who is God, blessed forever.

It is asked, Is a twofold communication of Deity to be acknowledged in Christ? One, through a secret and ineffable generation; the other, through a gracious communication of divine power and supreme glory; and therefore a twofold Sonship? The Remonstrants affirm it, Apol., c.3, fol. 48.

We deny it: 1. Because if Deity was communicated to Christ once from eternity, and once in time, there will be two Deities in Christ: one eternal, the other temporal; and thus Christ will be two gods, which is blasphemous.

2. Because Christ, through the Incarnation and resurrection from the dead, did not acquire a new Deity, which he did not have before; but he was only declared to be the Son of God

in power, through the Spirit of sanctification, and the resurrection from the dead, Rom. 1:4. Therefore, a manifestation of pre-existing Deity, not a new conferral of Deity, is to be understood here, because he himself, through his own Deity, raised himself from the dead, John 2:19; and he himself assumed our flesh in himself, Phil. 2:7.

3. Granted that Scripture says that he received power and glory from the Father through the Resurrection from the dead, that is nevertheless not a temporal Deity conferred on Christ; because thus the Father would not glorify his Son with that glory which he had with the Father before the foundations of the world were laid, John 17:5, but with another new glory of acquired Deity.

4. Nowhere in Scripture is it said that Christ, through the Incarnation and Resurrection from the dead, was made God or Deified; but only that he was exalted, made prince, obtained the name above every name; because now, with the state of exinanition laid aside, he is declared the consubstantial Son of God, and declared in both natures the Prince and supreme Lord and Judge of the Church, even though the world had treated him with death and ignominy and insults.

5. Because two filiations suppose two persons; and although what was born of Mary is called the Son of God, Luke 1:35, it does not follow that in that Nativity a new Son and Person is born; but only that in that Nativity, the Son of God, in the Unity of his pre-existing Person, assumed human nature.

6. Because to Christ, the consubstantial Son of the Father, nothing of new Deity or power could be added; indeed, nothing can be added to God, unless God were changed. Therefore, temporal Deity cannot be added to God; and accordingly, it is only a manifestation of divine glory.

But they say that Scripture asserts that that glory was given to Christ, and that Christ received the name and power. I reply: To give glory to God, to ascribe power to him, do not denote a real giving of glory to God; but to give here is only to declare the given glory, or the glory previously existing; as Joshua says to Achan: "My son, give glory to God," Josh. 7:19, and nothing is more frequent in the Psalms and in the whole Scripture.

7. For Deity to be communicated in time, and temporal Deity, is repugnant in the adjunct; and it is Deity and non-Deity. For what begins in time is not Deity. From which it is clear that when the Remonstrants assign two Deities to Christ, one through ineffable generation, the other through temporal conferral of glory, they do not assert that the Son of God is true God. For to the true God, nothing can be added, nothing taken away, in time;

and the communication of Deity belongs to Christ as God; and thus according to the Remonstrants, he would not be God from himself.

8. It is absurd for Christ to be adored by the grace of God, as if the true formal object of Adoration, namely Deity, were not in him.

But they will say that a twofold Adoration belongs to Christ: one is that which belongs to him as God; the other, which belongs to him as Mediator. But this is said without Scripture and reason. Because the Adoration due to him as God redounds to the Person, to the humanity by overflow; therefore, another Adoration is vainly imagined, no more than two bloods, two crosses, two healings of the leper, the demoniac, the dead; one which belongs to him as God, the other which belongs to him as man, or even as Mediator. Thus neither a twofold Adoration.

9. The ancient Church, against Nestorius, dividing the Persons and attributing two species of Adoration to him, defined that he is one Person and has two Natures, and is adored with one and the same Adoration as the God-man.

It is asked, Is Christ, as Mediator, to be adored? I reply: The word "as" is taken either reduplicatively or specificatively. Reduplicatively, it denotes the formal reason of Adoration, and says the reason why he is to be adored by all, alone, and always. God alone, but not the Mediator alone, is to be adored; nor is Mediatorial dignity the formal and adequate reason why the Son is to be adored, because the Father is to be adored no less than the Son, just as the Holy Spirit is also to be adored. But specificatively, the word does not say the reason on account of which he is to be adored by all, alone, and always. For as man, as man, is flat-nosed, sees, is a Geometer, is a Musician, nevertheless not every, only, and always man is flat-nosed, a Geometer, laughs. If therefore, in this question, "as" is taken specificatively, Christ is by all means to be adored as Mediator. That is, that person of Deity, who is the Mediator, and indeed also for that reason, because he is the Mediator, and undertook, carried out, and carries out the Mediatorial office for our good, is to be adored. But if it is taken reduplicatively, as Mediator, he is not to be adored. Because the mediatorial office is not the proper, formal, and adequate reason for adoration. Otherwise neither the Father nor the Holy Spirit would be to be adored.

Matt. 28:19.
Baptize all, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

It is asked: Is the Holy Spirit true God, consubstantial with the Father and the Son? The Remonstrants say that they cannot prove that the Holy Spirit is God, because he is adored; because Scripture is full about the Father and the Son being adored, but not a whit about the Holy Spirit. Confess., c.2. And Apol., c.2, fol. 51, they say that because the Son or the Holy Spirit is called Jehovah, it is not concluded that the Son or the Holy Spirit is God; since the name Jehovah is often taken appellatively, and is often attributed to created Angels. And thus it will be easy to mock all the passages in which the Son and the Holy Spirit are called God and Jehovah.

We, to the contrary: 1. Isa. 48:16: "The Lord Jehovah and his Spirit sent me." Isa. 63:14: "The Spirit of Jehovah quietly led them; thus you led your people, to gain for yourself a name of honor." Therefore, the Holy Spirit is to be praised and adored, as the one who led the people out of Egypt; unless they want the Spirit to signify, not a person, but the power and operation of God, as the Sadducees, Antitrinitarians, and Sabellians take the word Holy Spirit.

2. The Creator is to be adored, because Creator, by all creatures; the Sanctifier is to be praised and glorified, and to be hoped in; who as the highest and from himself infallible teacher, leads us into all truth; who, as the principal cause, sends the Ministers of the Church. But the Holy Spirit, as the highest and from himself infallible teacher, leads us into all truth, John 16:13, and as the principal cause sends the Ministers of the Church, Acts 13:2 and 20:28.

3. He is to be adored, in whose name we are baptized. But we are baptized in the name of the Holy Spirit, Matt. 28:19.

4. He is to be adored, who distributes gifts to each one in the Church, as he wills. But the Holy Spirit does this, 1 Cor. 12:11.

5. Song 4:15: "Awake, O north wind, and come, O south wind! Blow upon my garden," i.e., Holy Spirit, who breathes where you wish, John 3:8, make my garden fruitful. Indeed, the example of the Church adoring the Holy Spirit shines forth to us, as in 2 Cor. 13:14, Acts 13:2-3, Acts 4:24, Rev. 1:4 compared with Isa. 6:3, Heb. 3:7, and Acts 28:25.

Title Four, On the Knowledge[Scientia]of GOD.

Acts. 15:18.
Known to God are all his works from the beginning of the World, or, from eternity.

It is asked: Is there in God Middle Knowledge, mixed or conditioned? That is, Knowledge of things outside God, which as to their futurition do not at all depend on God; which is neither the Knowledge of Vision, nor of Simple Intelligence? The Arminians affirm it. James Arminius, disp. 4, thes. 43, 45, says: "Although it is necessary for that middle (Knowledge) to intervene in things which depend on the Freedom of the Will." The Pelagianizing Papists think this way also, especially the Jesuit Ruiz, I, Thom., On the Knowledge of God, disp. 49, sect. 2; Vasquez on I, Thom., disp. 67, q. 14, art. 13, c.3; Fasolus, tom. 1, q. 14, art. 13; Arrubal, tom. 1, q. 14, art. 13, disp. 46; Arriaga, Logic. disp. 14, sect. 6; Less., On Efficacious Grace; Lud. Molina on I. p., Thom., q. 14, art. 13, disp. 17, and in his Concord of Free Will with the Gifts of Grace, disp. 52.

Knowledge is twofold (to say nothing of reflexive Knowledge, plainly natural, by which God knows himself): one of Vision, or intuitive, or determinate, by which God knows all beings outside himself, which are, were, or will be, or are not; the other of Simple Intelligence, by which he knows possibles, and it is called natural, indeterminate, abstractive. But Middle Knowledge, by which God knows future contingents, which will be from such a hypothesis, before all God's decree, is a blasphemous figment.

1. Because there would be given another cause why from eternity possible things began to be future, and passed from the state of possibility to the state of futurition, besides the will of God; which cause would be non-being, or fortune, if God saw things future before his decree.

2. There would be given some temporal cause of an eternal thing (for the futuritions of things are eternal, nor did it begin to be future that it will be future), or futures would have no cause at all, if they were future, and foreknown as future, before the Will of God.

3. Because many wise connections of the admirable Wisdom and Providence of God, such as these are (Job will be despoiled by Satan, he will humbly submit himself to God; If Judas is tempted, he will betray Christ; If the Church is oppressed, it will believe and pray. These, I say, connections will precede every act of the Will and Middle Knowledge of God.

4. Because God will be compelled by fate to approve future beings antecedently to his decree; indeed, he can neither procure nor permit their futurition. And therefore no Dominion of Providence over contingent acts will stand for God, because they have futurition before every act of the divine Will, and accordingly before the act of Foreknowledge and Omnipotence.

5. Because in those evils which come to us by the ministry of contingent causes, no consolations are to be sought from the Will of God; because they were fatally future before all God's decree.

6. Because no hope, no prayer ought to be conceived, either for the procurement of contingent goods, or for the averting of contingent evils, if they come about apart from God's Will, and are future, God not willing.

7. Because the determinate number of contingent acts, and of supernatural conversions and non-conversions to Christ calling in the Gospel, will be absolutely in the power of created Free Will, not in the power of God and his Will. Because the conversions of so many and not more, and the non-conversions of so many and not more, are future before all the Will of God; and God cannot convert more than he converts, nor not convert more than are not converted. O iron Fortune, who obtains dominion over Jehovah!

8. Because what is unknowable, such as that which is future without the Will of the first cause, through this Knowledge is supposed as knowable, and as actually future, and as actually known, which nevertheless is merely possible, and nothing beyond. For things, before the act of the divine Will, are only possible, and in no way future, but indifferent to futurition or non-futurition; and thus they cannot be known as future, no more than the non-visible can be seen, and the non-audible can be heard.

9. Because the certain and determinate number of the Elect and non-Elect would not depend on the Will of God, but either on Fortune, or on created Free Will. For before all God's Decree, so many and not more, not fewer, are similarly going to believe, and therefore be saved; and not more, not fewer, are finally going to resist God calling, and therefore be damned.

10. Futures are future from themselves, not from the Will of God; non-futures are non-future from themselves, not from the Will of God; which overturns all Providence. For in God's power there will not be the certain and determinate number of all contingent actions, of all miseries and happy successes which come about by the ministry of contingent causes, and of all free acts of men, elect and reprobate, and of Angels, good and

evil. For all these are future, and foreknown as future, through Middle Knowledge, before every act of the divine Will.

It is asked: Did not God foreknow through middle knowledge that the Tyrians would be converted, if they had seen miracles? That the Keilites would deliver David into the hands of Saul, if he had remained among the Keilites? And that other Nations would hear Ezekiel, if he had been sent to them? The Arminians and Jesuits affirm it; we deny it.

1. He sees these things infallibly future in his Decree concatenating the conversion of the Tyrians and the vision of miracles.

2. Because he sees these things in his Decree by which he decreed to give them grace, by which they would be converted.

3. Because he could not see these things in the very slippery and hanging connection between two things which happen contingently, and cohere among themselves contingently, not per se, nor by any necessity. It is necessary, therefore, that the concatenating bond be the most strong decree of God; otherwise God would certainly know that which is not knowable.

Heb. 4:13.
All things are naked and open to him with whom we have to do.

It is asked: Does God certainly foreknow future contingents? The Remonstrants doubt it. Episcopius, thes. 10, sect. 4, On God, says: "Whether God foreknows future Contingents, it is not necessary to know for this, that God may be worshiped." Apol., c.2, fol. 43: "It is certain that the Remonstrants believe that contingents (future), as such, precisely taken, are not knowable; and accordingly, are not to be referred to the objects of divine Omniscience. Contingents, as future, from decree are not contingent, but necessary; nor can they be known by God." Here Cicero speaks in them, who took away foreknowledge of futures from God, lest the freedom of the creature perish; and lest men become slaves (as Augustine says), he made them sacrilegious.

We, against the Devil and the Arminians, and all Pagans and Socinians, profess that we worship the true God, foreknowing all futures.

1. Because God is not God, but an Idol, if he does not foreknow all futures, Isa. 41:26: "Who has declared it from the beginning, that we may know, and beforetime, that we may say,

'He is right'? There is none who declares it, none who proclaims it." Isa. 42:8-9: "I am Jehovah; that is my name; my glory I give to no other, nor my praise to carved idols. Behold, the former things have come to pass, and new things I now declare; before they spring forth I tell you of them." But there are future contingents, when they have not yet sprung forth. Isa. 41:22: "Let them bring them, and tell us what is to happen. Tell us the former things, what they are... [v. 23] Tell us what is to come hereafter, that we may know that you are gods." God, therefore, is not God, if he is not foreknowing of future contingents. Ps. 139: "You discern my thoughts from afar... [v. 4] Even before a word is on my tongue, behold, O Jehovah, you know it altogether... [v. 16] Your eyes saw my unformed substance; in your book were written, every one of them, the days that were formed for me, when as yet there was none of them."

2. All certainty of prophecies would perish, and the foundation and object of Faith about future contingents would be fallacious, if our God neither knew, nor could know, future contingents.

3. God predicted, in the whole Old Testament, things which he was ignorant of; and thus he would not know that the Son was to be crucified, his hands and feet to be pierced, lots to be cast over his garments, the Gospel to be preached.

4. He does not know future contingents before they are; therefore, if he knows them when they are, he knows something in time which he was ignorant of from eternity. The knowledge of God increases, and he now knows more than he knew from eternity; which is blasphemous.

5. If God did not know future contingents from eternity, nor from eternity decreed them to be done, new knowledge, new volitions, and new decrees begin in God; therefore, there are no futures, but all things are merely possible.

6. The arguments of the Holy Spirit are vain: God decreed these things; therefore, they will be; or, therefore, God decreed to be done things which he is ignorant of, which would be foolish in a prudent man; or, all things which he decreed, he so decreed that they remain possible, which can be or not be.

7. The decree of Election from foreknown faith, and of reprobation from foreknown unbelief, collapses. For Faith and unbelief are future contingents; and God today is ignorant, according to the opinion of the Arminians, of who and how many are to be saved, and who and how many are to be damned.

8. In vain David, Jehoshaphat, Ahab, in vain the Priests and Prophets of God, and with no faith, consulted God about future contingents.

9. Here the Arminians wrongly adhere to Aristotle, who said that of future contingents there is not determinate truth; who either speaks of truth with respect to us, who are ignorant of the truth of such things in non-necessary matter; or if he acknowledges no determinate truth in God's decree, he erred shamefully.

Title Five, On the Will Of God, and its certain execution.

It is asked: Are decrees and free volitions and actions in God something diverse from the Essence of God? And is that saying of our Theologians false, "Whatever is in God, is God"? Likewise, are there any accidents in God? The Arminians affirm it, especially Vorstius, Apol., p. 43.

We deny it: 1. Because the volitions of God, although they are not extrinsic denominations, but vital actions of God, nevertheless include two things: 1. The Essence of God, holding itself in such a way. 2. A relation of reason to things outside the will of God; this can be said in its own way about the external acts of God; and thus the volition of God is only God willing through himself, and through his Essence, and not through a volitive power distinct from act; as it is in us. And things willed ad extra, indeed created things, conserved things, and the works of God produced ad extra, put nothing new in God; just as to be right or left puts nothing in man, but supposes a new position of another body outside the man, at his right or left side.

2. Because whatever is added to God, besides or beyond the Essence, is either substance or accident. No substance can be added to the infinite Essence of God; because thus he would not be infinite. Nor can some accident newly come to God; for in him there are no accidents, because no composition can be in him, from accident and subject; no new qualification can accede to God, through the accession or recession of a new accident; because God would thus be changed.

Rom. 9:19.
Who can resist his will?

It is asked: Is there in God an antecedent and consequent Will? The Arminians affirm it.

But 1. If the antecedent Will were about the end proposed by God, the consequent about the means to the end, we would acknowledge the distinction.

2. If the antecedent Will were only a complacency of a thing pleasing in itself, as it coincides with the will of sign approving, and obliging us to our duty; and the consequent Will, with the Will of good pleasure; thus we would embrace the distinction.

But to the Arminians, the antecedent Will is to God a natural desire devoid of efficacy, by which naturally he desires the obedience and salvation of all mortals; yet he does not at all effect it; and that insofar as they are creatures, having as yet merited nothing. The consequent is that by which God wills the obedience and salvation of some, namely, if they show themselves worthy of calling; but if not, he denies them external means, and salvation. But this distinction is not to be borne.

1. Because if God antecedently wills all to obey and be saved, and yet few obey and are saved, then there will be in God an inefficacious will, and not armed with infinite power; and he will not do whatever he willed in Heaven and on earth. Which is against Rom. 9:19, Ps. 135:6.

2. Because thus God does not have mercy on whom he wills, and whom he wills, he hardens, according to Rom. 9:18. For the antecedent will is not free; the consequent is restricted by the immovable rule of Justice, by which God cannot not act according to the reason of merits and demerits, unless he wanted to renounce his Justice.

3. The natural will, by which God, by the impulse of nature, wills well to creatures, is eternal; from this it follows that God even still today wills the obedience and salvation of the Devils and reprobate men, bound by eternal torments; which is absurd.

4. Because it is absurd for God to antecedently will that from those whom, foreknowing they will finally resist grace, he peremptorily and irrevocably reprobated, or for it to be done, or for salvation to happen to them. Because this love of a thing which we know we will never obtain savors of imperfection and unhappiness even in men. Therefore, there is no such love in God.

5. Because the antecedent Will fulfilled is changed into the consequent; or not fulfilled, shaken off from its end, it ceases to be will; as miserable men very often cease to further desire things which they had wished for, their wishes vanish. Which makes God mutable.

6. Because he is not absolutely happy who cannot be in control of his wishes. But the antecedent Will makes God such.

7. Because the antecedent will is rash, and devoid of knowledge of the preintended end; and God intends many things by antecedent will, according to no foreknowledge of the end, as the Arminians want. But a will devoid of knowledge is a brute, blind, rash appetite, and worse than a sensitive one.

8. To will salvation antecedently to those for whom salvation has not been obtained by the merits of Christ, and who have not yet run the course of obedience, is as alien to Justice, according to Arminius's rule of Justice regulating the Will of God, as for God to decree the crown to him who has not yet fought; which sins, according to him, against Justice.

9. God wills the eternal destruction of all mortals antecedently with as solid a reason, because it is the good of Justice, as he wills the salvation of all, because it is the good of the creature. Indeed, according to Arminius, the good of Justice outweighs the good of the creature.

10. Because God not only ceases to will what he once antecedently willed, but also, from justice, positively does not will that of which he previously willed, prayed for, and swore that he wanted to do the contrary.

11. The antecedent Will is, properly speaking, a wish for it; and by equal reason, there will be in God a vain hope of that thing which never happens, and grief over a lost thing which he wanted to happen.

12. Because, in the manner of a shipwrecked man unwillingly throwing goods into the sea, God is compelled by the antecedent Will to turn the sails back to the consequent; as a father is compelled by the incorrigible stubbornness of a son, whom he had singularly loved, to disinherit him.

13. The consequent will regarding the impious and hypocrites, who make up by far the greatest number of men, is true repentance, born from sorrow over a thing not obtained that was antecedently willed. Therefore they teach that God punishes unwillingly and against his natural propensity.

14. The antecedent will is doubtful, uncertain, and suspended from the outcome of the creature's obedience.

15. The will of God cannot be resisted. But men and Devils daily resist the antecedent Will.

16. By antecedent will, i.e., by natural affection, he wanted to create more myriads of Worlds, Angels, Men; which wills are in vain in God to eternity, without any reason.

Rom. 9:18.
He has mercy on whom he wills, and he hardens whom he wills.

It is asked: Is having mercy and doing good essential to God, and as necessary as it is for the Sun to illuminate? Jackson the Englishman affirms it, with the ancient Anabaptists.

We deny it: 1. Because Freedom stands unharmed for God in distributing from his own as he wills, Matt. 20:15.

2. Because to have mercy in such a way that it would take away and totally vanquish the final hardness of all would be necessary for God, and thus it would also certainly happen. But experience and Scripture teach the contrary.

3. Because, without any force inflicted on his nature, God does not want to have mercy on many, but as the Apostle says, he wants to harden them, even if they are not worse than others by nature and demerits.

It is asked: Does God punish men unwillingly, and against his natural propensity to have mercy? The Remonstrants affirm it.

We deny it: 1. Because acts of Justice are as consonant with the holy Nature of God as acts of Mercy; and the former are as natural to him as the latter, Exod. 34:6-7.

2. Because God laughs (if only there is no figure here) at the destruction of the impious as properly as he exults with joy at the salvation of the pious, Prov. 1:26.

3. Although the exercise of Mercy is more agreeable to the Goodness of God with respect to us, nevertheless the Attribute of Justice is as essential as that of Mercy, Exod. 34:6-7.

4. God does all things according to the counsel of his will. Therefore, he does nothing unwillingly or against his propensity, Eph. 1:11.

James. 1:17.
With whom there is no variation or shadow due to change.

It is asked: Is God immutable? The Arminians deny that he is immutable. Corvinus against Molina, c.5, f.10: "It can be said that hypothetical decrees, taken separately in parts, are changed; because the condition, with respect to man, is either fulfilled or not fulfilled; and thus it either exists for some time, or even ceases to exist for a long time, or begins again." Thus Vorstius, Amica dupl., c.1, p. 6. Thus they teach that God falls short of his intention, and his primary intention is changed into a secondary one, Apol., c.9, fol. 105: "Men can render their Election vain and frustrated... and render the counsel of God vain." They distinguish election into peremptory and irrevocable, and non-peremptory and revocable.

We teach that no change falls on God; not subjective, because nothing can be added to the infinite, nothing taken away, and nothing equally good can happen to him. Bradwardine, On the Cause of God, book 1, chap. 1, fol. 6. Nor can terminative mutability be attributed to God, because he says of himself, "I am who I am." Things that are changed neither are nor remain what they are. Terminative immutability is that by which the Intellect and Will of God are not changed from the change of the object understood and willed, nor from the changed effects outside God. Not simply, because God does not change judgment, and nothing begins to be good to God which before did not seem to him to be good, as the Scholastics teach. Because this reason is not approved by me, because since God intuits all possible things, and wills them from mere freedom, not on account of the goodness which he sees in the things themselves (for things willed are not the formal reason for God of willing; indeed, God does not will things outside himself because they are good, but from his intrinsic freedom), therefore, it does not follow that there is a change from passion or moral inconstancy, because things begin to be good to God when before they seemed to him not to be good; but because pure "to will" would be changed into pure "to not will," from his intrinsic freedom, therefore there would be in God a terminative change. Indeed, if from two things rightly known, God knew one as a greater good and chose it, and the other afterwards as a lesser good and chose it, the former having been rejected, there would be no change in the Intellect of God, and accordingly no change in the Will, from diverse acts of knowing, because he equally knows both objects; there would nevertheless be a change, because the Will of God would not now hold itself in the same way toward this object as before toward that one; but Scripture argues from the Immutability of God to the immutability of the thing willed. And therefore, if he willed that, and afterwards did not will it, there would be in him a terminative change, Mal. 3:6: "For I, Jehovah, do not change; therefore you, O children of Jacob, have not been consumed." Therefore, if things outside God were changed, and held themselves otherwise than God had once decreed them to be, God would be terminatively changed. And therefore, if the children of Jacob

had been consumed, whom God had decreed not to be consumed, Jehovah would be changed. Thus 1 Sam. 15:29: "The Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent." Therefore, the sentence of God stands about rejecting you and choosing David for the throne. Therefore, the Strength of Israel, if Saul had not been rejected from the throne, whom God willed to be rejected, would have made a lie, and it would have repented him. Therefore, a terminative change is not to be ascribed to God; nor can God today will glory for him for whom he did not will glory yesterday.

2. Because, Ps. 33:10: "Jehovah brings the counsel of the nations to nothing; he frustrates the plans of the peoples. V. 11: The counsel of Jehovah stands forever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations." Isa. 46:10: "My counsel shall stand, and I will accomplish all my purpose." Rom. 9:19: "For who can resist his will?" Heb. 6:17: "So when God desired to show more convincingly to the heirs of the promise the unchangeable character of his purpose," etc.

3. God is not in potency to anything; but from eternity, his Will was determined to every willable and nillable thing, although things outside God could have held themselves otherwise. For there is no willable, no nillable thing, which God did not either will or nill from eternity. Nor does he begin to will something anew, or to nill anew.

4. What Vorstius says about God is blasphemous, in Notes to disp. 6, thes. 34, 35: "But what things God leaves indefinite (namely, which fall under our Free will), about these there is no certain Will of God." Because the Will of God would be in equilibrium and at a crossroads, until contingent acts actually existed or did not exist; and the Will would remain changeable at the nod of the contingently operating cause - which the Remonstrants said above, when they think that future contingents are neither known, nor necessarily future, with respect to the divine will.

5. Nor is it an objection that God willed the Ceremonial Worship from eternity, and that Worship has now ceased; because from eternity to eternity he wills that Worship to last for a time. But his volition is not proved from this to be temporal, or now to have vanished, because he now wills that Worship for a time.

6. Because it is blasphemous for God to will something anew, or to nill something anew (as if God should begin anew to will and destine to glory a man whom he had not destined to glory from eternity; and again to cease destining Peter to glory, whom he had destined to glory from eternity). Because thus true repentance in God, a new volition, a new frustrated intention, would succeed many other ancient volitions which were in him before. Therefore, our Theologians argue that God is not mutable, because nothing can seem new to his Knowledge or Volition, so that he judges that to be good which before he judged not

to be good, on account of a new reason arising in the object. But if he loves Peter to eternal glory, whom before he hated to death, or the contrary, on account of a new reason arising in the object, because he believes, and again does not believe, he is truly changed, as all of ours argue. And by the same reason, in God there is not a primary intention, by which he sometimes falls short, and a secondary intention succeeding it: 1. Because Job 23:13: "What his soul desires, that he does."

2. Because the counsels of God are eternal and immutable, Ps. 33:11, Isa. 46:10.

3. Because to fall short of one's end is in creatures misery and punishment, Job 22:28, Ps. 33:10, Isa. 8:9, Job 5:12-13.

4. The will of God cannot be resisted, Dan. 4:35, Rom. 9:19, Ps. 113:5, even in those things which are done through contingent causes, as those passages prove.

5. Because it is alien to infinite wisdom to will, intend, desire, pray, beg for and wish for what he knows he will never obtain, as the adversaries teach, when he could obtain it if indeed he willed; for this does not fall on a prudent man.

6. Because Paul moves the same objection, Rom. 9:6: "It is not as though the word of God has failed." Has the Word of God and the covenant begun with Abraham about obtaining salvation failed? That is, is God's intention expressed by that covenant void? And he responds in v. 6 that the Word of the covenant does not fail. And he denies this consequence: Israel has failed (namely, Israel according to the flesh), therefore, the covenant and intention of God fail. Because the intention of God was about saving, not the children according to the flesh, but the children of the promise.

7. Because it is the highest imperfection and dependence of the divine Will, that having been shaken off from its primary end, it intends another end per accidens, as if overcome by the creature.

8. A secondary intention supposes something to happen beyond the intention of God; and therefore fortuitously with respect to God.

9. Because God does not cease to call even the obstinate, and those who have lapsed into sin against the Holy Spirit. Does he therefore intend their obedience and salvation? If he does not intend it, with bad deceit and a feigned and fictitious will, according to the Adversaries, he calls them. If he intends it, God cannot here have a primary intention, as the Adversaries confess. Therefore, here that distinction is not valid, and by equal reason, neither in the calling of others.

10. Because a primary intention changed into a secondary one argues for a change of the divine will.

Matt. 6:10.
Your will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

Our prayers are means by which the Will of God is fulfilled.

It is asked: Is the distinction of the Will of Good Pleasure and of Sign to be admitted, as the Arminians hand it down? I reply: No. Because to them, by the Will of Good Pleasure, God wills those same things to be done, which he wills to be done by the Will of Sign; and they want the Will of Good Pleasure to be the same, but hidden, as is the Will of Sign, but revealed to us. Thus Arminius, Disp. 4, thes. 58.

But we teach that the Will of Good Pleasure is the decree of God, both about good things, which he himself will necessarily give and do by effect, and about evil things, which he himself permits to be done by others. And the Will of Sign is God's simple complacency and approbation of a thing, as morally licit and honest, even if the futurition of that good thing is never decreed by God.

And therefore God wills and approves many things by approving Will, which he never decreed to be future by the Will of Good Pleasure, as he wills the obedience of Judas and Herod and Pilate; and yet he decreed that they should crucify the Lord of glory, he himself permitting it.

2. Because God approves by the will of Sign perfect obedience to his Law. But by the will of Good Pleasure he decreed from eternity that no one except Christ should perfectly fulfill the Law.

3. Because God preaches the Gospel to many obstinate people, and approves their repentance; and yet from eternity he decreed not to give them effectual grace, without which they cannot repent.

4. What God decreed by the will of Good Pleasure to be done or not done, that will necessarily be done or not done in its time; and it is God's will simply, which God cannot not fulfill, because he willed and decreed it to be done, Matt. 27:35, John 19:36, Matt. 2:15,

17-18, John 2:22. But God approves many things as good, which he never decreed to be done.

Hence it is false that we posit contradictory wills in God. For we do not teach that God approves, i.e., decreed from eternity, that what he commands should be done, or what he prohibits should not be done. 2. Nor do we teach that God's approving will infers that God decreed from eternity to do what he approves, unless we place an obstacle.

Related to this is: In the calling of all in the Visible Church, is God's intention that all and each one obey and be saved? The Remonstrants affirm it, art. 2, 3, p. 10.

We deny it: 1. Because God does not fall short of his intention, as has been proved. But all do not obey and are saved.

2. Because the infinitely wise does not intend what he foreknows he will never obtain.

3. Because the Law says to all, "Do this and live." But God does not intend perfect obedience in all mortals; for he would thus intend to render the death of Christ frustrate.

4. God preaches the Word to many for this end, that they may be hardened, as Scripture says, Isa. 6:9, Matt. 13:14-15. And the Adversaries concede it.

5. Because God does not elect all to glory who are in the visible Church, therefore.

Related to this is: Because God not only approves the obedience of the reprobate, as something decent, to the performance of which they are obligated, but also because he sweetly invites, and solicits with prayers, beseeches, obtests, and grieves over, is saddened by, and complains about the disobedient; does he therefore intend their obedience? The Remonstrants affirm it, art. 1, p. 57.

We deny it: 1. Because from the sweet invitation, only the mild obligation of the creature to obedience is concluded, the serious approbation and complacency which God has toward obedience, as a holy thing, owed to him, and morally pleasing, agreeable to man and salutary. And therefore these affections in God add nothing beyond the simple complacency of God about obedience, except a certain quasi-intensity and vehemence of the divine obligation to it, by which he testifies that the obedience of all is seriously commanded by him, and men are obligated to it, and thus it will be uniquely and vehemently pleasing to him and salutary to men if it is performed, even if he decreed that it will not be performed by the vice of men.

2. Because from the sadness of God over the disobedience of the reprobate, it can no more be concluded that there was in him an intention that they should actually perform obedience, than it can be concluded that there are in God truly human passions, vain wishes, void prayers, and the unhappiness of a God grieving that he cannot give his desires fulfilled.

3. God, with the freedom of the creature unharmed, through motives which he has hidden in the treasures of his wisdom, by the testimony of Arminius, can infallibly procure their obedience, if he so strenuously decreed, intended, and desired it from eternity, as men desire those things to be done, over the non-performance of which they are saddened and grieve.

It is asked: What is to be thought of the distinction of the Will into efficient and permitting? We acknowledge it; here the Arminians differ from us. For the efficient Will is that will which is the first and highest cause of all positive beings. But the permitting Will affirms one thing, denies two. It affirms a positive act of the will of Good Pleasure; for it is not a bare negation of will, as the Arminians want, because God wills that sins be done for the glory of God, by permitting will. The Arminians want that by permitting will, God wills nothing, but barely does not will, that others permitted sin; and therefore it is an idle and non-acting will, or rather a negation of volition than a true will or volition, according to them. But the permitting will denies two things for us: 1. It denies moral efficiency; for God is not the cause of those things which he permits. 2. It denies the approving will. For what God permits, he by no means approves, or prescribes to the creature to be done.

Eph. 1:11.
Who works all things according to the counsel of his will.

It is asked: Did God from eternity decree all things, even contingents, absolutely? The mind of Arminius is expressed in these words, to art. 7, p. 143: "The word 'determination' is ambiguous; for it signifies either the determination of God (by which he decrees that something be done) such that, any action, motion, impulse of God having been posited, the second cause remains free, as to the potency and use of potency, to act or not act; so much so that it can suspend its action; or such that, having been posited, the second cause does not remain free, at least not as to the use of potency, so that it can suspend its action, the action, motion and impulse of God having been posited; but from which it happens that it is necessarily bent to one side or the other, before the determinate act itself is produced by the free creature. In the former way, God determined contingents to one side or the other by his eternal decree. Not in the latter way, because it is a contradiction for

something to be contingent and necessary." Thus also the Remonstrants in their Apology. We judge these words of Arminius to be false, blasphemous, and fables fabricated to please the people.

1. Because the determination of contingent acts to one side or the other, so that either this or that part, either the free act or the non-act follows, is a determination to neither part; and a determination to neither part is a non-determination, and indifference; which is openly contradictory.

2. The determination of contingent acts of faith, e.g., of Peter, by which having been posited, the non-faith of Peter can follow, is the same as if Arminius said that both after and before the determination of God, the faith of Peter is indeterminate. But for God to determine to one thing those which, after the determination, are not determined to one thing, is to make a game and a joke for the reader.

3. The other part of this distinction is a non-determination. And what the divided thing may be in such an unhappy division, no one can imagine, unless someone should say that man is rightly divided into man and non-man; and stones are divided into two parts, some are those which are stones, others are those which are non-stones; and fish, some are fish, others non-fish.

4. This determination of God leaves all contingent acts in no state of futurition; but all free acts can, all volition, action and impulse of God having been posited, as much not be as be; and therefore no free act is future, until it actually is. And God's decree is one by which he decrees that all possibles are, but none are future. Thus therefore God decreed free acts in that way in which he decreed the liberation of Christ from death, by more than 12 Legions of Angels; and in which he decreed three or four Worlds; and the repentance of the Tyrians, if they saw signs. And thus when God decreed that Peter should believe, it is the same as if I said, God decreed that Peter could believe by the grace of God; and he decreed that the soldiers should not break the bones of Christ, it is the same as, he decreed that they could break the bones of Christ; he decreed that Peter should dispute tomorrow, i.e., he decreed that Peter could dispute, or could not dispute tomorrow. But no sane person would say that to be able to act or not act is decreed and determined by God; because before every decree of God, Peter can believe or not believe by the grace of God, can dispute or not dispute; indeed, the potency to acts or non-acts, and the potency to be or not be, no more falls under the free decree of God than God can decree that God be infinite; nor do possibles fall under the free decree of God; because before and apart from the decree of God, all possibles are possible. Futures are decreed by God, not possibles.

5. By this opinion, God confers nothing more by his decree to the futurition of contingent acts than the volition of Peter or the walking of Peter, the sun shining, confers. The Will of God is no cause of the futurition of things, but leaves future contingents to "being able to be" or "being able not to be." The futurition of things, therefore, is from eternity from themselves, which is absurd. For if a thing is not without the will of God, as a cause, neither is a thing future without the same. And if things are through the providence of God, future things are through the providence of God. For as many present things as there are, so many future things there are, and so many futuritions of things. It is more absurd than an absurdity that the determinate number of futuritions does not depend on the will of God, because it is impossible for something to be present created, which was not future from eternity.

6. If God did not determine future contingents from eternity, nor willed them from eternity, nor does his will determine them in time, then God begins to both will and determine them in time; and he wills something in time which he did not will from eternity. And this is because he absolutely neither wills nor determines them in time. And if the free creature did not determine itself, God would neither will nor determine that act. Therefore, there is in God a present volition, which was not future, unless we had willed.

7. But the Scriptures, and reasons from the Scriptures, here refute Arminius. Isa. 14:27: He immutably decreed the devastation of the Chaldeans by the Medes; the Liberation of His People by Cyrus, the effecter of his counsel, Isa. 46:10-11. He decreed the division of the garments of Christ, the piercing of his hands and feet, the crucifixion, Matt. 27:35, John 19:24, Ps. 22:18, John 19:18. The non-breaking of his legs, John 19:33-36. He decreed the calling of the Gentiles, and freely on the part of the preachers, and on the part of those called, responding to God calling, Isa. 11:10, 49:1-2, 21-22, 54:1-3, 60:4-5, 66:12, Acts 2:8-12, 24, 13:46-48, Rom. 9:24-26.

8. Because he predefined the appointed times and the boundaries of their dwelling, Acts 17:26.

9. Because he decreed, 2 Sam. 17:14 (Heb: he had commanded), to thwart the counsel of Ahithophel.

10. Because from eternity he decreed to give the land of Canaan to his people, who nevertheless most freely fought, and made their way to possess it, and freely used stratagems and warlike preparations, Ps. 78:69: "He built his sanctuary like the high heavens, like the earth, which he has founded forever."

11. Because God works all things according to the counsel of his will, Eph. 1:11. Therefore, he decreed all those things from eternity, whether contingent or necessary. Because God does nothing in time, which he did not decree to do from eternity.

12. Lots, and things which are most fortuitous depend on the providence of God, as the first and certain cause. And if someone should kill a traveler by chance, as it seems, with iron fallen from the handle, Jehovah says that he killed him, Deut. 19:5, Exod. 21:13, Prov. 16:33. Therefore, the most contingent and fortuitous things are decreed by God from eternity.

13. Because it is alien to the Wisdom of God, that there should be contingents which are not predefined by his wise Will.

14. Because it is repugnant to the Justice of God, that there should be free acts penal to his servants and the wicked, which are not absolutely willed by the Will of God, as are the acts of despoiling Job, polluting the bed of David on account of Adultery and Homicide, killing the impious Ahab in war, and Sennacherib the blasphemous King of Assyria, in his idol's temple, by his sons, Isa. 37:37-38.

15. Because in vain we pray and trust in God to avert evils proceeding from contingent causes, unless they were done by the absolute Will of God.

16. Because in vain in such calamities we fear God, and most humbly submit ourselves to his Will; likewise in vain we accept with a grateful soul goods proceeding from contingent causes, unless they were done by the absolute Will of God.

It is asked: Did not God decree all future contingents by a conditioned decree, and does this suffice for saving the Providence of God, as the Arminians teach?

We establish that their conditioned decree is blasphemous and unworthy of God. Which so that it may be better understood, from their opinion, a conditioned decree is one by which God decreed that contingents will be, from the hypothesis that he foreknows, either by Middle Knowledge, or by another unimaginable way, that they are by nature prior to decreeing them to be future. As if God should say, I decree that Peter believe, after I will have foreknown that he will believe, or will determine his will to believing (which comes to the same thing); but I do not decree anything about the free acts of creatures, before I will have foreknown that they will be future, or that the contingent cause will produce those acts, before the determination of my will - this is, I decree that contingent effects will be, if they will be future; and if they are not future, I decree that they will not be. But this decree is blasphemous.

1. Because thus all future contingents are prior as to their futurition to every decree of God; and thus the effects of second causes are prior to the first cause, and its will.

2. It fights with the Freedom of God, that free acts should be future before the free decree of God.

3. It fights with the Wisdom of God, that effects should be future before the act of the wise Will of God.

4. It is adverse to Justice, for the Incest of Absalom to have futurition before the act of the Will of God, punishing the adultery of David by that act; and the despoiling of Job to precede the will of God, chastising Job, and proving his faith and patience.

5. It involves God in fate, and compels his Omnipotence, operating freely ad extra, to contribute concurrence to acts having futurition before all his decree, lest there be given an effect without any influx of the first cause.

6. There is no place for holy fear, submissive patience, due gratitude, hope and confidence, humility, and prayers, and ardor of praying, and holy care, and solicitude of using means, while men are either pressed by calamities which come from free and contingent causes, or while they obtain goods from contingent causes, namely, from Kings, Magnates, friends, enemies, by the industry of farmers, by the care and labor of artisans. Because there is no reason that they should look to the Will of God in all these things, which have futurition before every act of the divine Will.

7. Because God would do nothing from his mere grace in free acts, if all these have futurition before the act of his gracious will.

8. Because all contingent effects come about by Fortune, before, and therefore apart from the act of the divine will; and the providence of God, and therefore God, in the procurement or non-procurement of free acts and contingent effects, will be nothing except non-acting and a bare title, and a name without reality.

9. Because it fights with the Dominion of Providence over all beings, that all contingents should be future before the act of the Will of God.

Luke. 21:18.
But not a hair of your head will perish.

It is asked: Does Fortune reign, according to the Arminians? They deny it; we prove that Fortune dominates in everything, according to them.

1. Because contingents happen with respect to God knowing and ordering by his providence, beyond intention. Therefore, they happen fortuitously with respect to God. The consequence is from Aristotle, whom the Conimbricenses also follow in 2. Arist. Phys., chap. 7, art. 1. Francisco Murcia de la Llana, 2. Phys. 6, q. 1, fig. 10. Thus Julius Sirenius, book 5, On Providence, says that Sins happen fortuitously and rashly.

2. Because the Will of permitting Sin is posterior to the nod and inclination of the created will; and therefore whoever is permitted by God sins, who wills. Therefore, all free evil acts do not absolutely depend on God, and happen beyond the intention of God; therefore, by Fortune.

3. Because from eternity God decrees nothing more about the determination of contingent events to this part rather than to that, than does Fortune. Because God decrees nothing at all about them, but leaves all things to "being able to be" or "being able not to be."

4. Because to persecutions rather than to non-persecutions, to calamities and miseries which we suffer from contingent causes rather to be endured than to not be endured, to good to be obtained or not obtained from second contingent causes, to favorable or adverse things, to riches or poverty, to good fame or ill repute, to honor or ignominy, to life or death, which happen from contingent causes, God confers nothing more primarily, and as an infallibilizing and determining cause, than does Fortune. Therefore, Fortune reigns.

5. Because Prov. 16:33: "The lot is cast into the lap, but its every decision is from Jehovah." But that is false, for the decision of the lot, and its determination, so that it be white rather than black, is either from the hand apprehending the lot, or from the lots themselves, or from God, or from Fortune. Not from the hand, because the bare contact is of itself blind, nor is it directed by any light or instinct, so that it apprehends this lot rather than that one. Not from the lots themselves, because the whole question is about the lots; for they are of themselves determinable and indifferent. Nor is the Decision from God, because the Adversaries deny that God determines second contingent causes; and they teach that he concurs with them by a universal concourse indifferent and determinable, from which neither is the apprehension of the white lot, rather than the black. Therefore, it is from

Fortune alone, or from mere and absolute contingency, by which contingent causes, loosed from all predetermining action of God, and notwithstanding all action of God, can act or not act; and this certainly is a cause superior to God, which is not ruled by God, and is blind Fortune itself. Because if it is Fortune, it is not Providence; and if it is Providence, it is not Fortune.

6. Because in the power of God's Providence there is not a certain and determinate number of contingent and free actions; therefore, it is in the power of blind Fortune. The antecedent is the doctrine of Arminius. They condemn in ours that we teach that with respect to the active Providence of God, and of the Decree, contingent and free causes cannot produce more contingent actions than they produce.

7. There is no reason to give thanks to God for avoiding an evil, which happens through contingent causes. Because they teach that God cannot determine a contingent cause to act, if it is indifferent to not acting; and God cannot determine it to not act, if it is indifferent of itself to acting. Therefore, there is reason to give thanks to Fortune.

Rom. 11:23.
God is able to graft them in again.

It is asked: Does the Dominion of his Providence over free acts stand firm for God, according to the Jesuits and Arminians? They affirm that it stands firm. We deny it.

1. Because, Middle Knowledge standing, all contingent acts have futurition antecedently to the free decree of God. But God cannot have Dominion to procure its existence rather than to impede it, which is future before all the Will of God.

2. He who has true Dominion over a free act, so that it is rather than is not, he can effect that, all things required for acting having been posited, the free act is rather than is not. But according to the Adversaries, God cannot do this; for thus he would destroy Freedom, as they teach.

3. Legal experts rightly define Dominion, that it is the proper faculty of anyone of using a thing for all uses permitted by Law. But God cannot use the Will of Peter, to will rather than to not will, the definition of Freedom which they posit standing.

4. God does not have in his power Dominion about the determinate number of free acts of Angels and Men. Therefore, neither about acts. Because how many acts the free Will

elicits, not more, not fewer, is determined neither by the decree of God, nor by the action of God, but by created Free Will alone, according to the Adversaries.

5. Legal experts rightly deny that the Dominion of the same thing can be wholly in the power of two; because the will of using the same thing in one can be repugnant to the will of using the same in another. But the Arminians teach that the Dominion in not willing rather than in willing is in the power of the created will, even all things required for acting on the part of God having been posited. Therefore, it cannot be in the power of God, who often wills not willing, when man wills; and wills willing, when man does not will, as the Adversaries teach.

6. He does not have dominion of disposing about a thing, who cannot dispose about it as he wills, but as another resisting him wills to dispose. Thus an heir and a wife (as the Legal experts say) do not have perfect Dominion; because they cannot dispose of monies without the consent of the Tutor and Husband, who perhaps resist. Therefore, God does not have Dominion of disposing about the acts of the Will, unless the created will, which often resists God, should consent.

It is asked: Does the Dominion over free acts stand firm for God, according to the Scriptures, and indeed such that he could effect that the free act be, rather than not be? The Remonstrants and Jesuits attribute such Dominion to the Free Will, they do not attribute it to God. But we ascribe such Dominion wholly to God.

1. Because Eph. 3:20: "God is able to do far more abundantly than all that we ask or think, according to the power at work within us." Therefore, to give faith, Charity, Repentance and Perseverance, and the acts of those Virtues, which we daily seek. Rom. 11:23: "God is able to graft them in again." Therefore, he can procure the free conversion of the Jews. 2 Cor. 9:8: "And God is able to make all grace abound to you." Rom. 16:25: "Now to him who is able to strengthen you according to my gospel...to him be glory." Rom. 14:4: "For God is able to make him stand." Jude 24: "Now to him who is able to keep you from stumbling." 1 John 4:4: "Little children, you are from God and have overcome them, for he who is in you is greater than he who is in the world." 1 Pet. 1:5: "Who by God's power are being guarded." John 10:29: "My Father, who has given them to me, is greater than all, and no one is able to snatch them out of the Father's hand." Matt. 19:26: "With man this is impossible, but with God all things are possible." Rom. 15:13: "So that by the power of the Holy Spirit you may abound in hope." Neh. 1:10: "They are your servants and your people, whom you have redeemed by your great power and by your strong hand." But this power exerted itself through free acts in Pharaoh, who freely dismissed the people; through Moses and Aaron, who freely preached, and performed miracles; through the people, who freely went out.

2. Because God can convert and save more, and not convert and damn more, than he converts or saves, or does not convert or damns, if it had so seemed good to him, Acts 26:29, Rom. 11:23.

3. Because God has a greater and more absolute dominion over created wills than the created will has over itself.

4. Because God has the faculty of using every created thing for all licit uses (for thus Dominion is defined). Therefore, God can use the created will and free acts, so that they are or are not, as he knows it to conduce to his glory.

5. Because the determinate number of volitions of men and Angels would not be in the power of God, as to number and species, and consequently neither of the elect nor of the reprobate, if the Providence of God did not have Dominion to as many volitions of men and Angels as it seemed good to God would be future or exist.

6. Because the created will would be the first dominating, not God; and thus it would be the first operating.

7. Prayer and prayers for the unavoidable subjection of the will to filial obedience could not be poured out, unless God, by his invincible Dominion, could procure those acts, rather than non-acts.

8. Faith, repentance, gratitude to God for good or evil free acts of men and Angels, good and evil, would plainly collapse, unless they rested on the Dominion of God, by which he can procure a free act, rather than a non-act.

9. The praise and glory of conversion, rather than of non-conversion, would not be owed to God, but to the created will, if the created will, not God, had dominion in the acts of conversion, rather than of non-conversion.

It is asked: Does God have sufficient Dominion over free acts, because he created the will, conserves it, gives it power, and cooperates with it; and therefore has Dominion over the Will, because he gave the will absolute Dominion, and the free and absolute power of Dominating from the predetermination of God over free acts? The Jesuits affirm it. Fasolus on Thom., q. 14, art. 13, dub. 11, fig. 156. Ruiz on 1 part, Thom., disp. 76, sect. 4, fig. 3. Indeed, he is not the perfect Lord of a Field, who cannot concede the dominion of it, and its use, to another person (says Ruiz in 1, On the Knowledge of God, disp. 49, sect. 2). So Raymundus, Moral Discipline, dis. 2, q. 2. Egidius Coninck, On Supernatural Acts, book 1, disp. 1, dub. 3, fig. 42. So Grevinchovius and other Remonstrants.

But we assert that the Dominion over the will and over free acts cannot stand firm for God, unless it is from God, not only that the will is, but also that it acts or does not act, and that it is in the power of God's Dominion, that this free act exists, rather than does not exist; that there are so many free acts in number, not more, not fewer.

1. Because to have dominion over the will itself, by creating it, conserving it, giving it the power of acting, and not cooperating, is not sufficient Dominion; because God has all these things over the Devils; nevertheless, he would not have sufficient Dominion over them, if they could do whatever pleases them; and yet God created the Devils, conserves them, gives them the power of acting, and cooperates with them. Nor is God said to have dominion sufficiently over the seas, the winds, the storms, the lions, the fires, because he creates all these things, conserves them in being, gives them the power of acting, and concurs with them by a universal concourse; because the Devils, winds, storms, fires, lions, wild beasts can rage and rage against men, against the Church, notwithstanding this Dominion, God being unwilling.

2. He is a more perfect Lord of a Field, who so alienates the Field, that he retains in his hand the use of the Field, and the acts of the Vassal of using the Field, so that he could not do anything except by the Lord willing, directing, and assenting, than he who conceded to another the absolute Dominion of ordaining whatever about the Field, even the Lord being unwilling, prohibiting, grieving, desiring the contrary, as the Adversaries teach.

3. Because God has dominion over being, as being; and over this being, as this being. Therefore, he has Dominion over free acts, as such.

4. Because, this Dominion of God standing, and with the will of the creature obstinate against God, this consequence is valid: God wills that this free act exist, therefore, this free act will not exist; and this is valid: The free creature wills that this free act exist, therefore, this free act will exist. Because the dominion of the created will over free acts is greater than God's, according to the Adversaries.

5. Because, this Dominion standing, it is not in the power of God dominating that there are not more malicious acts of Devils and men against the Church of God, but in the power of Devils and men acting freely. Nor is it in the power of God dominating that there are not more good and supernatural acts than there are, but in the power of the free Will of creatures; because if God does not determine free causes to act by his Dominion, neither can he determine about the number of free acts, good and evil.

6. Because it would not be in the power of God dominating to impede an evil act, as free; nor to impede sins, as sins, unless by annihilating the will, or overturning freedom. But this would be to have dominion over the will, but not to have dominion over the free act.

7. Because the Adversaries say that dominion over its acts does not stand firm for the will, unless it could, all things required for acting having been posited, act or not act. Therefore, God does not have dominion over free acts, because he cannot as much as the will can.

1 Thess. 4:3.
For this is the will of God, your sanctification.

This Question about the volition of God concerning sin is chief between us and the Arminians. Therefore, let the state of the question be here.

Whether God wills that sin be done, he himself permitting? The state of the question must be diligently fixed.

1. It is agreed between us that God foreknows sins, before they are; between us (I say) and the Jesuits, although the Arminians blasphemously deny that God foreknows future sins.

2. It is agreed that God concurs to the material acts of sin, although there is no light controversy about the mode of concourse.

3. That God elicits good from sin.

4. That God neither effects nor causes sin.

5. That he forbids it, prohibits it, and has it in hatred.

6. That God, knowing and willing, permits sins.

7. That God is not the Author of sin, whatever the Adversaries may calumniate.

8. Although the Decree of God intervenes about the existence of sin, men who sin are not excused.

9. That God in no way wills sin by the will of sign, or approving.

Therefore, it is not Asked: 1. Whether God is the cause of sin? As Gregory of Valentia says.

Nor 2. Whether God wills sin in that way in which he wills punishment? Because God positively wills and effects punishment.

3. Nor is it asked (as the Valentinians say) Whether God stimulates men to sin under the aspect of good? Because man is impelled to the act, freedom unharmed, but in no way to the malice.

Nor 4. (As Armin. says, Anti-Perkins, p. 698) Whether by no act of God men are moved to willing or doing evil? But none of ours asserts that God moves men to willing or doing evil.

5. Bellarmine perverts it, On the Loss of Sin, book 2, chap. 3, when he says it is asked Whether God is the Author of sin?

Nor 6. Is it Asked (as Vorstius says, append. to amic. dupl., pp. 36-37) Whether for the most part God truly and properly wills the contrary of that to be done by us, and that by antecedent and absolute will, which God ordinarily commands in his Word under pain of death? We do not acknowledge such a question; indeed, we do not teach that God wills by the will of good pleasure that to be done, which by the will of good pleasure he does not will to be done; nor are the wills contrary here in God, but he approves and commands certain things, as good, which he has decreed to do; he disapproves and prohibits certain things as evil, which he has decreed to permit, that they be done, be done and be done for his glory.

Nor 7. Is it Asked (as the Tridentine Fathers dream) Whether the work of sin is equally the work of God, as the work of obedience?

But the Adversaries teach here: 1. That God intends and has decreed that all that be done and exist, which by the will of sign he commands and orders to us. We deny it.

2. They teach that God in no way wills that sins be done, but that God in the coming about of sin is unwilling, not acting, and idly permitting. We teach that God here is willing.

3. They teach that God wills that which he elicits from sin, namely, that God does not will that sin exist, not even as it is a means of illustrating the divine glory, but from the hypothesis that sin exists, God being unwilling, God wills the good of Justice or Mercy, which is elicited from sin. We teach that God permissively wills that sin be done, not simply, as sin, but as a means of illustrating the glory of Justice and Mercy.

4. They teach that permission is a bare and idle intuition of God doing nothing, by which God himself does nothing, but commits it to the Free Will of the creature, that it sin or not sin. We reject the figment of idle permission, as repugnant to Providence.

Therefore, it is Asked: Whether God, not by bare and idle permission, but by some active and positive act of the divine permitting will, actually wills that sin exist, insofar as it is a means ostensive of the divine glory, God meanwhile disapproving and detesting sin, as dishonest evil, although in the genus of useful good, he wills sin, namely, as it conduces to illustrating the glory of God? Or, whether God has decreed that sin be done, he himself permitting, the creature failing, insofar as sin is a means of the glory of God? The adversaries deny it. We prove it.

1. Gen. 45:7: Not the brothers of Joseph, but God sent him into Egypt. Acts 2:23 and 4:27: Because the crucifiers of Christ did nothing other than what God decreed to be done. And chap. 13, v. 29: They fulfilled all that was written of Christ. 1 Kings 22:20, 23: The spirit of lying in the mouth of the Prophets, sent by God, enticed Ahab to the battle prohibited by God, so that he might be killed there. 2 Sam. 24:1: God incited David to number the people of God. 2 Sam. 12:11: That Absalom should impiously pollute the bed of his Father, God ascribes to himself: "I will do this thing before the sun." 1 Chron. 5:26: God stirred up the spirit of Pul king of Assyria, etc., to carry the people away captive. 2 Chron. 21:16: Therefore Jehovah stirred up against Jehoram the spirit of the Philistines and of the Arabians, v. 17, who went up against Judah and invaded his land. Isa. 45:7: I am Jehovah, creating light and forming darkness, making peace and creating evil. Job 1:21: The Lord gave, and the Lord has taken away. Ezek. 14:9: I, Jehovah, have enticed that prophet. 1 Cor. 1:19- 20: He destroys the wisdom of the wise. 2 Thess. 2:11: God will send them a strong delusion, so that they may believe what is false. 1 Pet. 3:17: It is better to suffer for doing good, if that should be God's will, than for doing evil. Rev. 17:17: For God has put it into their hearts to carry out his purpose.

2. God imposes on all the posterity of Adam, from his free ordination alone, the necessity of contracting Original sin. Therefore, he wills that sin happen, he himself permitting.

3. Because he permits sin for a determinate end, which he does not attain without sin.

4. Because God, knowing and willing, so moves the wills of men, that they sin; and he can so move, that they do not sin, and he does not will to move them otherwise.

5. Because he uses Devils and men in the act of sinning, as his instruments for executing his judgments. Assyria is the rod of God's anger, Isa. 10:5. A razor hired, Isa. 7:20. Babylon,

the golden cup in the hand of God, Jer. 51:7. The hammer of God, Jer. 50:23. Nebuchadnezzar, the servant of God, Jer. 25:9 and 27:6.

6. Because in vain we pray to God, that he avert the hatred of the impious; for God could answer, I cannot help, it is not my will that the wicked man hate you.

7. Because there is no reason why the saints should patiently submit themselves to the will of God in persecutions, which they suffer from wicked men; because it is not the will of God that those wicked men afflict the saints. For the object of patience would be the will of the oppressors, which acquiescence is Idolatry.

8. Because neither with gratitude, hope, faith, fear, nor joy in God, is it to be relied on, if God altogether did not will, nor decree, that the impious should injure the Saints of God.

9. Because in vain I seek consolations in God, who did not serve such a cup to me, nor willed me to drink, nor appointed for the injuries inflicted on me by nefarious men.

10. Because gratitude, faith, hope, fear, joys, consolations, would ultimately recur to the will of impious men, and of Devils, as to the infallibilizing cause; because the permission of God here denies that the will of God is that we suffer from impious men; and God commits it to the judgment of men afflicting us, that we suffer these things, or do not suffer them.

11. Because, according to the Adversaries, contrary to that in Isa. 10:15, the impious can glory against God, if God is not the principal cause in persecutions, as the axe would glory against the one wielding it.

12. Because if God is a bare permitter here, and altogether unwilling that the impious should afflict us, then 1. he desires that the saints be tried by evils, as gold, and yet does not will that the flame seize them. 2. If God is here non-willing and a bare permitter, he is also uncaring.

13. Because if God is here unwilling, he does not love to chasten his own through most wicked instruments, contrary to Scripture, Rev. 3:19, Prov. 3:12: "Whom I love, I chasten."

14. Because it is alien to the decree of the wise God, to mortify the Saints through injuries inflicted on them by the world, if in such injuries, God is non-acting and non-willing.

15. Because it fights with the paternal care of God, that he would not will persecutions inflicted on his Servants, that three, rather than four, and that the temptation be proportionate to the strength of the one tempted, 1 Cor. 10:13. And that he would not will

the Church to be oppressed by the Chaldeans, for 70 years, rather than for only 20, or only 10 years. And accordingly it is necessary that God will persecutions simply. For if the paternal care of God tempers and moderates the afflictions of his own, he cannot not will them; indeed, the just Will of God cannot not ordain about the number, measure, weight, species, and mode of temptations - as that Sennacherib should immolate his son, rather than a sheep, to his Idol; that Christ should be crucified rather than taken away by a milder death; that the Sabeans should vex Job with such grave injuries rather than lighter ones.

16. God could not threaten obduration to the reprobate in punishment, unless he in some way willed it.

17. Because Ministers could not console those oppressed by the World, in this way, that they ought to be of good courage, while they suffer evils from nefarious men; because this is the will of the most clement Father.

18. Because it fights with the wise order of the Universe, that the pious should be afflicted by the wicked, God being non-willing, and not caring; but that should happen, which is the intrinsic matter of primitive Justice, God being unwilling; that the falls of the most noble creatures, men and Angels, should happen, God neither willing nor intending; that man was created by God for an ambiguous end.

It is asked: Whether God wills sin, insofar as it is the punishment of sin? The Jesuits and Arminians deny it. We prove it.

1. Because Rom. 1:26: For their idolatry, God gave them up to dishonorable passions. For their women exchanged natural relations for those that are contrary to nature, v. 28: And since they did not see fit to acknowledge God, God gave them up to a debased mind to do what ought not to be done. 2 Thess. 2:11: Therefore God sends them a strong delusion, so that they may believe what is false, v. 12: in order that all may be condemned who did not believe the truth.

2. Because God threatens obduration and sins in punishment, Isa. 6:9, Matt. 13:13-14, Acts 28:26-27.

3. Because God threatens his people, that the Assyrians, Chaldeans and others will lay them waste and lead them captive. But this devastation was a grave sin.

4. Because every just thing by participation, is from the first just thing per se. But it was just that the bed of David be polluted by incest, because he had polluted the bed of his neighbor. It was just, that Nebuchadnezzar should punish the idolatry of the people by

slaughter, sword, captivity; and it is just, that he who is an abomination to Jehovah, fall into a harlot, Prov. 22:14. Therefore, this is from the first Just one per se.

2 Thess. 2:11.
Therefore God sends them a strong delusion.

It is asked: Is sin the punishment of sin? The adversaries deny that sin is formally the punishment of sin. They teach that the entitative act is punishment. 2. That permission is punishment. 3. That sin is causatively and meritoriously punishment. But they deny that sin is formally and properly punishment. We prove it.

1. The Scriptures brought forward before prove it; to which add, 2 Sam. 12:11, 2 Sam. 16:11, 1 Kings 22:20-21, 2 Chron. 32:31, Isa. 19:14 and 29:10, Rom. 11:8, Prov. 22:14.

2. Because that which deprives man of the highest good, namely God, and of the good of reason (and brands the soul with stain and guilt), and of the owed good of legal rectitude, and converts men to creatures, and constitutes them most vile, is the most grave punishment. But sin, as such, does this.

3. Because God threatens sin in punishment, as the devastation and captivity of his people by the Assyrians and Chaldeans.

4. Because all the persecutions inflicted on the saints by impious men are great sins, and at the same time chastisements and punishments inflicted on the servants of God.

5. Because it is just that the impious be hardened, and be filled with all unrighteousness, as Paul says, Rom. 1:29-30. Therefore, this is a punishment justly inflicted by God.

It is asked: Whether, because punishment is involuntary and passion, sin voluntary and action, therefore sin cannot be punishment? Thus say the Jesuits and Arminians. We deny it.

1. Because the stain, turpitude, guilt, aversion from the highest good, which are penalties in sin, are involuntary; for the sinner would wish to lack these, and enjoy the illicit good.

2. Because not every punishment is involuntary; for if a Physician in punishment gives wine to an insolent sick man, thus to drink is voluntary to the sick man, and yet punishment. Thus the punishment of loss, as it is contradistinguished from the punishment of sense, is often inflicted on the unknowing, in which it has the rationale

neither of voluntary nor involuntary; as is clear in the impious, who unknowing and blind are fattened for the day of destruction, Ps. 73:2-4, Job 21:2-6, Jer. 12:1-3, Hos. 4:13-14. Because a drunk man is punished, while he is carried to prison by the Lictors, who nevertheless is not unwillingly carried there.

3. Because depraved habit, Original sin, vicious inclinations in man, which are vices by the Law of God, would not be sins; because they are not actions.

It is asked: Is God a bare permitter and a cause per accidens of obduration, committing it to the judgment of man, that he can be hardened or not hardened, according to his own judgment? The Remonstrants affirm it. We deny it.

1. Because God threatens obduration as punishment, most often. But punishment is not subject to the judgment of him who is punished. An idle and supine Judge is he, who commits it to the judgment of the guilty, that he can be punished or not punished.

2. Punishment is good; and punishing is a good work of Justice. But it is absurd for something just to be from the first just one per accidens.

3. Every just thing from a cause per accidens, is from another cause per se. Therefore, that a sinner be punished by sin, either is a work of Justice from God, which is the point; or from Fortune, which is abominable; or from the sinner himself, which is absurd. For he, as such, acts badly and unjustly sins against God.

4. Punishment is unavoidable by the creature, to whom God threatens it. Therefore, it is not in the judgment of man, that he be hardened or not hardened.

5. Because if God hardens per accidens, only by idle permission through good occasions and the preaching of the Gospel, which men abuse to harden themselves, then God has no other action in the hardening of Pharaoh, than in the hardening of David and the saints; indeed, he objects such occasions to them, which they can abuse to harden themselves.

6. Because there is no reason why anyone should pray, that God avert obduration, and give thanks to God for a softened heart, if God here is a bare permitter, committing the punishment to be inflicted to the Free Will of man, that he can harden himself or not harden himself. Because we do not pray to God for that which he himself does not have in his will; but if he is in no way an actor and cause per se here, God does not have culpable obduration in his power.

1 Thess. 2:16.

Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they may be saved, so as always to fill up the measure of their sins. But wrath has come upon them to the uttermost.

It is asked: Are there any acts of hardened men (such as Pharaoh and others were), which are in themselves and considered per se evil, and contrary to the divine Law, and therefore also worthy of punishment; yet when they are exercised by such men, from some penal judgment of God, do not come into the reckoning of sins, so that they increase guilt and punishment no more than the acts of Satan, which do not increase damnation? Thus the Remonstrants in the Synodical writings, art. 1, p. 202. But we deny this.

1. Because the Devils now sin, and obduration in evil does not absolve either Devils or men from the obligation of the Law.

2. Because men sinning according to "hardness of heart and unrepentant heart, store up wrath for themselves on the day of wrath," Rom. 2:5.

3. Because Pharaoh, already hardened, is both rebuked and more severely punished by God, Exod. 7:14-15, 9:1-2; and when more often hardened, he is further hardened, so that he pursues the people of God into the Red Sea, Exod. 14:3-4, Acts 28:24-25, Jude 8-12, 2 Pet. 2:13-17.

4. Because thus sins against the Holy Spirit, which are not committed except by the exceedingly hardened, would not be sins - which is absurd. To what purpose are the threats against this sin? Matt. 12:32-33, Heb. 6:2-5, 10:26-28.

5. Because murders, parricides, poisonings, betrayals, blasphemies, perpetrated by the hardened, would not be sins; they ought not to be reproved or punished by God or by the Magistrate.

6. The hardened could securely mock God, and heap up sins upon sins; since now they could further increase neither sins nor punishments.

7. Because God takes care that promises be preached to the exceedingly hardened, mixed with the elect; he gives hope of pardon, offers the kingdom of heaven under the condition of Repentance, rebukes them, reproves, threatens, urges with commands, invites, prays,

desires that they repent. But all these would here be deceitful hypocrisy, feigned expression of a double will; indeed, they would argue God of blasphemy, lying, evil deceit.

8. Because these acts fight with the Law of God, and yet are not sins - which is absurd, James 3:4.

9. Such and such a person would take away the essential rationale of sin; and what in other wayfarers is sin worthy of eternal punishment and to be punished, in this or that one would not be; and preceding sins would take away the guilt and stain, and the punishment of subsequent sins in the way.

10. Because universal grace would not always be connected with the Gospel, as they madly say.

11. Because God would often rebuke those who are constrained by Physical, let alone Moral, necessity of sinning - which they condemn in Ours.

It is asked: Does God impel men to the sins which he prohibits? The Remonstrants deny it, art. 1, p. 250, in the Synodical writings. We think it blasphemous that God impels to sins by Moral impulse; but by Physical and judicial impulse, he impels to sins.

1. Because he concurs to the entitative act of sin.

2. Because he punishes sin with sin.

3. Because he impels all second causes, and therefore free wills, to acting, Prov. 21:1.

4. Because he permissively intends sins for the illustration of his glory.

It is asked: Did God preordain absolutely the passions in the death of Christ, but not the unjust actions? The Remonstrants affirm it. We deny it.

1. Because Herod and Pilate were gathered together to do actively what God decreed that they should do, Acts 4:27-28.

2. Action and passion are really the same motion. It is impossible, therefore, that God absolutely preordained that Christ should be killed by the Jews, unless he also preordained that the Jews should kill Christ.

3. It is foolish that God first decreed the passive killing of Christ, by agents, I know not whom; and by another new decree God permissively decreed the active killing of Christ - as if the death of Christ was twice decreed by God.

It is asked: Was the Death of Christ absolutely decreed by God, but by which free agents he was killed, was it decreed by God conditionally and avoidably only? Thus Corvinus against Molina, chap. 4, q. 3. We deny it.

1. Because such a decree is confused and unworthy of God, by which God decreed that Christ should be killed, but ignorant by whom - by good or by evil instruments, by Christ himself or by others, by God or by men; then, that God by a second care proceeded to decree that the death of Christ be procured by nefarious men.

2. The death of Christ was thus twice decreed by God, once absolutely, once conditionally.

3. If first in general and confusedly, the death of Christ was inevitably and absolutely decreed by God, it could have happened that he was killed by others than by the Jews. But Scripture says that this very death, which Christ suffered, was preordained by God according to all the circumstances: As to the mode of death and kind, Deut. 21:23, Gal. 3:10-12, Isa. 53:12. As to the persons, attendants, place, all circumstances, as is clear from the prophecies of the Old Testament, the predictions of Christ, and their fulfillment, Ps. 41:10 (Cf. Acts 1:16), Ps. 118:22 (Cf. Acts 4:11), Ps. 2:1 (Cf. Acts 4:25-28), Ps. 22:13, 17, 19, Luke 18:31-33.

4. Because God absolutely decrees as to agents and all circumstances other sinful actions of lesser moment in the government of the universe than is the killing of Christ (on which depended the salvation of all the elect), and infallibly executes them according to his decree - as the devastation of many lands and cities, even in Judea, by Sennacherib King of Assyria, Isa. 37:26-27. Likewise, that these and those Kings by these and those modes and flagitious and impious acts exalt Antichrist, Rev. 17:17: "For God has put it into their hearts to carry out his purpose by being of one mind and handing over their royal power to the beast, until the words of God are fulfilled."

It is asked: Does God prohibit in his Law the act, or the malice of the act? The Arminians affirm that the act itself is formally prohibited, in Script. Synod., art. p. 235. Arminius, Antiperkins., p. 730. They say that God cannot even predetermine to the act, without necessarily predetermining to the malice, because the act itself is formally prohibited by God in the Law. Therefore Arminius says that the very eating of the fruit of the Knowledge [of good and evil] is to sin, the whole inordination consisting in this, that that act of eating

has a place in the number and order of human actions. We, to the contrary, contend that entitative acts, as such, are neither commanded nor prohibited.

1. Because entitative acts are neither morally pleasing to God, nor morally are they to him an object of hatred and displeasure; because to act simply is neither morally good nor evil, but only to act well or badly.

2. Because God bears Law to man, as he is an Ethical agent and capable of beatitude. But to do Physical acts befits man, as he is a Physical, not an Ethical agent.

3. Because those acts are formally commanded and forbidden, which make us blessed or miserable. But entitative acts are not such, but only walking in the Law of God, Ps. 119:1, or deviating from it.

4. Because God formally commands that to the effecting of which the Saints implore the grace of God; and he forbids that which men perpetrate destitute of grace.

It is asked: Are the act and disorder distinguished in all sins? The Arminians deny it there. We prove that they are always distinguished.

1. Because no act is essentially disordered; for thus the act would be essentially the disorder itself, which is plainly Manichaean. Because although snow is white, yet it is not whiteness itself; and form or privation are predicated of acts to which they inhere in the concrete, but by no means in the abstract.

2. Scripture distinguishes these, Isa. 1:16: "Remove the evil of your deeds." Thus Hos. 5:15, Isa. 65:2, Gal. 5:19. Therefore, the work is one thing, the flesh cleaving to the work is another.

3. Arminius confesses that eating is in itself a natural act, having no disorder in itself. But truly the prohibition of a Legislator does not take away the nature of a natural act, nor transubstantiate it into the disorder itself.

4. Because the act is a real and positive being; the disorder, a moral and privative being.

5. The act is metaphysically good, and the proper effect of the first cause; but the disorder is essentially evil.

6. If the act were forbidden per se, therefore also the contrary act, which is the substrate of supernatural goodness, would be commanded per se; and thus our act physically would be essentially obedience itself - which is absurd.

It is asked: Is sin essentially opposed to God? The Arminians affirm it, who teach that sin is opposed to the Nature of God. We reply that there is a twofold repugnancy. One is internal, such as is between two accidents, hot and cold. The other is external, which is non-convenience, such as is between those things which are first diverse, substance and quantity. In the former way, there is no repugnancy between God and Creatures. Nor is Sin opposed to God, either privatively, because the privation of the Highest Good cannot be given, because that is the destruction of God; nor is it opposed to God contrarily, because that opposition is only between Accidents; nor relatively, because thus posited sin, God would be taken away, or posited God, sin would be taken away - which is absurd; nor is there here Contradiction, because thus every creature is opposed to God, for God is non-man, non-tree, non-angel. From which it follows that Sin takes away neither God, nor anything of the Divine Nature. Therefore, it only takes away something approved by the free Will of God, namely it takes away the rectitude which the free will of God requires to be in the acts and powers of our Soul. Nor is anything posited through Sin or the existence of Sin, which is contrary either to God, or to the Nature of God, or to the essential properties of God - indeed, not even to the will or Decree of God. For who has resisted his will?, Rom. 9:19.

It is asked: Does God concur to the entitative acts of Sin, by an indifferent, universal, and determinable concourse by the second cause, so that it is not from God, but from the second cause, that the effect of the will is good or evil, forbidden or commanded? The Jesuits and Arminians affirm it. We deny it, and say that their opinion is absurd and repugnant to the sacred Scriptures. Because if it is not from God, but only from the determining will, that the action of the will is good or evil, then:

1. In vain we pray that God conciliate favor and grace for us with men; and prayers should be conceived to fortune or Free Will, in whose power is either grace or hatred. In vain we implore from God either acts of believing or of repenting, rather than of not believing, not repenting.

2. Because God would in vain promise us goods, or threaten evils, which are done through free agents; because goods or evils are such from the created will, not from God.

3. Because we give thanks to God in vain for liberation from evil, or the conferral of good through free agents; in vain we trust in him, hope, in vain we fear him; and we patiently

submit our wills to him, afflicted by enemies, so that either the good freely to come to us may be granted, or the present or imminent evil may be averted.

4. The sentence of each one will not be from the Lord, but from the judge, who determines the concourse of God to a just or unjust sentence, as it pleases him.

5. Because acts of believing, repenting are no more from God concurring in this way, than acts of resisting God calling.

6. Because God cannot convert more than he converts; nor leave more in their natural blindness than he leaves.

It is asked: Does God predetermine second causes to all their actions? I reply: The Jesuits and Arminians deny this. But we teach that all second causes are predetermined by God; from which, free causes are then also determined by themselves under God, and determine other inferiors. This is proven by the arguments brought forward above, to which let these be added:

1. Because the first agent is also the first determining.

2. Because he uses the wills of good and evil men, of his angels and of devils, to confer benefits or to inflict punishments on men; he uses False prophets to seduce Ahab, the Assyrians as the rod of his fury, Nebuchadnezzar as his servant and hammer in all things which he contrives with a bloodthirsty mind against the people of God, to chastise and humiliate his Church; Herod, Pilate, and the Jews, to crucify the Savior, and to fulfill all things which are written of Christ, Acts 13:29.

3. The praise and glory of particular providence, and of the world gloriously and wisely administered, will perish for God, if the predetermination of their acts is in the power of the wills of Devils and men.

4. All the acts of Devils and the impious, according to the adversaries, would happen not only beyond the intention of God, but even God being unwilling - this being posited, that God would not will any material acts of sin to exist. But if the predetermination is in the power of free creatures, they could operate all their acts, God being unwilling.

It is asked: Because God predetermines the will to the material acts of sin, is he therefore the author of sin? The Jesuits and Remonstrants calumniate that we, on this account, make God the principal and chief Cause of sin. Thus Bellarmine, Stapleton, and the Arminians.

But we teach that the action of God and of men sinning is the same, according to material being, but not according to moral being. But that it is the same action according to material being is clear:

1. Because the Sabeans took away the goods of Job, and God through the Sabeans took away those same goods. But Job was not twice despoiled of his goods, once by God, and once by the Sabeans.

2. Because while the concubines are taken away from David through incest, God by this very thing through Absalom polluting the bed of his Father chastises David. Therefore, it is the same material action of God and of Absalom.

3. God, Isa. 10:12, performs his work in Zion by punishing the Church through the Assyrians, oppressing the people of God as through the rod of his fury, v. 5.

4. God, through the King of Babylon, as through his servant and hammer, punishes his Church with slaughter, sword, and captivity. But truly the action of God and of men is not the same according to moral being; because God acts justly from all four causes, while he punishes the Church through sinning instruments; but the action of the instruments is morally unjust and vicious. Because God, superior to every Law given to men, does not sin; but men, if they used other men sinning in this way in the act of sinning, would gravely sin. Nor is the holy nature of God here a Law to him, by which it is not permitted to God to exercise the supreme, eminent, judicial act through sinning instruments.

It is asked: Is God therefore not the cause of the thing caused, namely, of the malice, although he is the cause of the cause (namely) of the act, because God concurs to the act by a universal and indifferent concourse, and the concourse of God is not the cause why the act is supernatural and good rather than an act forbidden by the Law of God? Thus say the Jesuits and Arminians. But we teach that God is not the cause of the malice, although he is the cause of the act.

1. God is not the cause of the malice for this reason, because he is not bound to give rectitude to the act; but man is bound, as Scotus says, 2. Distinct. 34, §. 1.

2. Because the concourse of God is as it were Physical and necessary, but not moral; nor is God here subjected to Law.

It is asked: Do ours conspire with the Libertines in this doctrine? The Remonstrants affirm it. We deny it.

1. Because Quintinus, an impure pig, said that God himself steals in the thief, fornicates in the fornicator, lies in the perjurer. Not even envy itself dares to object such things to us.

2. Quintinus says that fornications, thefts, lies are holy works of God.

3. That they are not to be censured, unless someone thinks God is to be censured.

4. The Libertines say that all evil works are the same in every way of God and men, both materially and morally.

5. The Libertines state that men are already judged and condemned, and there is no Last Judgment. We relegate such dogmas to Orcus.

6. The Libertines said that those who accuse others of sin are hypocrites, abusing that passage Matt. 7:5: "Hypocrite, first take the log out of your own eye."

7. The Libertines extinguished the conscience of sin, and had the irresistible Providence of God, the authoress of all crimes, for conscience. We teach nothing of the sort.

8. The Florentines said that sin is mere opinion and imagination, and nothing to God. We state that it is a violation of the holy Law of God.

9. The Libertines strove to indulge the flesh, to live lavishly and jovially. We have not so learned Christ.

10. The Libertines taught that men do not properly sin, nor are they subjected to the wrath of God. We hold, teach, and defend the contrary.

It is asked: Is that distinction frivolous, by which we teach that God hates sin, and yet wills its existence? Arminius affirms it, Anti-Perkins, p. 701. We deny it.

1. Because for God to hate sin is not for God to intend that sin should never exist; because it is false that God decreed that the crucifixion of the Savior, the selling of Joseph, the leading away of his people into captivity by the Assyrians and Chaldeans, the defection of the ten Tribes also from the family of David, the despoiling of Job by the Sabeans, should not exist.

2. Because sin in itself is a dishonest evil, and an object of displeasure and of disapproving will. But truly for sin to exist is a useful good and conducive to the glory of God; and every good existing in time was decreed by God from eternity.

3. Because Arminius falsely imputes to us in the explication of our distinction that we teach that God wills and approves existing sin and that God does not hate existing sin. For God hates sin and hates the existence of sin in the genus of a dishonest thing, and yet he decreed to permit that it should exist in the genus of a useful thing.

4. Twisse rightly says that M. Cato wanted Carthage to exist, insofar as it was a whetstone and matter for exercising the virtue of the Roman youth, and yet he did not want, i.e., he hated Carthage. Indeed, I add that Peter rightly wanted Christ to spare himself, lest he be killed by impious enemies; and because he did not want this, Christ rightly called him Satan. And yet Peter was bound to hate that killing, as sin, Matt. 16:21-23.

It is asked: Are all good and evil acts individuated and determined by God, as to the singularity and numerical unity of the acts? The Jesuits and Arminians deny it, because they want it to be from the created will that these acts, and so many, are, not others, not more; but not from God determining. We, to the contrary.

1. Not a sparrow falls to the earth, nor this lot rather than that, without God. Therefore, neither does this act rather than that happen without God determining.

2. Because God thus could not do more good through free creatures than he does, nor impede more evil through them than he impedes.

3. Because this numerical taking away of the goods of Job, this killing of Christ, this evil of the devastation of the people by the Chaldeans, is ascribed to God.

4. Because the number of beings would not be from God; nor the abundance and want of grain, herds, monies, of the acts of favor and hatred, of injuries, benefits, which often flow from free causes, would not be from God, contrary to Deut. 28.

5. Because it would not be from God that Christ was crucified rather than stoned; that he rather than Barabbas was killed; that Solomon, not Adonijah, was heir of the Davidic kingdom; that the counsel of Ahithophel was rejected rather than received.

7. Because the number of the converted and non-converted, of the elect and reprobate, would not be from God; because conversion rather than non-conversion would not be from God, but from the created will.

8. Because the created will would be the first determining.

It is asked: Is permission a bare non-efficiency, and an abandonment of the will, by its natural indifference of acting or not acting? Thus say the Jesuits and Arminians. We deny it.

1. Because permission is often an act of punishing. But it is not committed to any creature that it can be punished or not punished according to its own judgment, even after the sentence has been passed.

2. Because thus Permission would have place in good acts; and the good Angels, Christ, and all the Saints would be permitted by God to fail finally, because their will is not violenced to good.

3. Because in Devils, parricides, and in all the slaves of the Devil, in whom the will is not violenced, there would be the same permission as in the Elect and the Regenerate.

It is asked: Is the permission of sin done only suasorily? Arminius affirms it. We deny it.

1. Thus God would permit sin, as Cicero and the Devil do.

2. Because permission would as much posit sin not future as future, as dissuasion from sinning does.

3. Because if he permits only by persuasions, there is no reason to give thanks to God for an impeded sin; there is no reason to pray that God impede it. Because it is in our power to believe persuasions or not.

It is asked: Does sin necessarily follow from permission having been posited, by logical necessity? The Arminians deny it, Remonstr. Confess., chap. 6, thes. 3. Armin., Anti-Perkins, p. 667. We affirm it.

1. Because permission is the negation of efficacious grace required for avoiding this sin, temptation urging, Here and now. But sin necessarily follows from the negation of grace having been posited, in the hour of temptation.

2. Because Scripture argues from the position of permission to the position of sin. God permitted Pharaoh to detain his people, and Sihon to deny passage to the people. Therefore, the former detained, the latter denied passage. Likewise, God did not permit

Abimelech to violate Sarah, the wife of Abraham. Therefore he did not violate her, Gen. 20:6. He did not permit his people to perpetrate the abominations of the nations. Therefore, they did not perpetrate them, Deut. 18:14. Thus Gen. 31:29, 1 Sam. 25:32, Ps. 106:41, Acts 17:30.

3. The permission of sin is often the punishment of sin. But it is not punishment, except insofar as sin follows permission.

4. Because it is necessary for form or privation to inhere in a capable subject, at the owed time. Therefore, grace having been denied (as happens in permission), it is necessary to posit privation, namely, sin.

5. Because to state that sin permitted is not posited, permission having been posited, fundamentally extirpates the fear of God, confidence, the fervor of praying, humility, gratitude; because in vain I holily pray or fear, lest God permit me to sin, lest he deliver me to a reprobate mind, if I can not sin, permission having been posited.

Chapter 3. On Election.

Rom. 9:11.

It is asked: Is Election to salvation twofold? One indefinite and general, namely, by which God elects all believers to salvation, not considering these or those persons; the other definite and special, by which God elects certain ones to glory by name, insofar as he intuits them as finally believing? The Arminians affirm it. We deny it.

1. Because indefinite Election is not Election; because in it no singular person is ordained to salvation, but only the mode of arriving at salvation is promiscuously prescribed to all; and it can stand with the eternal Reprobation of all, and the eternal damnation of the same. But Election (of which in the Scriptures) does not stand with the damnation of the Elect, Rom. 8:30: "Those whom he predestined he also called, justified, glorified."

2. Because indefinite Reprobation also stands with the eternal salvation of all - which is absurd.

3. Election is a singular indivisible act, about ordering determinate men to glory; as is the preparation of such a portion of clay for honor, Rom. 9:21.

4. Because men would thus be twice elected; once in the General Election, and again in the special Election.

5. Because Election is an act of divine love, separating these persons from those, to glory, Eph. 1:4: "Even as he chose us in him," etc. Rom. 9:30. But by this general Election, God pursues Judas and Simon Magus with as much love as Peter and Paul.

It is asked: Is any Predestination or Election in the Scriptures other than of singular, definite, and certain persons? Or truly, of all promiscuously, if they should will to believe? The Arminians in Coll. Hag., p. 34. Corvinus against Tilenus, p. 53, say that the decree of Election is nothing other than the decree by which God decreed to justify and save believers in Christ.

We, to the contrary, teach that Election is only of certain persons.

1. Thus Scripture, Matt. 20:16: "Many are called, but few are chosen." Matt. 24:22: "And if those days had not been cut short, no human being would be saved. But for the sake of the elect those days will be cut short." Rom. 9:11: "Though they were not yet born and had done nothing either good or bad," etc. Rom. 11:5: "So too at the present time there is a remnant, chosen by grace." John 15:16: "You did not choose me, but I chose you and appointed you that you should go and bear fruit." Therefore, they are elected so that they might believe, not because they had believed.

2. Because they are defined by certain pronouns, Rom. 8:30: "Those whom he predestined," etc.

3. Because the number of the elect is certain; and as many as believe in time, not more, not fewer, Acts 13:48: "And as many as were appointed to eternal life believed."

4. Because the elect are inscribed in the book of life, Luke 10:20, Phil. 4:3, Rev. 21:27. But those who are thus designated in the mind of God are not Lunar men, wandering in a common notion, not circumscribed by the Arminians' "Provided that, If."

5. Because that election is of all and each one if they should believe, and Scriptural Election is not of all; because not all are elect, not all are given by the Father to the Son.

6. Because Christ determinately acknowledges the Elect as his own, as his sheep, John 10:16, as his peculiar flock, as those given to him by the Father, John 17:9.

7. Because this Election is the will of God about the Means of salvation. Therefore, it is not Election. Because by the decree of Election faith is given, or denied to whom God wills, and as he elects or does not elect men. But by the will about means, faith is given to no one.

8. Because this Election can stand with the eternal salvation of all; and thus it is not Election, and the taking of some with others passed by. And it can stand with the eternal damnation of all.

It is asked: Does God destine certain ones to glory incompletely, revocably, for a time, and not peremptorily, namely, those who only for a time believe; but others he destines to glory completely, irrevocably and peremptorily, namely, those whom he foreknows as finally believing, and expiring in faith? The Arminians affirm it, Apol., c. 9, fol. 104.

We judge revocable and mutable Election to be plainly blasphemous.

1. Because the counsel of God is immutable to the heirs, Heb. 6:17, and to a certain person, namely, to Abraham, vv. 13-15, who nevertheless could have (according to the Adversaries) fallen away; nor was all his obedience after the oath of God violent, but free. And Rom. 11:29: "For the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable." Therefore, the Jews are not plainly rejected, but are still beloved by God as to Election. Likewise Mal. 3:6: "For I, Jehovah, do not change; therefore you, O children of Jacob, have not been consumed." Therefore, if they had been consumed, whom God had decreed never to be consumed, Jehovah would have been changed; and if they did not obtain the glory, whom God had destined to glory, God would have been changed.

2. Because Rom. 8:30: "Those whom he predestined he also called, and those whom he called he also justified, and those whom he justified he also glorified." But if man were not peremptorily elect before the end of life, God would predestine many whom he would never glorify. Then the order of the Apostle would be inverted, and it would have to be said, those whom God justified, those and no others he predestined.

3. Because no one would be elect in this life, nor would have eternal glory in this life; indeed, he would be as much reprobated revocably and incompletely as elected revocably and incompletely. But many in this life are elect, Eph. 1:4, Matt. 20:16, 24:25. Indeed, Christ wanted the disciples to rejoice in this life that their names were inscribed in the book of life, Luke 10:20.

4. Because revocable Election is a mutable volition in God, and a mutable love, contrary to what Scripture says, which says that the love of God is eternal, and those whom he loves, he loves to the end.

5. Because seven times and a hundred times in one, God would fix and rescind his eternal counsels and decrees, as often as man believes or does not believe.

6. Because new decrees would begin and cease in time in God, and ancient ones would recede.

7. Because no one would have hope, confidence, joy, and Christian consolations in the sense of Election, which nevertheless are commanded to the Elect in the Word, Luke 10:20: "Rejoice that your names are inscribed in heaven."

8. Because if Pilate said, "What I have written, I have written," much more God, whom I have destined to eternal glory as inscribed in the book of life, I have destined them to eternal glory.

9. Because Christ would falsely say to certain ones, Matt. 7:23: "I never knew you," because he at one time knew as his own those elected revocably to glory, for whom he suffered death and whose salvation he seriously intended on his part, equally as of the others who were saved after constant faith and piety.

10. Because Christ would wrongly prove that he ought to call many from the Gentiles, because (he says) they are my sheep, John 10:16, namely, in my eternal predestination. But there is no consequence, if they are only revocably elected, and are not certainly elected before the end of life. Because thus they were not Christ's, until they expired in faith; but to what purpose is there need of a call to faith, for the dead?

11. If we are chosen before the foundation of the world, Eph. 1:4, and grace was given to us according to purpose before times eternal, 2 Tim. 1:9, therefore, there is no pendulous and fluctuating Election, depending on the last acts of Free Will, in which men expire.

12. Because the complete and incomplete Election standing, no Election to Adoption can be imagined, and therefore to faith, of which Paul speaks, Eph. 1:5. Because according to the adversaries, we are elected for a time because we believe; and we are not elected for another time, because we do not believe.

13. Because no wise man destines a man, whom he foreknows will never attain the end, to the end for a time - as if God should say, I foreknow that Judas is to be damned to eternity, and will never attain eternal glory; yet I destine him to glory for a time, and I know well enough that I will at length retract and commute my destining will.

14. Because there would be such a promise in Scripture: Do this, and you will be irrevocably elected, namely, after death you will be elected to glory, and that peremptorily and irrevocably. But such a promise is found nowhere in the Scriptures.

15. Because it would be false, that in Ps. 33:10-11, the counsels of the nations are mutable and can be dissipated; but God's cannot be rescinded, but consist immutable to all generations. Because the counsels of God destining Judas to glory can be fixed and rescinded before the end of Judas's life; indeed, these counsels are revocable, as it pleases Judas.

16. Because Peter finally believing would elect God irrevocably, and would be the peremptory cause of Election; nor would thanks here be owed more to God, because Peter is irrevocably elected, than because Judas is irrevocably elected. For Judas could, if indeed he willed, be irrevocably elected, equally as Peter. For God conferred nothing more in this general decree (I will to elect irrevocably and peremptorily to grace all expiring finally in faith - Peter, if he wills; and Judas, if he wills) to the irrevocable Election of Peter, than to that of Judas.

Eph. 1:3.
Even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy.

It is asked: Is the Election of this one rather than that to glory made from the sole free will of God, and absolute good pleasure? Or is it made according to foreseen faith, as a cause, condition, or quality required in the object?

To elicit the state of the Question, it is to be noted:

1. That Predestination is from eternity, although the Remonstrants now do not blush to say that Election, contrary to what has hitherto been believed, is a temporary and transient act.

2. That God has ordained not rashly, but by certain counsel, about the final state of all men.

3. Nor whether the proximate Cause of Election and Reprobation is in God, namely, the will; but it is asked, Whether there is something outside God in man, which determines the will of God to elect this one, to reprobate that one.

4. It is agreed that the cause of predestination in general is the will of God. Therefore the Remonstrants, Script. Synod., art. 1, pp. 5-6: "One is the predestination in general, to life and death; another of this or that one, of those dying in faith or unbelief. The first decree is most free, and has no other cause besides the pure pure Will and judgment of God."

5. Nor is it asked why in general there are some elect, some reprobate. Because the glory of Justice and Mercy, and the adornment of the world, is the cause why some are reprobate, some elect. But the whole Question is about the comparative Election of this one; why this portion of the mass and clay is destined for honor, that for dishonor?

6. It is agreed that here Dominion, Mercy and Justice must stand firm for God, unharmed.

7. That God does not rashly transmit all, either permissively or positively, to two ends.

8. That the predestination of God is not the cause of sin.

By absolute Decree, we do not denote a decree loosed from all knowledge; for to God, there is a reason for his decree.

2. Nor a decree loosed from the knowledge and notice of the final cause, which is the glory of God.

Nor 3. so absolute that it excludes all Means serving the execution of the Decree; for thus Peter is ordained to glory, so that he is ordained by the same decree to all the efficacious Means which lead him to glory.

4. Nor is it so absolute, as if it dragged the will by force, against the genius of its freedom, so that that Decree must stand, whether the will willed or not, as the Adversaries calumniate. But the Decree of Predestination is absolute in this way, that the good pleasure of God ordaining Peter to glory rather than Judas is not moved to predestine him, either causally, or inclined occasionally, or determined through any order of the Justice or Veracity of God, nor by any meritorious cause, or by a cause moving from congruity, or from decency, or from any quality, disposition, or condition in Peter. Therefore it is Asked:

Whether faith is a condition, quality, or office required beforehand in him whom God elects to glory; or whether faith is an effect and fruit flowing from Election?

In the whole question, the Arminians act craftily. For 1. Arminius posits four decrees about predestination.

1. The absolute decree about sending a Savior into the World.

2. The absolute decree by which he decrees to save the repentant, to damn the impenitent.

3. The decree about the Means necessary for Faith and Repentance, to be administered sufficiently and efficaciously.

4. The decree of saving certain singular persons, whom he foreknows as finally going to believe, and of damning those whom he foreknows will finally be impenitent.

Whether all these decrees, or only the second, or both the second and the fourth are to be noted in the question about Predestination, they do not teach. For elsewhere they make the second Decree the whole Decree of Predestination, Coll. Hag., p. 34. And thus the question is vain, namely, what cause there is outside God why God decreed from eternity to save the repentant, to damn the impenitent; namely, such a question can be made, what cause there is why those fulfilling the Law are saved, why the Rechabites not drinking wine are favored with rewards by God?

2. They act deceitfully about the predestinated Persons. For they teach that there is no Election, no Reprobation at all, of infants, madmen, the furious, the deaf, and all who have heard nothing of the Gospel, as if for them neither Heaven nor Hell were prepared, and they were transmitted to those two places by no predestination of God, but by the blind impulse of fortune.

3. They do not distinguish between complete and immutable Election, and incomplete and mutable Election in the Question, nor in the Theses. For it is one Question, why Judas is elected for a time, and why he is predestined irrevocably to death.

4. They do not act sincerely about the condition required beforehand and the cause of Election; because to them Christ is the meritorious cause of Election (provided they acknowledge any merit at all in Christ). And I do not see how he is not the meritorious cause of the non-Election of others, namely, of Reprobation.

5. They imagine that Predestination to the Means of salvation and to faith is common to all and each one; namely, God decreed that all mortals should believe, provided they were willing; but they are not accustomed to say thus, that God decreed to lead all and each one to the fruit of faith, namely, to eternal glory, provided they believed.

We, against them, teach that the Cause why God from eternity elected Peter, not Judas, to the glory and to the faith of the Elect, is neither faith, nor final obedience, as it includes conversion and the performance of good works, as Grevinchovius says, p. 37, nor the merits of Christ, nor any foreseen quality in Peter, but only the free good pleasure of God, against the Arminians.

1. Because men are elected to glory before they have done anything good or evil, Rom. 9:11: "Though they were not yet born and had done nothing either good or bad—in order that God's purpose of election might continue, not because of works but because of him who calls."

2. Because God has mercy on whom he wills, and whom he wills, he hardens; from the same lump the potter makes some vessels for dishonor, and others for honor, because he wills, Rom. 9:18, 21. Therefore, Election is not from the dignity or indignity of the elect.

3. Because for this ultimate end God raised up Pharaoh, that in destroying him the glory of Power and Justice might be declared; and others, that the glory of Mercy might be declared. Therefore, moved by his will alone, he intends these ultimate ends, ibid., v. 17.

4. Because God chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world was laid, that we might be holy and blameless in His sight in love. Therefore, He chose us to believe. For faith is the greatest part of holiness. Therefore, He chose us by His will alone, not because we were holy and believing, Eph. 1:4.

5. Because He predestined us to adoption as sons through Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the kind intention of His will. Eph. 1:5. To faith, through which we are regarded as sons of God, John 1:12, Gal. 3:26. Therefore, not on account of faith, or from foreseen faith.

6. Because we did not choose Christ, but He chose us, and appointed us that we should bear fruit, John 15:16. But if we are chosen because we believe, we chose Christ first.

7. Because in 2 Thess. 2:13, God chose us from the beginning (i.e., from eternity, Prov. 8:23, John 1:1) for salvation through sanctification by the Spirit and faith in the truth. Therefore, not because we believe, but He chose us for salvation, that we might believe.

8. Because in Acts 13:48, this reason is given by the Holy Spirit as to why the Gentiles believed, but not the Jews, because all who were appointed, or chosen, to eternal life believed. Therefore, the free will of God who chooses is the reason why we believe; and thus faith cannot be the reason why we were chosen.

9. Because all who are given by God the Father to the Son, they come to the Son and believe, John 6:37 and 17:2, 6, 9, 24. Therefore, this giving, that is, Election is the reason why they come and believe; and thus the reason or cause of Election cannot be faith.

10. Because in Rom. 8:29-30, those whom God foreknew (as His own, John 10:27, Ps. 1:6, Matt. 7:23), He also predestined; those whom He predestined, He also called; those whom He called, He justified; those whom He justified, He glorified. Therefore, the cause and first reason for calling and justification, and thus for faith, is predestination. Therefore, justification and faith are not the cause or reason for predestination.

11. Because in 1 Pet. 1:2, they are chosen according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through the sanctifying work of the Spirit, to obey Jesus Christ and be sprinkled with His blood. If we are chosen for sprinkling, and thus for faith, then we are not chosen because we have already been sprinkled and have believed.

12. Because if Election is not certain nor dependent on God's free will as a certain cause, if we are chosen because we believe - for it is certain to the Arminians that we can believe or not believe, given all that is required for action - then Election is as uncertain and contingent as the act of our will.

13. Because if God's good pleasure were not the cause and reason why this one is chosen rather than that one, but only the free act of believing, which is absolutely in our choice, to be or not to be, as they teach - then the glory of Peter's Election rather than Judas' would be owed to free will, not to God's gracious will. Because the gracious will in the general decree of saving all who believe is not the reason why Peter is chosen rather than Judas. For given God's decree, all can be chosen, or all can be reprobated. Nor is Election based on foreseen faith the reason why Peter is chosen rather than Judas, because the same thing is not the cause of itself; but the reason and cause why Peter is chosen rather than Judas is because Peter believes; and the reason why he believes rather than does not believe is free will. And certainly Arriaga, Molina, and the Jesuits (who teach that God, only with the preceding Middle Knowledge by which He knows who will finally believe and obey God's call, and who will not, if placed in this or that order of things, and therefore effectively chooses for glory the one thus foreknown to be finally obedient, and does not

choose the one foreknown to be not finally obedient) also teach that it is in the free will of Peter that there is in God the eternal election of Peter, or that there is not.

16. Because Peter would distinguish himself from Judas, because by freely believing he makes himself the object of Election, which Judas does not do, because he does not want to.

Acts. 13:48.
And as many as were appointed to eternal life believed.

It is asked, Is faith the effect of Election? Of Election to grace (say the Synodists, art. 1, p. 9), faith can be called a fruit, insofar as by the benefit of those means which are supplied by grace, man is not only made able to believe, but also actually believes; but faith does not necessarily arise from this Election, or rather from the bestowal of grace, as fruit from a tree. But we, on the contrary, teach that faith flows from Election, as an effect from a cause.

1. Because those whom God immutably destines to an end, He destines to efficacious means, Rom. 8:30, "Those whom He predestined, He also called."

2. Because we are predestined to Adoption, therefore to faith, Eph. 1:5. For through faith we become and are children of God, John 1:12, Gal. 3:26. We are chosen for salvation through the sanctification of the Spirit and belief in the truth, 2 Thess. 2:13. For the sprinkling of blood, 1 Pet. 1:2.

3. He who gives faith to this one, not to that one, from a certain intention of giving faith to this one, not to that one, gives faith from an infallible intention of saving. Because this intention is nothing other than Election to eternal salvation. But God gives faith to this one from a certain and infallible intention, so that this one rather than that one may be converted, because He knows that giving to be saving and fruitful for this one, not for that one.

4. Because if God makes known the mystery of His will, according to His gracious purpose which He purposed in Himself, Eph. 1:9, and reveals the mysteries of the kingdom to these, not to those, because thus it was well-pleasing to Him, Matt. 11:25, and opens the heart of this one, not of that one, because He has mercy from eternity on this one, not on that one

- then God gives faith, because He pursues someone with the eternal benevolence of giving glory. But the former is true; therefore, also the latter.

5. God cannot make the Word the power unto salvation for the believer, and effectual unto salvation and conversion, unless from eternity He decreed to give salvation to such. But God does the former. Therefore He decreed the latter, and by virtue of this decree the former happens.

6. All spiritual blessings flow from Election, as from a cause, Eph. 1:2-4. Therefore, also faith.

7. Faith is not the fruit of Election to grace, if given that Election, men can never believe.

8. Because final faith is given by God rashly, and by no plan, unless God chooses for eternal glory the one to whom He gives belief. For a means adequate to the end is given rashly, if not from the preordained decision of the decreeing will. But it is absurd and impious to attribute such rashness to God, the most wise Ruler of the world.

9. Because as many as were ordained to eternal life believed, Acts 13:48, and they believed because they were ordained to life.

It is asked, Is the whole decree of Election that God decreed glory to men if they believe? The Remonstrants say yes; we say no.

1. Because in Election, God's will to save this one rather than that one, Peter rather than Judas, is fixed and determined, Rom. 9:11. But in this decree, He did not decree glory more to Peter than to the traitor Judas, but equally to both, insofar as, or if, one believes.

2. Because this decree can stand with the glorification of all, or with the eternal damnation of all. But Election posits that some are necessarily to be saved, others being left, because it includes the certain efficacy of means, Eph. 1:3-4.

3. Because then all and each man would be elect. But Christ says, "Many are called, but few are chosen," Matt. 20:16 and 22:14.

It is asked, Did not God decree from eternity to save in the same order in which He saves in time? But in time He saves those persevering in faith and obedience; therefore, He so decreed to save from eternity. Fulgentius, book 1 to Monimus and the book on the incarnation and grace, last chapter: "He does not accomplish otherwise in the work than He has arranged in His eternal will."

Smising responds, vol. 1 on God, treatise 3, disputation 6 on providence, question 8, no. 579: The proposition ("In the order in which God saves in time, in the same order He decreed to save from eternity") is true of the eternal decree with regard to execution. For the execution and order which God observes in execution were decreed from eternity, just as whatever God does in time, He decreed to do in the same order from eternity. But this is not the decree of eternal Election, but the decree of the execution of eternal Election, which differ greatly; otherwise, God saves no one except the sinful Lydia hearing Paul at this hour and place, and believing and praying, etc. Therefore, sin, hearing the Word, lamentation, prayer, such words of prayer, in such a place, with such a preacher, etc. will all be required in choosing - which the Opponents will not say. But in this sense the proposition is denied and is in question: in what order He saves, for what condition He saves, for the same He predestined men to eternal glory (namely, because He finds them believing, and not because He predestined them to believe), therefore He chose them for eternal glory from eternity. The proposition is not admitted ("In the order in which God saves in time, in the same order He decreed to save from eternity") concerning the decree, by reason of His eternal and gratuitous intention and election to glory. With this distinction, says Smising, Augustine sometimes, and the Greek Fathers, establish that Election to glory is sometimes gratuitous and by grace, sometimes from the foreknowledge of merits, and from justice. But he is undoubtedly deceived, for the Greek Fathers erred; but Augustine, more practiced in these controversies after the rise of Pelagius, constantly teaches that Election to glory is purely gratuitous.

It is asked, Is predestination an act of God's justice or truthfulness? Or of His absolute good pleasure and supreme dominion? The Arminians contend that it is an act of justice, and is restricted by justice just as much as the actual giving of life is restricted. We say it is an act of God's supreme good pleasure.

1. Predestination is an act of God having mercy on whom He wills, because He wills; but the giving of glory is an act of truthfulness, because He promised.

2. Because predestination is absolute and unconditional. The giving of life is conditional, on the hypothesis that one has preserved faith and fought the good fight.

3. Predestination is an act such as belongs to the potter making from the same lump one vessel for honor and another for dishonor, to which lump it is not permitted to reply, "Why have you made me like this?" Rom. 9. But the giving of life is not such an act; for there is a condition in man as to why eternal life is given to that one rather than to another. Because the one to whom it is given believes by God's special grace; but the other does not believe, and therefore it is not given to him.

Eph. 1:4.
Just as He chose us before the foundation of the world, or from eternity.

It is asked, Was the Election to glory made from eternity? The Remonstrants in their Apology, ch. 8, fol. 190-191, say that it is not an eternal and immanent action in God, but external, transient, and begun in time, contrary to what has been commonly believed until now. We affirm that it was made from eternity.

1. Because in Eph. 1:4, God chose us before the foundation of the world was laid. 2 Tim. 1:9, Grace was given to us before times eternal. Ps. 90:1, You have been our dwelling place in all generations. v. 2, Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever You had formed the earth and the world, etc. Rom. 9:11, The children not yet being born, etc. and v. 13, Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated. Isa. 54:8, With everlasting kindness I will have mercy on you.

2. Because Christ was chosen before this world existed, 1 Pet. 1:20.

3. Because if Election began in time, it would be a temporal promise, and God would say, "Believe, and you will be elect to glory."

4. Because predestination to glory would be calling. But Paul says otherwise in Rom. 8:30, "Those whom He predestined, He also called."

5. Because Election is immutable, Rom. 9:11, Heb. 6:17. But a transient action begins and ends.

6. Because God would will and decree something new, which He did not decree from eternity; He would do something in time, which He did not decree from eternity that He would do - which would be rash.

7. All the arguments of the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures, from God's eternal decree, would be null and vain, Jer. 1:5, Isa. 14:24, 2 Tim. 1:9.

It is asked, In what does that absolute and free good pleasure of God consist (of which Paul speaks in Rom. 9) in the article on Election? The Arminians hold that it consists in this, that it belongs to God's absolute will to establish any conditions whatsoever of

justification and glorification - either faith, or good works, or even (as others teach) eating the fruit of a tree, or any good work - and that God's freedom shines forth in this (Rom. 9), that He decreed to have mercy on believers, to save believers, when He could have saved workers, or had mercy on workers. We, on the contrary, although we grant to God absolute freedom in choosing either these or those means, yet hold that the most free will and good pleasure of God in the article on Election is situated in this, that He chooses this one rather than that one to eternal glory.

1. Because the Arminians are thus compelled, with their Corvinus on Rom. 9, to understand by the elder brother, the Law, by the younger, the Gospel or covenant of grace - and thus He hated the Law and workers, before they had done anything good or evil, and loved the Gospel and believers, before they had done anything good or evil.

2. If the absolute freedom of God consists in the Election of these conditions of the Gospel and faith, rather than of the Law and works, then the Law and Gospel are such subjects of which it can be said that they do good or evil.

3. The Law and Gospel are born from the womb of a woman.

4. God has mercy on the Gospel or faith, and hardens the Law.

5. God hates the Law, before the Law is born from a woman - which are vanishing dreams.

6. But the whole text cries out that Paul is dealing with persons, not with conditions of two covenants - because he brings in Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau, and Pharaoh, in whom He loves some, on whom He has mercy, hates others, hardens them and does not have mercy on them.

It is asked, Because God chose us in Christ (Eph. 1) and God blesses us in Christ with every spiritual blessing, will Christ therefore be the meritorious cause of our Election and predestination to glory? Response: Not at all. The Scholastics teach that no cause is given of predestination, as to the act of willing or predestinating, but as to the things willed (namely, grace and glory) Christ is the meritorious cause.

1. Predestination is not so much grace as the eternal preparation and ordination of the person to grace.

2. By the name of blessings are understood the promised gifts of grace. But predestination to glory, or the willing of good in God, is not a promised gift in Christ. For all the promises are Yes and Amen in Christ, 2 Cor. 1:20.

It is asked, Are all and each mortal - the insane, deaf, infants, Indians, and those who are outside the visible Church - either elected to life or reprobated? The Arminians deny that Election pertains to such, but only to those who are in the visible Church, and to adults who have the use of reason. But we affirm that Election or Reprobation pertains to all and each mortal, without exception.

1. The deaf, insane, Indians, infants have immortal souls, and after death they are either tormented in hell or enjoy eternal blessedness with God. Therefore, from God's eternal providence, and thus from predestination, they are destined from eternity to the possession of one or the other of these two lots, and are sent there in time - or God is a rash agent and blind fortune reigns.

2. Either those who are outside the visible Church sin, or they do not sin. If they sin, they are capable of punishments and rewards, and God will render to each one according to his works on that day of Christ's coming, He will judge them and the whole world. Therefore, from eternity He designated some to rewards, some to punishments. If they do not sin, then the Law of Nature does not obligate them either; therefore they are with impunity perjurers, liars, fornicators, murderers, and without hope of reward are chaste, just, temperate, and despisers of vainglory.

3. Those who sin without the Law will perish without the Law, Rom. 2:12. Therefore, they are destined from eternity to punishments.

4. In Rom. 9:11, Paul says that before the children were born, God chose one, reprobated the other.

5. God leaves some born of good parents to their natural hardness, like Esau, Absalom; others procreated from the most wicked, He effectually calls - which proves that God has the freedom of electing or reprobating infants.

6. Many infants are preserved alive, and God deems them worthy of the Gospel and gracious conversion; others He removes from our midst by the sword, being burned alive, and slaughter, in the womb or hanging at the breast, as is evident in the destruction of the Sodomites, Amalekites, and others. Therefore, here too, by the same reason, God has His freedom concerning the eternal states of infants.

7. The Remonstrants concede that prayers benefit infants, art. 1, p. 46. But to what end, if Election and Reprobation have no place in them?

8. How, according to the doctrine of the Remonstrants, is grace given in Christ to all mortals in or outside the Church, did the Savior die for all, even Indians and Americans? How does God will all and each to be saved, the Gospel to be preached to all? If neither Election nor Reprobation pertain to such.

It is asked, Do the Remonstrants rightly teach (Synod. Script., art. 1, p. 7) that glory is considered 1) under the aspect of an end, 2) under the aspect of a reward? When it is considered under the aspect of an end, they teach that God chooses all to glory, John 3:16, 2 Cor. 5:19, 1 Tim. 2:4 - because He wills all to be saved; and from this Election He is effectually moved to confer the necessary means; and this Election is not peremptory, from which neither faith nor salvation necessarily follow, because given this Election it can happen that all remain unbelieving, p. 9. But peremptory Election to them is when God, considering glory under the aspect of a reward, decreed to give it peremptorily, as the reward for obedience rendered - and the object of this is the dying man; and the giving of the Savior and faith precede this Election. Thus they. We judge this doctrine to be blasphemous.

1. Because there is no Election of all and each according to the Scriptures, or even according to sound Reason; indeed, it is a contradiction in terms, and a non-Election.

2. By equal reason, eternal destruction ought to be considered as a wage or punishment, and as an end. And thus God reprobated all and each mortal from eternity, and destined them to destruction, as to an end - which is absurd. Because God equally wills all to be damned, if they have not believed, by an affection of Justice, as He wills all to be saved, if they have believed, by an affection of Mercy. For if there are certain natural affections in God antecedent to remunerative Mercy, by equal reason there are such affections in Him antecedent to punitive Justice.

3. Because it is absurd for God to elect some to eternal glory, as to an end, whom He in no way elects to glory, as to a reward; indeed, He ordains men to glory, and does not ordain men to glory, in this way.

4. The regenerate are said to be truly elect in this life, Matt. 24:25 - namely, such as pseudo-Christs attempt to seduce. Eph. 1:4 - such as in this life are blessed with every spiritual blessing in Christ. 1 Pet. 1:4 - such as have been sprinkled with the blood of Christ, and believe. Acts 13:48 - such as believe, because they are ordained to eternal life. But by this doctrine, no one is elect, except the man who has died in faith, and is expiring in faith - unless the discourse is about such an Election by which Pharaoh, Judas, and all the reprobate are elect; which is absurd.

5. Because those whom God predestined, He also glorified, Rom. 8:30. That text cannot be understood of peremptory election, whose object is the man dead in faith, unless the sense is, "Those whom God predestined, as dead in faith, He effectually called and justified" - than which, what is more absurd? And it is false, if the discourse is about non-peremptory Election; because not all such are glorified, as they themselves teach.

6. Because no wise person chooses men to an end, through means which he knows will be ineffective, and to an end which is a non-being.

It is asked, Is Christ the meritorious cause of Election - that is, does God love no one to eternal life, nor can He elect anyone to eternal life, unless the merit of Christ is the cause of that Election? The Arminians say yes. We say no.

1. Because 1 Thess. 5:9 says, "God has destined us for obtaining salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ." Therefore, our destination to salvation as an end precedes the merits of Christ, through which we obtain salvation. For if a doctor decides to heal a sick person through bloodletting, then the bloodletting did not precede that decision. Eph. 1:5 says He "predestined us to adoption as sons through Jesus Christ." Therefore, Christ is the means of adoption, and thus cannot be the cause of predestination to adoption.

2. If Christ is the meritorious cause of Election, either He is the cause absolutely and as having died, or as apprehended by faith. If the former, then because Christ died for all and each, as the Arminians, Jesuits, and Dominicans teach, all are elected to glory. For given the cause here, the effect seems necessarily to be posited - unless they say that God, notwithstanding the meritorious cause, chooses some and not others. And thus certainly, He freely chooses, not moved by the meritorious cause. If Christ is the meritorious cause of Election as apprehended by faith (as the Arminians teach), then faith will be the cause moving God's will to elect. But faith is the effect of Election; for we are predestined to obtain salvation through faith (2 Thess. 2:13), through the sprinkling of blood (1 Pet. 1:2).

3. Because God chooses us before we do anything good or evil. Therefore, not because in Christ the Sponsor, divine justice has been satisfied (indeed, God, moved by no external cause, chooses us rather than others), but because He has mercy on whom He wills. Therefore, the merits of Christ do not determine God's will.

4. Because predestination, as to the act of the One predestinating, is the eternal will of God. But all the Scholastics teach that no cause is given for the divine will outside of God Himself, if we except Alvarez, Vasquez, and some more recent ones, who obscure the matter with crude distinctions.

5. Because God decreed from eternity that the merits of Christ would be causes of our salvation. But it is contradictory for the merits of Christ to be causes of our ordination and Election to salvation, because then the merits of Christ would be both causes antecedent to Election, and effects consequent to Election. For this is our very Election - namely, the decree of God by which He appointed us to glory as an end, and to the participation of the merits of Christ as a means conducive to this end.

It is asked, Does God love no one, unless insofar as he is in Christ - at least to eternal life? The Arminians say yes; we say no.

1. Because God loves the Elect before He gives or sends Christ to them; because unless He had loved the Elect to life, He would not have given the Son for them to death, John 3:16 - "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son," etc.

2. To be in Christ through faith is a temporal act. Therefore, it is not the cause of God's eternal love.

3. Because there is a twofold love in God. One is His good pleasure, or love of benevolence. And no more cause can be given for this than for God Himself; for this love is God Himself loving men to life from eternity. With this love He loves us while still enemies, dead in sins, and perishing in our blood, Rom. 5:10, Eph. 2:2-3, Ezek. 16:7-9. And our temporal acts cannot transmute God from hating us to loving us, and having a new affection and love toward us. The other is the love of complacency. And this is a quasi-temporal and transient act in God, and arises from our good acts, just as its opposite - namely, the act of displeasure and abomination - arises from our evil acts, John 14:21 - "He who loves Me will be loved by My Father." v. 23 - "If anyone loves Me, he will keep My word; and My Father will love him." But if the discourse is about love properly so called, no one can love God unless first loved by God, as it is in 1 John 4:19 - namely, with the love of benevolence and free beneficence, which, after the benefits of grace have been conferred in Christ, is immediately followed by the love of complacency, other things being equal, necessary in God as the Judge of the world judging men according to His word.

4. Neither the merits of Christ, nor our good or evil acts, can transmute God from loving to hating, or from hating to loving - as with Him there is no variation or shadow of turning, James 1:17. The merits of Christ indeed reconcile us to God, and bring it about that God, in agreement with His truthfulness and justice, can bestow the remission of sins, eternal life, and the righteousness of Christ - which, out of His most free eternal love of Election, He freely decreed to give.

In vain the opponents object that it is impossible to please God without faith, for the sake of Election and foreseen faith. For by equal reason they can say that no one can so please God as to be elected to glory, unless he is actually born, hears the Word, and is converted to Christ - for the Apostle in Heb. 11:6 is speaking about such complacency. But truly, with another complacency of good pleasure, God embraces many who are neither converted nor believing - expressly, Gal. 2:20 - "who loved me and gave Himself for me"; Gal. 1:15 - "But when it pleased God...to reveal His Son in me." So Titus 3:4 - "But when the kindness and love of God our Savior toward man appeared" to men before they believe, and while they are serving various lusts.

It is asked, Because God has absolutely destined some to eternal glory, can Christ therefore not merit grace, favor, and eternal glory? Because it is not necessary that glory and the right to glory be obtained for him by the merits of Christ, whom God, apart from all the merits of Christ, has absolutely destined to eternal glory. Thus the Arminians, art. 1, pp. 217-218. But we teach that the merits of Christ are fully consistent with absolute Election to glory.

1. Because God so destines to glory, that He also destines to participation in the merits of Christ through faith.

2. Because it is not contradictory for someone to be absolutely elected to an inheritance, and absolutely elected to the grace by which he is rendered fit for the actual possession of the inheritance.

3. Because 2 Thess. 2:13 says, "God from the beginning chose you for salvation through sanctification by the Spirit and belief in the truth."

4. Because God so destines men to glory apart from merits, that no one will actually possess glory unless the merits of Christ are applied to him.

5. Because they argue in vain that he through whom, as Mediator, the Father elects no one, is excluded from peremptory Election to salvation. But according to us (they say), the Father elects no one to salvation through Christ as Mediator. Therefore, etc. We respond that he through whom, as the Author of salvation, though not as the meritorious cause of predestination to salvation, is excluded from election to salvation - the major is false, as is the minor. Because the King destines a ragged beggar to participate in the inheritance of his kingdom, and to be co-adopted as a son; it does not follow that he is a ragged beggar when he is actually crowned. A general assigns an unarmed man to battle; it does not follow that he is unarmed when he goes to battle. Because Christ is not the meritorious

cause of the decree of Election to glory, it does not follow that He is excluded from the decree of Election as the means of executing the decree, and as the Author of salvation.

It is asked, Can a conditional promise of some good be subordinated to the immutable decree of God, by which that good has already been absolutely destined to the one to whom the promise is made? The Remonstrants deny it. We affirm it.

1. Because God absolutely destined the throne of the kingdom in Christ to David, and indeed by an oath, Ps. 89:35-37. And yet the promise was made conditional to David's posterity, if they walked in God's commandments, 1 Kings 2:4, Ps. 132:11-12. God absolutely decreed to save His Son from Herod; and yet His salvation is conditional - if the parents, together with the Child, would flee into Egypt.

2. Means and end do not conflict - for Peter to be absolutely elected to glory, and for God absolutely and irresistibly to work faith in Peter, do not conflict. Therefore, neither do a conditional promise and an absolute decree.

3. Because the conditional promise of the Arminians and the absolute decree do conflict. For their conditions are drawn not from Sacred Scripture, but from the books of the jurists - namely, those which indifferently and absolutely relate to being or not being, given every decree of God; which are conditions free from all dominion of God's providence, and depend on that absolute contingency posited by God. We do not acknowledge such conditional promises, but only such promises as God through His grace unfailingly works in His elect. And these no more conflict with God's absolute decree than the willing of the end and the willing of the means to the end conflict in God.

It is asked, Can faith not simultaneously be a condition required by way of duty, and free obedience by the Elect; and simultaneously a thing promised by God, and unfailingly effected by God in us? The Remonstrants deny it. We affirm it.

And indeed it is conceded by both sides that it is a condition and free duty. But that it is also a thing promised, and unfailingly effected by God - which the Remonstrants deny - is proved:

1. Because a circumcised heart is promised, Deut. 30:6; a new heart, Ezek. 36:26; that all will be taught by God, Jer. 31:33-34, John 6:44-45; that all flesh will see the salvation of the Lord, Isa. 40:5; and the Spirit of grace and supplication will be poured out on the house of David, Zech. 12:10-11. Therefore, faith is also promised.

2. Because the faithful pray for faith. But prayer relies on the word of promise.

3. Because saving knowledge of God in Christ is promised, Isa. 11:9, Jer. 31:34; and knowledge of Christ, by which men are justified, Isa. 53:11 - which is nothing other than faith.

4. Because the Spirit is promised, by whom they will look on the Lord whom they have pierced, Zech. 12:10-11. Therefore, faith.

5. Because faith is the gift of God, which excludes all boasting of man, Eph. 2:8-9, Phil. 1:29.

6. Because the saints give thanks to God for their own faith and that of others, Eph. 1:15-16.

It is asked, Do we overturn the natural order, because we hold that the object of predestination is man to be created and not yet created; because God thus determined non-being to glory? The Remonstrants say yes, Apol., ch. 5, fol. 67. We say no.

1. Because God made all things for Himself. Therefore, He decreed to give being to man, that He Himself might be glorified.

2. Because it is asked, To what end did God decree to create the world from eternity? For the world was non-being from eternity. Certainly, that He Himself might be glorified. Therefore, God decreed non-beings to His own glory.

It is asked, Do solicitude, fear, and caution in the use of means conflict with absolute Election to glory? The Remonstrants say yes, art. 1, p. 265; Corvinus against Molina, ch. 24, §30. We say no.

1. Because those who are absolutely destined to glory are absolutely destined to blameless holiness, Eph. 1:4. But the greatest part of holiness is pious solicitude and caution lest we offend God, Prov. 28:14, Phil. 2:12.

2. Because pious solicitude is a thing absolutely promised by God in the new covenant, Jer. 32:40, and therefore absolutely decreed.

3. Because this opinion supposes that men know they are absolutely elected to glory before they obey God with pious fear and religious solicitude, and avoid sins - which is false. For such knowledge would be mere presumption. But no one knows he is absolutely elected to glory who does not walk in fear and pious solicitude. For how can anyone know he is absolutely elected to solicitude who is not solicitous?

4. Christ knew He was absolutely destined to die only at such an hour; and yet He piously fled and avoided His enemies, John 11:53-54, Mark 1:34, John 10:39, Luke 4:29-30. And this is the consequence of the Holy Spirit - Christ's hour had not yet come, therefore no one seized Him. Unless the hour at which it was necessary for Him to die had been absolutely appointed, this consequence would not hold; because if the hour was conditionally appointed at which He had to die, on what condition was it appointed? Namely, if the Jews would seize Him at that hour - no other condition can be imagined. Thus, therefore, the Holy Spirit would argue: Christ died at that hour, therefore He died at that hour - because here, according to them, the condition and the thing conditioned are the same.

5. Pious fear conflicts equally with peremptory Election as with absolute Election - because it is just as contradictory for one peremptorily elected not to be glorified as for one absolutely elected to glory not to be glorified.

6. And given Middle Knowledge, there is no reason for the Elect to seek from God in trembling the grace of obeying, because their final obedience or final non-obedience is before and apart from every free will of God.

It is asked, Is the number of the Elect determined in God's will and power, so that there are so many, neither more nor fewer? The Arminians by necessary consequence deny it. We believe that both the numbered number, and the numbering number, are certain.

1. Because he who yesterday was reprobate cannot be substituted in the place of him who yesterday was elect, John 10:14 - "I am the good shepherd; I know my sheep and my sheep know me." 2 Tim. 2:19 - "Nevertheless, God's solid foundation stands firm, sealed with this inscription: 'The Lord knows those who are his.'" Rom. 9 - "in order that God's purpose according to election might stand." John 6:37, 39 - "All that the Father gives me will come to me, and whoever comes to me I will never drive away...And this is the will of him who sent me, that I shall lose none of all that he has given me, but raise them up at the last day." Rom. 11:28-29 - "As far as election is concerned, they are loved on account of the patriarchs, for God's gifts and his call are irrevocable." Prosper to the Gauls, ch. 8 - "From these stones nothing is cast out, nothing is diminished, nothing is seized."

2. Because those whom God has determined from eternity to be saved, to them He gives faith and perseverance, that they may infallibly be saved. For those whom He predestined, He also called, justified, and glorified - all of them, Rom. 8:30.

3. Because Jehovah does not change, therefore the sons of Jacob are not consumed, Mal. 3:6.

4. Because as many as were ordained to eternal life believed - not more, not fewer, Acts 13:48.

5. Because it is impossible for the elect to be deceived, Matt. 24:24.

6. Because persons are designated who are effectually called, and inscribed in the book of life - that is, in the decree of God, certain and determinate men, Isa. 49:12 and 66:8-9, Hos. 1:10, Zech. 8:22 and 12:10, 12.

But the numbered number is not in God's will, according to the Arminians.

1. Because God, since He does not unfailingly produce the free acts of conversion, cannot convert and save more than He converts and saves. For He would overturn freedom, unless He left men to absolute indifference of acting.

2. Because the final conversion of all to God, and final opposition to God calling, precedes God's foreknowledge and free decree. Therefore, according to them, we pray in vain that He would save more than are actually saved.

3. Because notwithstanding the action of most special grace, and the most invincible dominion of providence, the reprobate can convert himself, and thus pass into the number of the Elect, and the elect can finally fall away, and thus pass into the number of the reprobate. Therefore, the determinate number is not in God's power, but in man's.

4. Because the Arminians deny that God knows future contingents. Therefore, He does not know today how many are to be saved and how many damned - because the conversion or non-conversion of men not yet born, and not yet called through the preaching of the Gospel, is a future contingent. But that future contingents are not knowable even to God, the Remonstrants expressly teach in their Apology, ch. 2, fol. 43.

Chapter 4. On Reprobation.

It is asked, Is Reprobation a temporal act, not an eternal one in God?

The Remonstrants say yes, Apol., because Paul says that the Jews will again receive mercy, if they do not continue in unbelief. We say no.

1. Because the text does not say that the same numerical men from that nation who were to be saved and again receive mercy were reprobated.

2. Because those who were hardened and did not obtain the promises are opposed to the Election - that is, to those eternally elected, who obtained the promises.

3. Because Esau was reprobated before he was born, and had done anything good or evil, Rom. 9:11.

4. Because the ungodly are rejected from efficacious grace and glory in time. Therefore, they were reprobated from eternity.

5. Because there is no new will in God in time, which was not in Him from eternity; for thus He would be mutable.

It is asked, Did God reprobate men from eternity absolutely - that is, with no regard to original sin, actual sin, or final impenitence as a preceding cause or condition - and thus out of His sole free and independent will? The Remonstrants say yes, art. 1, p. 230 - sin is the meritorious cause of Reprobation. We say no.

1. Because Scripture says, John 10:26 - "You do not believe because you are not my sheep." 1 John 2:19 - "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us." According to the Remonstrants, the contrary would have to be said.

2. Because Esau was reprobated and hated by God before he was born, and had done anything good or evil, Rom. 9:11.

3. The potter has power over the clay, to make from the same lump one vessel for honor and another for dishonor. Therefore, according to Paul, the same right belongs to God, by greater right, over men.

4. Because God hardens whom He wills; He raised up Pharaoh, that His glory of justice and power might be declared in him. Therefore, He has mercy on whom He wills, and He hardens whom He wills, Rom. 9:17-18.

5. Because God denies to Judas efficacious grace for believing, which He gives to Peter - not from the merit of free will, but because He absolutely wills it. Therefore, He decreed from eternity to deny it, out of His good pleasure alone.

6. Because God can convert and save all, if indeed He wills it. Therefore, it is from God's absolute good pleasure that some are not converted but perish.

7. If the created will freely determining itself were the cause and maker of the reprobation of men, the elect would have something in which to boast in their free will, not in God's grace - because this one would be reprobated from eternity because he wills it; that one elected because he wills it.

8. It would be in the power of free will for men to pass from the number of the reprobate to the number of the elect; and the determinate number of the elect and reprobate would not belong to God, but to men.

9. Because it would belong to created free will whether or not the glory of punitive justice would be declared; and it could happen, if it so seemed good to men, that this glory would lie hidden for eternity.

10. Because man would distinguish and separate himself from others by free will, who freely make themselves objects of eternal reprobation.

11. Because there would be no mystery here, as Paul says in Rom. 11:33. Nor any place for this Pauline response to the objection of Rom. 9:20 - "But who are you, O man, to answer back to God?" Because there is no place for the objections of carnal men, Rom. 9:19, if God reprobates men for this reason, because men first reprobated God by their final impenitence.

It is asked, Is that distinction between non-election negatively and privatively, or preterition and reprobation, empty? The Arminians say yes, art. 1, pp. 235-236. But we acknowledge that preterition or non-election (by which God can deny a benefit to a man who has deserved no evil, His justice being preserved) and reprobation, by which God decreed out of His absolute good pleasure to create some, and to deny them efficacious grace to declare the glory of His justice, are distinct from each other. The former act is called non-election logically, preterition theologically - because by this very fact, that God from His free will absolutely elects some to eternal glory, He necessarily (for election, if it is of all, is not election) passes by all others, and does not elect them to glory.

Objection: Reprobation necessarily follows from non-election, and therefore God here does the same thing as if He were to command someone to live for a thousand years, yet meanwhile continue to him the life-preserving power for only ten days.

Response: This same argument is proposed by Paul in the person of carnal men, Rom. 9:14. For God can rightly be angry with him who preserves the life-preserving power for only ten days, and then willingly casts it away, even if God of His free will withdraws that power.

It is asked: Is there no reprobation of those who have never heard the Gospel? Or is it more hidden and indescribable than that of those who are in the visible Church? The Remonstrants say yes, art. 1, p. 23. We say no.

1. Because God absolutely reprobated the Edomites, Ammonites, Moabites, and other nations from the covenant and means of grace, only because He willed it - as may be gathered from Mal. 1:2-4.

2. Because God chose the Jews for His people, with no consideration of worthiness or holiness, and called them to communion of glory and grace, Ezek. 16:3, 8, Deut. 7:6-7 and 9:4-5, Ps. 147:19-20. Therefore, He rejected all other nations from such communion, because He absolutely willed it.

It is asked, Is absolute Reprobation the first and by far the greatest cause of the destruction of the great majority of men? The Remonstrants say yes. We say no.

1. Because God is not at all the cause of destruction, unless He is considered as Judge, beholding sin actually existing. But in reprobation He is not Judge, but absolute Lord. Therefore, God is not at all the cause.

2. Because in Reprobation, God only determines to deny grace, which He owes to no mortal; therefore, He cannot be either the cause of sin or of destruction, because He reprobates men.

It is asked, Does God create and form some men for destruction? The Remonstrants deny it. We say that God created the ungodly for the day of evil - not absolutely, but for His own glory. And although to an insane reason it seems unjust for God to create man for destruction, yet the sounder Scholastics rightly teach that although it seems cruel to will to punish someone only from an intention of punishing, it is not so from an intention of completing the good of the universe, and manifesting punitive justice.

1. Because Prov. 16:4 says, "The LORD works out everything for his own ends - even the wicked for a day of disaster." Rom. 11:32 - "For God has bound all men over to disobedience so that he may have mercy on them all." Rom. 9:17 - "For the Scripture says to Pharaoh: 'I raised you up for this very purpose, that I might display my power in you and that my name might be proclaimed in all the earth.'" Rom. 9:22 - Those predestined to death Paul calls "vessels of wrath prepared for destruction." 1 Pet. 2:8 - Some "stumble because they disobey the message - which is also what they were destined for." Jude v. 4 - "For certain men whose condemnation was written about long ago have secretly slipped in among you." 1 Sam. 2:25 - "Eli's sons did not listen to their father's rebuke, for it was the LORD's will to put them to death."

2. Many are born for afflictions, God so determining from eternity, Job 5:7. 1 Cor. 4:9 - "For it seems to me that God has put us apostles on display at the end of the procession, like men condemned to die in the arena." 1 Thess. 3:3 - "You know quite well that we were destined for them [afflictions]." For if God formed some for punishments to 4, it is not contradictory for Him to form them to punishments to 10, 20, 100, 1000, and to eternal ones.

3. Because many infants, having committed nothing more grievous than other infants, seized from the breast by the sword, being burned alive, and the inundation of waters, miserably perished. Therefore, God from eternity formed them for these calamities. For nothing happens in time which was not decreed by God from eternity.

It is asked, Does creation for that reason cease to be a benefit of God toward creatures, because the reprobate are created for this end, that they may be vessels of wrath, to demonstrate the glory of punitive justice? Arminius says yes, in Declaration, p. 107. We say no.

1. Because a benefit does not cease to be a benefit, even if it turns to the harm of the one to whom it is given, by the fault of the one to whom it is given alone, not by the fault of the giver.

2. Because being is far better and more excellent than not being, although per accidens and on account of the misery attached to it, it could be worse.

3. Nor will the Opponents extricate themselves here, if they do not cease to measure the infinite God with human standards - because no earthly father would confer a benefit on his son which he foresees will turn out to his eternal destruction, which if he had lacked, he would have avoided destruction - especially if, the paternal right being preserved, he

could give grace to use that benefit in such a way that it would turn out to his eternal happiness. But such a father here is the Creator of all the reprobate.

It is asked, Does God create men, especially the reprobate, for the purpose of sinning? The Remonstrants deny it simply. We distinguish: With an approbative intention, God preordains no one to sin.

1. Because He hates sin.

2. Because He forbids and punishes it.

But He preordained men to the material acts of sin.

1. Because He absolutely decreed all contingent acts, as has been proved.

2. Because no acts happen fortuitously, or apart from God's intention.

3. Because we devoutly pray that God would effectually prevent such acts in us and in others. But effectual prevention supposes an effectual decree about such acts being effectually procured or prevented.

But truly, with a permissive intention, God creates men to sin - not simply, but to illustrate the glory of punitive justice.

1. Because he who intends an end also intends the means - of which sort here is the permission of sin, which, that being posited, is posited.

2. Because God from eternity freely decreed to deny special grace, which being given, men would avoid sin.

3. Because God cannot intend glory confusedly and generically, or under a disjunction - namely, either the glory of Justice or the glory of Mercy, or glory by bare legislation and speculatively, or by experimental practice to be manifested to angels and men - but this determinate glory, namely, of Justice in the reprobate, and of Mercy in the elect. Therefore, He necessarily intends to permit sin, which is the intrinsic foundation of punishment and pardon.

It is asked, Is the absolute will of God the cause of all things, so that God's will is known by the event itself? The Remonstrants deny it, art. 1, p. 250. We affirm that the will of God is

the first and highest necessity, and the cause of all things, either by effecting or permitting.

1. Because nothing good or evil is apart from God's intention, because thus it would happen fortuitously.

2. Because every good and every evil which has the character of a useful good, for declaring the glory of God (of which sort is sin), is either effectively or permissively from the first efficient cause, and for the sake of the ultimate end, Eph. 1:11, Rev. 4:11, Rom. 11:36, Prov. 16:4.

3. Because there is no being, either positive or privative, which is not in some way through the will of the first being - because beings are made by God, not by the necessity of nature, but by the free will of God, Rev. 4:11.

4. Because thanks would not be rendered to God, nor prayers poured out to Him, nor patient acquiescence given to His holy will, if not all evils, even of guilt, which are often punishments to the saints, flowed in some way from God's will.

It is asked, Does God need the service and ministry of sin, according to our doctrine? The Remonstrants say yes, art. 1, p. 258. We say no.

1. Because God does not need the declaration of punitive justice and mercy, since He is infinitely blessed in Himself, and in need of nothing outside Himself.

2. Because if He had never created the world, angels, or men, who sin, nothing would have been lost from His self-sufficiency.

3. Yet such a decree being posited about illustrating the glory of punitive justice and mercy, it was necessary, by a hypothetical necessity, that sin exist.

It is asked, Because God has entered into a covenant of grace with us, consisting of precepts, promises, and threats, by which God deals with men according to truth, mercy and justice, has God therefore abdicated His absolute dominion of disposing of rational creatures as He wills? The Remonstrants say yes in the place cited. We say no.

1. Because disparate things do not conflict with each other, although they are dissentaneous, and one cannot be the other.

2. Because Scripture manifestly asserts God's absolute dominion and right over rational creatures, Rom. 9:20-22, and also says that the ways of Jehovah are mercy and truth toward His own, Ps. 25:10.

3. Because the Opponents dare not deny inscrutable dominion, because He could save more than He saves, and yet does not save them, and increase the number of the elect and diminish that of the reprobate, and yet does not increase or diminish.

It is asked, Did God absolutely will that men should do no more good than they do, and omit no more evil than they omit, according to our doctrine? The Remonstrants say yes, art. 1, p. 250. We say, if the discourse is about the approving will, it is false; if about the will of good pleasure and decree, it is true.

1. Because the measure of good and evil actions, and also the number of all beings, is absolutely determined with God.

2. Because there would be no use of prayers or of thanksgiving, if there were not just so many good actions, so many evil, neither more nor fewer, according to God's will.

3. Because there would be no use of faith, unless it were to be believed that God, according to His gracious will, precisely determines the number of our enemies and injuries, and also the number of supernatural acts.

It is asked, Does God absolutely not will to convert and save more than are converted and saved? The Remonstrants teach that God wills all to be converted. We deny it.

1. Because if God gives efficacious grace to whom He wills, without the merit of men, as they teach, then by equal reason, He denies grace to whom He wills, without their demerit - for just as He has mercy on whom He wills, so by equal freedom He hardens whom He wills, Rom. 9:18.

2. Because God is able to save all, John 10:29, Rom. 11:23, Jude v. 24, if indeed He willed it. But He does not save all. Therefore, He absolutely does not will to save them.

3. Because with God electing and reprobating from eternity, the number of the elect and reprobate was determinate, which can neither be increased nor diminished.

4. Because for so many, and not for more, Christ died, prays, intercedes, and reveals Himself - and indeed because He wills it, Matt. 11:27, Jas. 1:18, Titus 3:6.

5. Because God, according to the doctrine of the Opponents (who deny that God determines the will, or can unfailingly produce more free acts than men freely produce), cannot convert more than He converts, nor not convert more than He does not convert. Therefore, God does not will to convert more than He converts, because God absolutely cannot will what He cannot do by omnipotence.

6. Because, if God willed to convert more than He converts, if indeed more willed to be converted, then God's will would be indeterminate, pendulous, and dependent on the free will of the creature; nor would He have absolutely decreed so many free acts of the creature, not more, not fewer - nor would God's election and love concerning the salvation of the elect be fixed and immutable, but uncertain and mutable.

It is asked, Do the threats and promises of the Gospel conflict with the absolute Reprobation of the reprobate? The Remonstrants say yes. We say no.

1. Because absolute Reprobation is fully consistent with the use of free will, as is evident in Esau, Pharaoh, Rom. 9.

2. Because God's absolutely not willing to give salvation does not conflict with the approbative offer of salvation, because God says He approves the obedience of those who never obey, thus far, that this obedience would be rewarded, if indeed it existed.

3. Absolute reprobation and the conditional offer of Christ no more conflict with each other than the peremptory reprobation of those whom God foreknows will finally resist Him calling, and the conditional offer of Christ. But the Arminians teach that these two latter things do not conflict at all. The reason for the major premise is that it seems just as alien to human reason for God to propose conditional promises and threats to those whom He knows will never obey, and out of that foreknowledge rejects irrevocably from eternity, as to propose the same things to those whom He has absolutely rejected.

4. Because for those whom God absolutely reprobated for the declaration of the glory of justice, He determined the non-giving of glory by the order of justice, on account of Christ rejected in the Gospel. But the absolute intention of the glory of justice does not conflict with the actual exercise of justice.

5. Because the reason of the opponents, on account of which they contend that these two things conflict with each other, is that given the absolute decree, the will of the reprobate would not be absolutely indifferent, all things required for acting being posited, to finally sinning or not finally sinning. But this reason is null. 1. Because it conflicts with God's dominion over all free acts, which is not to be taken away from God without sacrilege. 2.

Because it makes God's will, concerning the declaration of the glory of justice in the reprobate, to be in a dilemma, and fluctuating between the declaration of the glory of justice, or the non-declaration of the glory of justice, as it pleases free creatures, not as it pleases the most free Creator. 3. Because it supposes free conditions to be indifferent in creatures to being or not being, as the jurists teach, and not to be determined by the will of God from eternity - which conflicts with particular providence.

6. Because this doctrine supposes promises and threats to indicate to us that God's will is conditional in itself, and not on the part of the object - as if God intended eternal salvation for the reprobate under a condition which suspends God's intention in uncertainty and in a dilemma. But we by no means deny that such a conditional intention of God conflicts with God's absolute Reprobation; but we reject such an intention as unworthy of God, because thus God would intend the salvation of all equally, and thus in none would He intend the declaration of the glory of justice, which is manifestly false, Rom. 9:17, 23.

7. The prolongation of Christ's life until His hour came did not conflict with Christ's flight, and solicitous effort to avoid the furies of His enemies; so neither does the declaration of the glory of justice, absolutely intended, conflict with the promises and threats proposed by God.

It is asked, Did God decree the declaration of punitive justice absolutely, or conditionally from eternity? The Arminians here dream of a conditional decree of God. We deny it.

1. Because the intention either of the glory of Mercy or (if God should fail of this intention) of the glory of punitive Justice, is an intention under a disjunction, doubtful, and confused, and conflicts with the infinite perfection of the divine will - just as it is the highest imperfection for a helmsman to intend first this port, or that one, if he should fail of his first wishes, as it seems good to the impulse and quasi-fortune of the winds.

2. Because thus the glory of punitive justice could have lain hidden to infinity, if it had so seemed good to free creatures.

3. Because God "for this very purpose" - namely, for this determinate end, that the name of God might be declared in the whole earth - raised up Pharaoh, Rom. 9:17.

4. Because God would have created the noblest creatures, men and angels, for an ambiguous and uncertain end, when He formed all other things for their certain and determinate ends, Prov. 16:4, Rev. 4:11, Rom. 11:36.

Meanwhile, we by no means deny that God's will concerning the reprobate is conditional with respect to the object, although it is not so in itself, since God from eternity destined the reprobate to eternal destruction, which however they were not to incur except by voluntary sins and disobedience toward God calling them.

It is asked, Does absolute Reprobation conflict with the ministry of the Word, with the mandate to believe, repent, and pray? The Remonstrants say it conflicts. We say no.

1. Because Reprobation does not violently force, nor fatally necessitate the will of the reprobate.

2. Because the Opponents hold that mandates, prayers, and the free use of such means, by which such danger is avoided, have no place, except where the will is absolutely indifferent to acting or not acting - which is evidently false in Christ praying for the glory which He had with the Father from eternity, John 17 - and yet Christ could by no means lack that glory.

3. Because God's absolute intention of manifesting the glory of justice does not conflict with the permission of sin, by which the glory of justice is made manifest. But mandates, both of repentance and of prayer, are amicably subordinated to the permission of sin, as the Opponents confess.

4. Because mandates tend to this, that the reprobate may be rendered inexcusable - but not from the eternal intention of God commanding, that they should obey and be saved, although this is the end of the mandate.

5. Because it seems just as alien to natural reason for God to command that those repent, believe, pray for grace and glory, whom God foreknows will finally reject grace and glory, and whom He calls in that ineffectual way by which He knows they will never obey, as to command that those repent, believe, etc., to whom God from eternity denied grace and glory.

It is asked, Does it conflict with the blessedness of God for Him to propose an end absolutely which He cannot attain without that which is displeasing and hateful to Him? The Remonstrants say yes, art. 1, p. 257. We say no.

1. Because nothing is lost from God's blessedness because He intends an end which He does not attain without sin, which does not impair His blessedness, and which He, remaining holy and free from all stain, permits to happen.

2. Because sin is indeed opposed to God's free approbation; but it is not properly opposed to God's nature either privatively or contrarily, except conditionally, insofar as it conflicts with the immutability and holiness of God to will as just and right such an act which He Himself has forbidden as unjust, which however He could have absolutely commanded before that volition as just and right.

It is asked, Because the power and benefits of Christ's merits are denied to the reprobate from eternity by absolute reprobation, can the reprobate therefore not be accused of ingratitude toward the mercy and merits of Christ? The Remonstrants say yes, art. 1, p. 261. We say no.

1. Because ingratitude toward the merits of Christ consists in despising God's complacency, and in rejecting the offered Christ and His benefits, but especially in not believing in the Son of God, John 15:22 - "If I had not come and spoken to them, they would not be guilty of sin." But ingratitude does not consist in this, that men are unwilling to believe that God elected or reprobated them from eternity; nor do the reprobate sin because God reprobated them from eternity and did not destine Christ's benefits to them - for God's eternal volitions do not fall under mandates, nor under our free choice.

2. Because evangelical ingratitude consists in this, that men are unwilling to trust in Christ, but hold His death and merits in little or no regard, as the Opponents confess; and yet the same men who thus spurn Christ are also, according to the opinion of the Opponents, irrevocably, peremptorily, and completely reprobated by God from eternity; and to them, in the same decree, that effectual calling is denied, which if they had had, they would have believed in Christ, and embraced His death and merits with open arms. For this is the mystery of sound theology, that for this reason very many are condemned in the visible Church, because they are unwilling to embrace and receive by saving faith Jesus Christ (who however, by God's eternal intention and decree, was never foreordained to them as an effectual Mediator and Savior). Thus therefore let insane Reason be silent.

3. Because the Opponents can prove this connection neither from the Scriptures nor by solid reason (if God absolutely, and from eternity, decreed that Christ and His death should by no means pertain to the reprobate, then the reprobate are not ungrateful to God because they are unwilling to believe in Christ crucified, that they may obtain eternal life).

It is asked, Does absolute reprobation overturn the Gospel, which says, "He who believes will be saved; he who does not believe will be damned," because this decree says that he will be saved whom God absolutely wills to be saved, and he will be damned whom God absolutely, and out of His mere good pleasure, without any fault of his own, appoints to death? The Remonstrants say that the Gospel is thus overturned. We say no.

1. Because subordinate things do not conflict; nor does a part of God's Word, namely, the doctrine of Reprobation, conflict with the Gospel. For God so absolutely appoints some to death, that nevertheless in the second act no one incurs death absolutely, but only conditionally - if he has not believed in the Son of God.

2. Because it is not an overturning, when the order of the intention and execution of the end and means is varied.

3. Because the decree by which God appoints some to death, whether they are unbelieving or impenitent or not, would indeed overturn the Gospel. But the decree of Reprobation is not so absolute that it is entirely absolved from all means procuring eternal death meritoriously and culpably.

It is asked, Reprobation being posited, would it have been far better for the reprobate never to have heard the Gospel? The Remonstrants say yes, art. 1, Synod. Script., p. 261. We say that per accidens, and from the abuse of the Gospel, it would have been better for them never to have heard the Gospel.

1. Because it would have been better for Judas, if he had never been born, Matt. 26:24.

2. Because the condition of the Sodomites and Tyrians will be more tolerable in the last judgment than that of the impenitent hearers of the Gospel, Matt. 10:14-15 and 11:24.

3. Because it is better to lack the sin of evangelical unbelief than to be guilty of it, John 15:22.

But truly the proclamation of the Gospel in itself and in the first act is a far most excellent benefit of God, nor does it cease to be a benefit, because it turns out to a far more grievous and mournful evil for men abusing such a benefit - although if here indeed, by our insane reason, we should wish to measure the wisdom of God, it would seem not to be a benefit to confer that good on man which we foreknow will turn out to him to a far more grievous evil.

It is asked, Is the doctrine of absolute Reprobation the abyss and precipice of despair? The Remonstrants say yes. We say no.

1. Because conditional Reprobation cannot be the foundation of solid hope and consolation, but the fulcrum of perpetual fluctuation, by which one is as certain of his

salvation as he is persuaded of the volatility of his indifferent will. Therefore, absolute Reprobation cannot be the foundation of despair.

2. Because no one is bound to believe himself reprobated from eternity, except insofar as he himself in time finally reprobates and rejects God and Christ.

3. Because abundant salvation in Christ Jesus is offered to all in the visible Church, this decree notwithstanding.

4. Because God does not deny internal grace even to the absolutely reprobate, except to those rejecting it.

5. Because the whole foundation of solid hope and consolation properly and proximately pertains to those alone who believe in Christ. And we profess that we are unwilling to profess that doctrine of Election and Reprobation which suggests to all mortals the proximate matter of solid hope, internal peace, and living consolation. What have they to do with hope, with peace, with consolation, who give themselves over to their lusts, and do not believe in Christ? But the Arminians bid all mortals to be of good courage, to enjoy peace, consolation, Christ, if indeed God from eternity willed eternal glory to them, if Christ died for all of them - by which means internal peace and Christian consolations pertain no less to Indians, Turks, Jews, and all pagans, than to those believing in the Son of God.

Chapter 5. On the State of the First Man.

Eph. 4:24.
And put on the new self, created to be like God in true righteousness and holiness.

In these words we have described the state of the first man. 1. That he was created upright and holy. 2. That this uprightness and justice was concreated with him and natural. 3. That he was able to stand and persevere in that state, or to fall from it. From which these questions emerge.

It is asked, Was original justice natural to man before the fall, or supernatural? That is, was it a gift concreated with nature, or grace added to man after he was created? The Remonstrants say it was a supernatural gift. We say it was natural. 1. What was implanted and concreated in a thing from its very creation. 2. What does not transcend the powers of nature, and has its cause in nature. And original justice is natural in both ways.

1. Because Eccl. 7:29 says, "God made man upright." Heb. "pure, just." The Septuagint in Eccl. 7:30, "righteous." Num. 23:10, "good." Num. 12:7, "pure." Job 33:3, the Chaldean Paraphrast: "God made man upright before Him and innocent." Damascene, On the Orthodox Faith, book 2, ch. 14: "He made man good." Paul, "righteous and holy." And "upright" there is opposed to him who is "crooked," and "devises many thoughts," or "ways." If therefore God did not create man upright by nature, He certainly created him crooked, which is absurd.

2. Because Gen. 1:27 says, "God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him" - that is, endowed with true justice and holiness, Eph. 4:24, Col. 3:10.

3. Because this justice is naturally owed to the end for which man was made by God through nature - namely, to serve God; for God could not demand obedience from man by the powers of nature, unless He had given him the natural power of obeying.

4. Because concupiscence and inclination to evil would have been natural to man by nature, if this justice was not natural - because either form or privation inheres in a capable subject. But to say that concupiscence was natural to man before the fall, and that man was naturally prone to sin, and that the act of sinning was impeded only by the bridle of original justice, as the Opponents say, makes God the author of sin and the author of concupiscence - which however is not from God, as the Apostle John testifies.

5. Because it is repugnant to reason that man before the fall obeyed God against nature - indeed, we judge it blasphemous for the Remonstrants to say in ch. 15, th. 4 of their Confession, that Adam abstained from eating the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil only with the greatest trouble - for that trouble in obeying could not fail to be culpable, and repugnant to the natural love of God. And thus fault would have preceded the first fault, and man would have been created evil and crooked.

Objection: This image is now supernatural to fallen man. Therefore, it was supernatural to man not yet fallen.

Response: It does not follow. Because the image restored to us in Christ is analogically the same as that lost image, but different in species, and of an entirely different nature.

6. And it is worthless for them to say that from the condition of the matter, propensities flowed to contraries - namely, to that which pleases the flesh and the sensitive faculty, and to that which is agreeable to reason - but that these propensities did not flow from God's intention, as they teach that rust on a sword is not from the intention of the maker, but from the condition of the matter. Because the objects of the sensitive faculty and of reason are indeed diverse, but not contrary; and in upright man a natural harmony was concreated, by which the sensitive appetite would obey reason, and reason would obey God. But man would not be upright by nature, and created in the image and likeness of God, if by force of matter and a propensity concreated with nature he was inclined to that which is opposed to the Law of God.

7. Thus there would be a struggle in man between the flesh, or sensitive appetite, inclining to that which is forbidden in the Law of God and right reason, and right reason. But such a natural struggle could not fail to make man miserable by nature - for Paul miserably complains of the propensity to contraries, Rom. 7:24.

8. If that concupiscence which was in Adam (as they teach) is a bare power to act or not act, then they say nothing - because thus concupiscence would be in the good angels, in the glorified, and in Christ, which is absurd. But if it is a quality superadded to the power of acting or not acting, by which man naturally inclines to sin, then 1. It is natural to man, and implanted by reason, to sin, and to obey God will be against the concreated propensity of the creature. 2. Man could not tend to the object of the power naturally analogous and agreeable, when he would sin, and purely natural acts would be culpable, which is absurd.

9. It is Manichaean for something concreated to be morally evil.

It is asked, Is not God made the author of the first sin, if man sinned for this reason, because God denied him, apart from his own fault, the grace necessary for avoiding the first sin? The Arminians say yes, with their Antiperk., pp. 504-505. We say no.

1. Because God did not take away from man anything of His image - for actual grace, or the effectual influence of God required for the act of obedience, is not part of the divine image; for Adam had the ability to sin, and the ability not to sin.

2. Because that influence was not owed to man by any law or debt. But God cannot be the author of sin because He takes away from Adam something not owed, although it is necessary for avoiding sin.

3. Because God denied this effectual influence to Adam not willing to have it; and therefore there was here a virtual and interpretative demerit of Adam, although not formal - because in the same instant of time in which God denied this actual influence, Adam freely willed to lack it, and by this very fact, that he sinned the first sin, he interpretatively willed to lack that predetermining grace, which if he had had, he would have devoutly avoided the first sin. Nor do we deem it absurd for the lack of predetermining grace, and the culpable demerit of that lack, to coexist at the same time, although the lack is prior in the order of nature to the demerit - which I acknowledge to be a mystery of our theology not to be scrutinized.

It is asked, Does the first sin absolve and free Adam from every covenant, because, namely, the covenant of grace was not yet made with him before the promised blessed seed - and the first covenant being broken (says Corvinus against Molina, ch. 8, §7, from his Arminius), the obligation to render obedience to that covenant ceases, since the Law (as the Remonstrants teach) does not obligate to both active and passive obedience at the same time? We defend the contrary.

Because all are bound to obey the Law, or covenant of works, made with Adam not yet fallen, even after that covenant is broken.

1. The wages of sin is death, Rom. 6:23. And it would have been death, even if God had never made the covenant of grace in Christ the Mediator with the human race - otherwise God could not actually inflict the penalty threatened for the second transgression of the Law, unless He had promised Christ the Mediator, which is absurd.

2. God rebuked Adam fleeing and hiding among the trees, even before the promised blessed seed; therefore, in that space he sinned after the first covenant was broken - but he did not sin against the covenant of grace, which was then null. Therefore, he sinned against the first covenant of works. But he could not sin against the covenant of works, unless he was obligated to render active obedience to that covenant.

3. Because the first sin makes no one exempt from law.

4. Because thus perjurers, idolaters, fornicators, murderers and parricides would not sin against the Law, as it is Law. But pagans committing such things cannot sin against the covenant of grace never revealed to them - because a Law in no way promulgated does not obligate, and therefore one cannot sin against that Law. Therefore, the most wicked sinners do not sin at all, because where there is no Law, there is no transgression.

5. Because if all are under the covenant of grace and absolved from the first covenant of works, then no mortal would be liable to the curse of the Law, as Law, contrary to the Scriptures, Deut. 27:26, Gal. 3:10. For they are not cursed by the penal curse of the Law, who are not obligated to render active obedience to the Law - because a Law not obligating to obedience does not obligate to punishment.

6. Because thus some would not be under Law, and some under grace and Christ, the new husband, as Paul says in Rom. 7.

7. This doctrine of the Opponents rests on false hypotheses. 1. That all mortals are in covenant in the covenant of grace, even those who have never heard of the covenant or the name of Christ the Surety of the covenant - when Scripture comprehends only the elect, and the house of Israel, and the children of promise in that covenant, Jer. 31:31, Heb. 8:10-11, Rom. 9:8, Gal. 3:26-27. 2. Is that no one is obligated at the same time to punishment and obedience - which is true indeed in this sense, no one is obligated to obedience in those acts, the neglect of which he also suffers the punishments, yet he is obligated to other subsequent acts - otherwise the first sin would make all mortals exempt from law and liable to no Law, unless God had made the covenant of grace. And God would have thus made the covenant of grace out of necessity, lest perhaps men remain exempt from law.

8. Because the reprobate are always children of the slave woman, and liable to the legal covenant and its curse, since they are never in Christ.

It is asked, Is vicious concupiscence a privative being, or a positive quality? The Opponents want it to be a privative being.

We distinguish. For positive quality is taken in three ways. 1. Physically; 2. Ethically. 3. Logically.

Concupiscence is not a physical positive quality, because every such quality is from God, as something good of nature - nor in this sense do our men teach that concupiscence is a positive quality. But truly concupiscence is also considered in two ways. 1. Formally and in the abstract, and thus logically speaking, it is not a positive quality, but logically privative, and is rather a curvature of the power than a power. But truly 2. concupiscence is considered in the concrete, as it connotes a subject capable of a contrary habit; and thus our men teach that concupiscence is not a purely privative being, but an ethically positive being.

1. Because it does not say only the bare absence of rectitude owed to be in the powers; but also connotes a subject capable of either form or privation.

2. Because it not only deprives the soul of original justice, as blindness deprives the eyes of sight; but also affects the soul with a depraved quality and propensity, as rottenness corrupts an apple, and fever makes a body morbid.

3. Because Scripture ascribes positive actions to it - namely, that it opposes itself to the Spirit of God, leads men captive, does the works of the flesh, etc.

It is asked, Was there no power in Adam of believing in Christ; and therefore did he not lose that power by the power of the first sin, until it is restored in Christ? The Remonstrants deny that there was such a power in him. Thus Arminius, resp. to art. 31; Episcopius, disp. 5, thes. 6. So also Socinus in Theol. Pralect., ch. 3, fol. 8-9. Smalcius, refut. of Frantzius, disp. 2, fol. 44-45. They deny any virtues infused in Adam's will. We, on the contrary, say there was such a power in Adam.

But 1. We do not teach that justifying faith was actually in Adam; for that supposes sin. 2. It is not asked whether there was in him a passive and remote power to believe in Christ - this the Opponents do not deny. Nor 3. whether there was legal faith in Adam - for all concede this.

Yet we affirm that there was in Adam not yet fallen a proximate power to believe in Christ.

1. Because there was in Adam the perfect image of God in the mode of a habit. Therefore, the power for all acts which the Creator could command him, either absolutely or hypothetically. For the image of God includes the power of believing everything which the first truth could reveal.

2. I suppose it was revealed to Adam, not yet fallen, his misery and the Savior restoring; either he was obligated to believe in the Savior in that case, or not. If the first, then he had the power of believing - for moral obligation in man not yet fallen supposes physical power, because God cannot obligate man not yet fallen to the impossible. If the second, then he was bound not to believe, and thus to despair of the Savior, even revealed, which is absurd.

3. Because Adam was obligated to trust in God in all possible dangers (for example, if he were tempted by the Devil to sin), therefore also under sin, the greatest danger, if the remedy had been revealed. Therefore, he had the power of believing in Christ.

4. Adam had the power of believing in God as Creator; therefore, also in God as Redeemer. The reason for the consequence is that there would not be one baptism, one faith, contrary to the Apostle in Eph. 4:5, if these two faiths differed in species. Thus in Heb. 11:3 and 13, by one faith we believe the creation and the evangelical promises.

5. Adam had the power of believing everything which is commanded in the moral Law, either explicitly or implicitly; therefore, of believing every truth either revealed or to be revealed by God - for the Law commands the intellect and affections to give assent to every truth.

6. Abraham had the habitual charity of exercising acts of love of God, both in the acts commanded by God and to be commanded (for example, in sacrificing his son, if God should command it), therefore, by equal reason, Adam had the power of believing, both what was revealed and what was to be revealed.

7. If Adam did not have the power of believing in Christ, neither did he have a pious inclination of mind to take the intellect captive in obedience to God, which cannot stand with the true holiness and justice which was in Adam.

It is asked, Was the image of God in Adam original justice and habitual holiness; or a bare free will of obeying God, without any infused or concreated habit of holiness? The Remonstrants say, Apol., ch. 7, fol. 6, that it does not matter whether one says or denies that Adam was endowed with such justice. Episcopius, disp. 5, thes. 3; Corvinus against the Wallachians, fol. 55. So also Socinus, Theological Prelections, ch. 3, fol. 7-8. Smalcius, Refutation of Frantzius, disp. 2, fol. 44-45. They deny any virtues infused in Adam's will. We, on the contrary, affirm it.

1. Adam was made in the image of God; but this image consists in true justice and holiness, Eph. 4:24, Col. 3:10.

2. Because God made man upright, and prone to love God; otherwise Adam sleeping would not have been good and holy in habit.

3. Because a bare power, and free will of obeying God, without any infused virtue in the will, remains in man after the fall, as something natural and concreated, and essential to the will (as they teach). From which it follows that Adam lost nothing of the divine image, nothing of holy inclination to good, agreeable to the Law of God, in the will by the fall - and therefore man was equally sound and holy after the fall as he was before the fall.

It is asked, Was Adam created mortal? The Remonstrants and Socinians, as formerly the Pelagians, teach that mortality belongs to man by nature. We respond with these assertions.

Assertion 1. If natural is taken for that which is implanted in a thing in creation, then mortality is not natural to man.

1. Because God made man such that he could not die, and such that persevering in obedience to God, he would not have died.

2. Because not only death, but also mortality is the punishment of sin; for mortality is something evil, and a disposition to destruction. Thus the threat of God bears, "In the day that you eat of it, you shall surely die," i.e., you shall be mortal, and at last you shall die, Gen. 2:17.

3. Because death and dissolution is a disturbance of the harmony of the elements, and of the union of soul and body, which seems to turn out to the dishonor of the Creator, if it had been concreated with man.

Assertion 2. If natural is taken for that which has its cause in any way in nature - that is, either in matter or in form - thus mortality is natural to the dusty body of Adam.

1. Because everything generable is corruptible.

2. Because what is compacted from contraries is dissoluble.

3. Because man, as to body, was dust.

4. Because every contrary can suffer from its contrary.

Assertion 3. The possibility of not dying did not belong to man simply by reason of the soul, but by the benefit of the Creator.

1. Because the rational soul cannot impede the action and reaction of contraries.

2. Because the soul cannot impede external force, compression and suffocation, to which the body could be physically subjected, if indeed it had seemed good to God to inflict external force on the body of Adam not yet fallen. But God could inflict that force from an external agent, according to His absolute good pleasure apart from the demerit of sin. But what belongs to man as something concreated by the benefit of the Creator, as He is

Creator, is to be deemed simply natural, and a certain connaturally owed thing to nature, but not supernatural; for God, as Creator, does not confer supernatural things.

Assertion 4. By moral obligation, the body of Adam before sin was liable neither to death, nor to mortality, nor to old age, diseases, or dissolubility.

1. Because according to the Apostle, Rom. 6:23, "The wages of sin is death."

2. Because that threat, "Dust you are," etc., would never have prevailed, unless man had sinned.

3. Because the Arminians and Socinians impiously subject man to mortality naturally with the Papists. For thus without the demerit of sin he could naturally die. The reason for which is, because, when they teach that original sin is not properly called sin, it seems to them unjust and alien to the justice of God that infants die.

Chapter 6. On Original Sin

Rom. 5:12.
Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all sinned.

This passage is illustrious and specious, if any other, for confirming the dogma of the Reformed Churches on original sin. Hence,

It is asked, Is there in man sin properly so called, which they call original, subjecting man to eternal death and condemnation? Or is it only sin improperly so called, and only an infirmity, or languor and disease of nature, subjecting man neither to punishment, nor to guilt properly so called, nor to the wrath of God? The Remonstrants, with their Pelagians and Socinians, say there is no such sin properly so called, Apol., ch. 7, fol. 64: "It is contrary to the nature of sin, to be deemed sin, or to be properly imputed as sin, which was not committed by one's own will." Hence they say, Censure of the Professors of Leiden, fol. 87, that no one is condemned on account of this sin. And there, with James Arminius and

Corvinus, they teach that it conflicts with the mercy, goodness, and justice of God, that tender infants should be adjudged to eternal torments, on account of that sin alone, which they never committed in their own person, and of which Adam the first author obtained pardon. For thus God would act much more rigorously with innocent infants and men than with the apostate angels, who by no means suffer the punishments of another's sin. We, on the contrary, affirm (whatever insane reason may say against it) that all mortals (Christ alone excepted) sinned in Adam, and therefore are born in sin, and liable from the womb to death both temporal and eternal.

1. Because David says, Ps. 51:5, "Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." The first Hebrew word is חוֹלָלְתִּי, which is to be seized with the pains of childbirth; the other is יְחַמַּתְנִי, "my mother was made hot concerning me," Tremellius, "my mother cherished me." Chemnitz says, "David is not subtly seeking here an account of the voluntary." The Septuagint renders it ἐκίσσησέ με. Add Job 14:4, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? There is not one." Job 15:14, "What is man, that he can be pure? Or he who is born of a woman, that he can be righteous?" Gen. 6:5, "Every imagination of the thoughts of man's heart was only evil continually from his youth." Eph. 2:3, "Among whom we all once lived in the passions of our flesh, carrying out the desires of the body and the mind, and were by nature children of wrath, like the rest of mankind." John 3:6, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." Rom. 5:12, "Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all sinned." v. 15, "For if many died through one man's trespass," etc. v. 18, "Therefore, as one trespass led to condemnation for all men," etc. v. 19, "For as by the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners," etc.

2. Because infants die, and suffer death, the wages of sin. Therefore, they are sinners. Nor is death in them chastisement (as the Remonstrants would have it), since they are not capable of chastisement properly so called, except those who have the use of reason.

3. Infants were formerly circumcised, and are now baptized for the remission of sins. Therefore, they are born in sin.

4. The same thing the Pelagians formerly taught about original sin:

1. That the sin of Adam harmed no one except himself, nor is man now born more deteriorated than he was made.
2. That Christ died to expiate sins committed by imitation of Adam.
3. That we are sinners, and so born in Adam, by imitation, not by nature.

The Arminians and Socinians plainly teach the same thing.

It is asked, Because original sin is not committed by the personal will, is it therefore not sin properly so called? The Arminians say it is not sin properly so called, for this very reason. We say the contrary.

1. This sin is voluntary by the will of nature, not of the person; by the representative will, not one's own.

2. Opposition to the Law of God is more essential to sin than something voluntary; nor is the voluntary essential to sin in general, because the powers, propensities and inclinations of the soul (which precede the voluntary) are defiled by sin; in which however the character of the voluntary has no place.

3. Scripture says we all sinned in Adam, were constituted sinners, Rom. 5:12, 19. Yet our personal and physically individual will was not in Adam.

4. Nor is the character of the voluntary formally in the arm killing a man, and yet it is punished on account of the killing. Yet our will, although not physically, yet legally and morally, from a special pact, and the free imputation of God, was in Adam - so that such sin is imputable according to that pact.

It is asked, Can such a pact be proved, by which the sin of Adam is imputed to all his posterity? The Remonstrants deny it. We prove it.

1. Because Scripture says more than once that we are born in sin, sinned in Adam; by the offense of one, were constituted sinners. But this was not done by nature; therefore, by pact and special Law of God.

2. Where there is a promise and a threat inflicted, there is a covenant and pact. But it was made to Adam and his posterity, "He who does this shall live," and "In the day that you eat of it you shall die." Therefore, there was a covenant and pact.

3. Because if the same punishment is inflicted on us which was inflicted on Adam, then the same legal pact holds us which held him.

It is asked, Is concupiscence sin, especially after baptism and regeneration? The Remonstrants say that it was in man before the fall, and is not sin in itself. And after regeneration in the reborn, the Papists and Arminians say that it is sin only metonymically, effectively, and improperly so called. We, on the contrary, affirm that it is univocally and properly called sin, both in itself and after regeneration.

1. Because Paul, purposely explaining the nature of concupiscence, designates it by the name of sin fourteen times, Rom., chs. 6, 7 and 8. And we must not depart from the propriety of words, where the natures and proper passions of a thing are explained.

2. The definition of sin which the Apostle assigns agrees with it, 1 John 3:4. For it is a transgression, which is prohibited by the Law of God, Rom. 7:7: "I would not have known sin except through the law. For I would not have known covetousness unless the law had said, 'You shall not covet.'"

3. Concupiscence is something which God hates; because Paul, according to the inner man and the renewed part, hated it, Rom. 7.

4. Concupiscence is to be mortified, crucified; not to be obeyed, but strongly resisted, Rom. 6:13-14, Col. 3:5.

5. Concupiscence is not from God, according to John the Apostle, and is something evil, as the Opponents confess. But if it is only an evil of punishment, it will be from God, as a good work of justice. Therefore, it will necessarily be an evil of guilt.

6. Concupiscence lusts against the Spirit of God in us, Rom. 7, Gal. 5.

7. It is the evil surrounding us, which we are bidden to lay aside, Heb. 12:1.

8. It makes Paul carnal and sold under sin, works in him all manner of evil desire, Rom. 7:8; it deceived him and killed him, v. 11; it is sin appearing to be sin, v. 13; it is sin dwelling in Paul, v. 17; it is not-good, and that which hinders the performance of the good which the Law of God commands, and the Spirit of God in Paul approves as good, v. 18. It describes this evil both privatively and positively, v. 15: "For I do not understand my own actions. For I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate." v. 18, "For I know that nothing good dwells in me, that is, in my flesh." v. 19, "For I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I keep on doing." v. 20, "Now if I do what I do not want, it is no longer I who do it, but sin that dwells within me." v. 21, "So I find it to be a law that when I want to do right, evil lies close at hand." v. 23, "But I see in my members another law waging war against the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin that dwells in my members." Finally, it is the evil which makes Paul miserable morally, v. 24, and delivered from the tyranny of which, he gives thanks to God through Jesus Christ, v. 25. Its wisdom is enmity against God, nor can it be subject to the Law of God, Rom. 8:7, and ch. 6, vv. 6-7, 11, 14, 16, 18.

It is asked, Is concupiscence formally prohibited by the Law of God? The Remonstrants deny it. The Papists say that the precept ("You shall not covet") obligates to the means, that we may not yield to lusts, not to the end, that we may root them out entirely, because this is not in our power - but they want it prohibited, that it may be evident, not what is to be done by us from obligation, but what is to be desired from a vow and pious endeavor - and therefore it is forbidden by way of doctrine, that we may be admonished where to run. Thus Bellarmine, On the Loss of Grace, book 5, ch. 10; Stapleton, vol. 2, book 3, ch. 5; Becanus, part 2, treatise 5, section 5, question 3, ch. 9. We, on the contrary, teach:

1. Because it is an axiom, consonant with Scripture, reason, councils, and the fathers, and received by all the learned: Whatever God commands, we are obligated to do it. Because a precept essentially reveals that God wills us to be obligated to do it.

2. It is false that we are not obligated to the end of the Law, because the end is impossible - for thus we would not be bound to love God above all, and to be perfect and holy, as our heavenly Father is, which however is commanded, 1 Pet. 1:16, Matt. 5:48.

3. The Law is spiritual, and requires things altogether spiritual, that it may be observed perfectly even as to the end, as Bellarmine says in the same place. It is false, therefore, that we are not guilty if we do not accomplish the end of the Law.

4. If not everything which the Law forbids is evil, which we are obligated to flee, then by equal reason, not everything which the Law commands is good, which we are bound to do.

5. A moral Law not obligating to obedience is a Law and a non-Law, and a contradiction.

6. If it is prohibited only for the sake of doctrine, God could have commanded in the Decalogue that we should know the nature of Cassiopeia and the Polar Stars, in the way He wants us to know concupiscence - in which case, however, this knowledge of the stars would have obligated us.

7. If concupiscence is prohibited only as a vice of nature, arising from the condition of matter, the Law as to the end would prohibit that there be in us the nature of a living and animal being - which is as absurd as for God to command that man not be an animal and living.

8. Augustine, On Marriage and Concupiscence, book 1, ch. 29: "He does much good, who does what is written: 'Do not go after your lusts' - but he does not accomplish it, because he does not fulfill what is written." Augustine thinks, therefore, that concupiscence is prohibited by the tenth commandment.

It is asked, Is concupiscence sin, when the consent of the will is not added? The Opponents teach that in that case it is not sin. But we affirm thus: The first-first motion is either purely intellectual in the mind, as speculatively knowing the temptations of the Devil - this is not sin, for it was in Christ. Another is the first-first motion in the appetite; and another also the second-first. Both presuppose some cognition and semi-consent, or consent inchoate and imperfect. And this is sin.

1. Because this motion is contrary to the most intense habit of loving God, which the Law requires.

2. It is prohibited by the tenth commandment. For Paul says it is sin, and the evil leading him captive and enslaving him to sin, to which however he did not give consent, Rom. 7:15-16, 19-20. Because of these motions Paul says, "I do not do what I want."

3. The Law of God requires perfect conformity between the will and all the inclinations of the sensitive and rational appetite, which precede the consent of the will, and the will of God revealed by the Law. For the inclinations to revenge, fornications, drunkenness, heresies, and vainglory, which the saints experience in themselves with holy grief, are for this very reason culpable, that the Holy Spirit makes us grieve over such things, even if we never give consent to them.

It is asked, Is the struggle between the flesh and the Spirit, which is in the regenerate, altogether natural, and on the part of the resisting flesh, not at all culpable? The Remonstrants say it is not culpable, and that it is only of the lower appetite against reason. We deny it.

1. Because Paul complains of such a struggle, Rom. 7, by reason of which he says he is carnal and sold under sin, v. 14, and that nothing good dwells in his flesh, v. 18, and that he is hindered and retarded from doing good, vv. 19-20, and that he is led captive to the law of sin, v. 23. But Paul would complain badly about himself, if this struggle were the natural work of the Creator - for thus he would rather spew out complaints and blasphemies against the Creator than devoutly lament the state of sin.

2. He would complain as foolishly about a struggle altogether natural and not at all culpable, as if someone were to vomit complaints against nature, because heavy things tend downward, light things upward.

3. In vain would Paul pray to be freed from that struggle, and give thanks to God through Christ for deliverance, vv. 24-25, because there would be no condemnation for those who are in Christ, Rom. 8:1, if indeed this struggle were altogether natural.

It is asked, Is this struggle always in the regenerate, as long as they live here? The Remonstrants teach, Confession, ch. 11, sect. 11, with their Socinus on Rom. 7, p. 54-55, that some are so perfect that they are altogether free from this struggle, and that such sometimes sin not from culpable innate concupiscence, but perhaps through some error, ignorance, surprise, and some darkening of the mind. We teach the contrary.

1. Because if there were any such in this life, it would not be necessary for them to pray, "Forgive us our sins," and to say that they have no sin, which the Apostle John says is a lie, 1 John 1:8.

2. Such would be more perfect than Paul, a chosen vessel, in whom there was this perpetual struggle, and than David, a man after God's own heart, who not only fell into adultery and murder by a darkening of mind, but from this bitter principle, Ps. 51:5: "Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me."

3. Once the acquired habit of sinning was cast off, as they fable, there would be no other sinful principle in these perfect men than there was in Adam before the fall - for take away concupiscence, and reveal the will of God to the regenerate (which revelation is present to the regenerate, 2 Cor. 3:18, 4:6, Eph. 1:17-18) - I ask, what was there in Adam before the fall, which is not in the man thus perfectly reborn? Therefore, they have no reason to pray, "Open the eyes of my mind," and "Increase our faith," Ps. 119:18, Luke 17:5.

4. Paul in Gal. 5:17 says that this struggle remains. And in Rom. 8:6, "To set the mind on the flesh is death." And 1 Pet. 2:11, fleshly lusts wage war against the soul.

5. This doctrine rests on this hypothesis, that this struggle arises not from innate concupiscence, but from the acquired habit of sinning, which habit can be cast off by the perfectly regenerate, so that they are as perfect, and freed from every stain of sin, as the holy angels are - so that they can say they have cleansed their heart, contrary to Prov. 20:9; that they do not need a Mediator, or remission of sins, or an Advocate at the right hand of the Father; and that their life is perfectly conformed to the Law of God in all things; and that they do not care, even if the Lord should enter into judgment with them - all of which are absurd.

It is asked, Because every sin is remitted in baptism, is concupiscence after baptism therefore not sin? The Papists and Arminians teach that no sin remains after baptism,

because God blots out the sins of the elect like a cloud; casts them into the depths of the sea; buries them; purges from all sin; does not remember sins; and frees from all condemnation in Christ.

We teach that the guilt of sin as to its legal being is entirely taken away, so that the obligation to punishment is removed, and the power obligating to condemnation; but sin remains as to its real being, and physical inherence. The former part is proved by the passages alleged by the Opponents. The latter we prove:

1. Because no one in this life is pure from sins, and he is a liar who says he has no sin, 1 John 1:8.

2. Because sin truly is, and dwells in the regenerate, as long as they are in this life, as Scripture and the experience of all the saints sufficiently proves.

It is asked, Does the remission of sin in baptism not take away all the being of sin in the baptized from the root? The Opponents say yes. We say that by the act of remitting, the essence of sin is not taken away, but sin is only taken away as to actual ordination to punishment, or actual obligation to punishment is taken away, which is the second act of sin; but the essence of sin remains, i.e., the power of obligating and potential guilt. Therefore Paul says in Rom. 8:1, οὐδὲν κατάκριμα, "There is no condemnation," not οὐδὲν κατακριτόν, "There is nothing condemnable," for those who are in Christ.

It is asked, Do actual sins have their origin not from original sin, but from the habit of acting badly acquired, and from pure free will? The Arminians say yes, with their Socinians. We deny it.

1. Because David rightly acknowledged that his adultery flowed from this, that he was born in sins, Ps. 51.

2. Out of the unclean heart proceed the things which pollute man, Matt. 15:18; John 3:6 - "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," i.e., it savors of a vitiated origin.

3. Because all the works of the flesh flow from the flesh itself, Gal. 5:19; Rom. 3:11-13 and 8:10.

4. Because in children there cannot be an acquired habit of acting badly, nor is there in them free will created in pure naturals, and devoid of sin - since every imagination of the human heart from youth is only evil, Gen. 6:5.

5. Because in every man there is a propensity to sin, Rom. 7:14, 18, 21, 23; Gal. 5:16-17; Jer. 17:9; Job 9:2-3. But evil acts flow only from evil propensities.

6. Because this doctrine supposes that man can be devoid of sin, and that the habit of acting well is acquired not by the infusion of grace, but by the exercise of good acts, by the power of free will - as the Peripatetics taught about the habit of moral virtue, and that men by the exercise and industry of their free will become good or evil, sons of God or of the devil.

7. It belongs to the Socinians, who utterly deny that the first fall of Adam, since it was only one act, can have that power which could deprave the nature of Adam, much less of all his posterity - and therefore men are as innocent and whole after the fall of Adam as Adam himself was before the fall. Thus teaches the Racovian Catechism, on the prophetic office of Jesus Christ, ch. 10, fol. 250; Socinus in Theological Prelections, ch. 4, fol. 23.

It is asked, Because original sin is the punishment of the first sin, can it therefore not be sin? The Remonstrants say yes. We say no.

1. Because the same thing is sin and the punishment of sin, as we have proved before from the Scriptures.

2. Because they concede that sin is punishment, which however is against their principles - because when they teach that there is no sin in infants, from the order of justice, neither can the punishment of sin be inflicted on them. It is therefore not only sin, but also such a punishment, which is altogether inevitable for the posterity of Adam.

3. Punishment, according to their principles, is involuntary. But in infants who lack the use of reason, neither the voluntary nor the involuntary has a place.

Chapter 7. On the State of Fallen Man

Rom. 8:7.

For the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God, for it does not submit to God's law; indeed, it cannot. v. 8. Those who are in the flesh cannot please God.

This is an illustrious passage on the δυναμία and impotence of natural man. Indeed, it is denied of natural man, both the act and the power, both in the intellect and in the will, to do that which pleases God.

It is asked, Do the Arminians rightly, with their Socinians, deny that the knowledge of God is natural to man, so that men now after the fall are by nature ἄθεοι, and it is to be imputed to grace, not nature, that men believe that God is? Thus Episcopius, private disputation on the Knowledge of God, coroll. 2-3: "Is the knowledge of God which is had from nature natural? We deny it." Arminius calls the remnants of the image of God remaining in us after the fall supernatural grace. So Socinus, Theological Prelections, ch. 2, fol. 3.

We determine the contrary with these assertions.

Assertion 1. Atheism is either purely speculative, or practical. Speculative is when the mind purely, as mind, inclines to this conclusion, "There is no God." And this is direct atheism. But practical, or virtual, or by consequence, is of those who interpretatively deny that God is, by life or doctrinal consequence.

Assertion 2. Speculative atheism has under it two species of speculative atheists. The first are ἄθεοι purely mental, and that by habit, and by the full and habitual persuasion of the mind. And contrary to the Opponents, there are no such speculative ἄθεοι.

1. The work of the Law is inscribed by nature on the hearts of men, Rom. 2:14-15. The heavens declare the glory of God, Ps. 19:1. That they should seek God, if perhaps they might feel after Him and find Him, although He is not far from each one of us. For in Him we live and move and have our being, Acts 17:27-28. Because what can be known about God is plain to them, Rom. 1:19.

2. Because the natural conscience dictates to all men that God is. And what the Socinians say about the nations in the New World, in Brazil, and in many places of India, who (as Ostorodius says, Institutes of the Christian Religion) have no suspicion of deity - yet they

worship some deity, and have some religion, which is a sign that they acknowledge God, with nature as guide.

3. Men would be worse than beasts, if they believed nothing about God naturally - indeed, and than devils, who, as Voetius observes in Thersites Heautontimorumenos, sect. 2, ch. 4, p. 34, are not speculative ἄθεοι, Jas. 2:19 - for they believe that God is, and tremble.

4. Because why do those who deny that God is fear judgment in death, if they do not know by natural habit that God is? As is evident in Diagoras dying, who shuddered at death and judgment; and Suetonius says of Caligula, ch. 51: "For he who so greatly despised the gods, at the least thunders and lightnings was accustomed to cower, wrap his head, and at greater ones, to jump out of bed and hide under the bed." They also say that there was nothing more timid than Dionysius the scorner of divine judgment.

Assertion 3. Yet there are by that speculative act:

1. Those who by wish and endeavor would desire that there be no God. 2. Those who by doubt for a time deny it, by which storm even the pious (I speak from experience) are often shaken. 3. Those who by malicious suffocation, for a time, bury nature and the sense of deity - indeed, such is the dominion of the will over the intellect, that it obscures acts, when habit lies hidden in the heart. Yet there is always in them the habit by which they are certain that God is.

Assertion 4. Practical ἄθεοι, some are in doctrine, as idolaters, who by consequence deny God, and transmute Him into an idol. Others, who by their impious life say there is no God. And the world abounds with such ἄθεοι - and always ἄθεος in lips, not in heart.

It is asked, Is the mind, in understanding supernatural mysteries, blind and darkened, so that there is need of internal illumination to understand them? The Remonstrants teach, Apol., ch. 2, fol. 34, that to understand the senses of Scripture, the light of the Holy Spirit is not required. Episcopius, disp. 3, th. 3: "A supernatural light potentially superinfused is not required." Confession, ch. 1, sect. 14: "The unlearned and endowed with common sense and judgment can, as much as is sufficient, attain the mind of the canonical books." So the Socinians. Ostorodius, Institutes, book 1, ch. 5. Smalcius in his refutation of the book on the Incarnation, ch. 9, fol. 19, 55, says "There is nothing in the whole faith of Christ which reason does not grasp, after the evangelical revelation has appeared."

We teach that revelation is threefold. One is on the part of the subject revealed and found in the Gospel - and because the dogmas of the Gospel alone could be devised by God, this is from God alone. 2. Another is of the object or objective revelation - and this is the clear

proposition of the dogmas of the Gospel, through natural species, and is literal revelation, or external illumination, by which one knows the grammatical sense of the Gospel. 3. Revelation is on the part of the intellective power, when not only the object and letter of the Gospel, as to the grammatical sense, is understood (which is obvious to natural men and the unlearned), but also by spiritual evidence, and a new power superinfused in the intellect, it is known. And the present question is about this revelation. We affirm that there is need of this infused power in the intellect.

1. Matt. 16:16-17 - Flesh and blood has not revealed to Peter that the son of Mary is the true Messiah, or that Christ, the Son of the living God, but the heavenly Father. Matt. 11:25-26 - "I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that you have hidden these things from the wise and understanding and revealed them to little children; yes, Father, for such was your gracious will." John 1:5 - "The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it." 1 John 2:27 - "The anointing of the Spirit teaches you all things." 1 Cor. 2:14 - "The natural person does not accept the things of the Spirit of God, for they are folly to him, and he is not able to understand them because they are spiritually discerned." Rom. 8:7 - "For the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God, for it does not submit to God's law; indeed, it cannot."

2. The removal of the veil superimposed on the eyes of the mind, 2 Cor. 3:16; the shining of light in the heart, 2 Cor. 4:6; the opening of the eyes, Ps. 119:18; the giving of eye salve to anoint the eyes, that we may see, Rev. 3:18; the donation of the Spirit of wisdom and of revelation in the knowledge of Christ, that the eyes of our minds being enlightened, we may know what is the hope to which he has called us, Eph. 1:17-18; and the donation of strength in the intellect, by which with all the saints we may have strength to comprehend what is the breadth and length and height and depth, and to know the love of Christ that surpasses knowledge, Eph. 3:18-19 - are special gifts of the Spirit of sanctification, which we both pray to God for, and for which we give thanks in Christ.

3. If the clear proposition of truth, and mere illumination of the object, without infused power in the intellect, were sufficient, then by the preaching of the Word alone and bare persuasion, men would understand the mysteries of the Gospel - and thus grace would be nothing other than the doctrine of the Law and Gospel, which Pelagius said.

4. If the clear proposition of truth were sufficient for understanding the mysteries of the kingdom of God, as the Remonstrants say, art. 3 and 4, Synod. Script., p. 164, man would be no more blind and impotent to understand them than a man altogether natural is blind and impotent in understanding Aristotle's Acroamatica, and metaphysical disputations - for if a felicitous intellect is present, man only needs the clear proposition of truth, that he may attain knowledge. And therefore there is as much need of the eye salve of the Spirit,

the anointing teaching all things, the Spirit of wisdom and revelation, the opening of the eyes, for understanding the metaphysics of Aristotle, as for knowing the Gospel of John.

5. This external persuasion through the clear proposition of truth, without any superinfused light, and supernatural power in the intellect, is the work of the pastor alone, and of a man rhetorically declaiming, such as Cicero or Demosthenes - and here there would be no need at all of the operation of the Holy Spirit, by which He might open and illuminate the heart, and inwardly teach man what he hears outwardly.

6. Because if the will and affections can embrace everything which the intellect judges to be good, as the Remonstrants teach, then no grace, no superinfused supernatural power would be needed for true faith and conversion to Christ. And thus grace is a bare title, and a name without reality.

7. All light which is required in faith would be from the bare letter of the Gospel clearly and distinctly proposed.

8. For writing commentaries, for perceiving the senses of Scripture, for engendering true faith, for the internal illumination of the mind, it would not be necessary for us to implore the Holy Spirit and light infused from heaven - nor would there be reason for Peter rather to give thanks to God for the revealed Gospel, than Judas. Read also and compare what was disputed above on this question and matter in ch. 1, p. 83.

It is asked, Is there in the will a power to supernatural acts? Or, is the will impotent in supernatural acts? The Arminians deny this impotence. We affirm it.

1. Because Scripture says so, Ezek. 36:26-27 - "And I will give you a new heart, and a new spirit I will put within you. And I will remove the heart of stone from your flesh and give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes." Jer. 32:39-40 - "I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me forever, for their own good and the good of their children after them. I will make with them an everlasting covenant, that I will not turn away from doing good to them. And I will put the fear of me in their hearts, that they may not turn from me." Eph. 2:5 - "Even when we were dead in our trespasses, [God] made us alive together with Christ." John 6:44 - οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν, "No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him." Rom. 8:8 - "Those who are in the flesh cannot please God." Matt. 7:18 - "A healthy tree cannot bear bad fruit."

2. Because the glory of conversion would not be ascribed to God's grace alone, if the will were not thus impotent.

3. Because it would not at all be necessary to pray for the infusion of new powers into the will, if the will were not impotent of itself.

4. Because we are by nature dead in sins, children of wrath, and not even sufficient to think any good of ourselves, Eph. 2:1-3, 2 Cor. 3:5.

5. Because without Christ we can do nothing, John 15:5, i.e., unless we are grafted into Him, as branches in a tree, drawing life from Him.

6. Because Christ died in vain, in vain merited for us the grace of regeneration, if the will were the principle of supernatural acts of itself, Eph. 2:10, 13.

It is asked, Is the freedom of not willing and willing the good shown by the intellect always in the will, in every state of this life, where legislation, exhortation, the promise of rewards and threat of punishments have a place? The Remonstrants say yes, Script. Synod., art. 3-4, p. 7. We say no.

1. Because thus liberty would not be injured, but only the mind obscured - nor would it be impotent in spiritual things, nor would there be need of a new heart and new spirit infused; for the clear proposition of truth would suffice, as they imagine.

2. Because if the intellect were to show that it is good to come to the Son of God, which was done in Balaam, and in many unregenerate men, then the will could choose to believe and come to the Son of God, without the drawing of the Father - contrary to that saying of Christ, John 6:44.

3. Because the doctrine of the Law and Gospel alone would be sufficient grace for conversion, if the freedom of willing and not willing the good shown by the intellect were always in the will.

4. Nothing else would need to be prayed for true conversion, except the objective proposition of truth to the intellect, which of itself can draw the will to embrace or reject the good shown by the intellect.

5. Whatever the Holy Spirit says in the Scriptures about our impotence to supernatural good will be in vain.

6. Because the Remonstrants say there, ibid., that the will does not have the freedom and power of willing good, unless beside the illumination of the mind, the collation of supernatural power is added - if indeed they speak sincerely.

It is asked, Do the Arminians sincerely say there that the will is corrupt? Response: No.

Because Script. Synod., art. 3-4, p. 107: "Adam," they say, "did not lose the powers of rendering that obedience which is required in the new covenant, insofar as it is considered formally, i.e., insofar as it is required by the new covenant." Coll. Hag., p. 250: "Liberty to act well or badly remained as a part of concreated nature." And Grevinchovius, p. 183: "Adam after the fall retained the power of believing, and the reprobate remaining in him." Rem. Apol., ch. 6, fol. 76: They establish that indifference to opposites is essential to the will, and remains a survivor in the state of corruption. Coll. Hag., pp. 253-254: That the will of man has remained so unimpaired, that it is not vivified in regeneration, nor is a new will to good given. So also the impure Socinus, Theological Prelections, ch. 5, fol. 15-16. Thus among the Papists, Stapleton, vol. 2, on Original Sin, book 2, ch. 9, denies that in regeneration a new power is infused in the will, but the preexisting power is only disposed, excited and corroborated.
It is asked, Is there in man not yet regenerate any previous disposition, on account of which God is moved, out of congruity or condignity, to confer the grace of conversion?

The state of the question is various. For either the question is about first grace simply, which the Jesuits, Suarez, Valencia, Molina call remote disposition. Or the question is about efficacious grace of conversion (which is not first grace simply, but only first grace in the act of formal regeneration) - namely, whether there is any condition, disposition, cause, merit, or reason in man, which being posited, God infallibly converts man.

Or 2. Whether there is any natural preparation in man, moving God to give grace, or any supernatural preparation.

Or 3. Whether on the part of man there is given a moral condition, demanded from him by way of duty, or a disposing cause, merit, or reason, which being posited - namely, if man either by the powers of nature, or by the aid of more common grace, fulfills that condition - God is moved either from common equity and justice, or from congruity and divine decency, or from a special law made in Christ the Mediator, and by the power and virtue of His merits; or from a liberal pact and promise, to infallibly give either supernatural aid, by the good use of which man is successively promoted to the grace of regeneration, or to effect conversion itself. The opponents affirm it. We deny it.

Therefore, the question is not whether God simply requires obedience from the not yet converted - but whether He requires it, which necessarily has subsequent to it the grace of conversion, either by the title of merit, or of God's gratuitous mercy promising.

2. Nor is it asked whether there are antecedent preparations in the man to be converted - for we by no means deny that; but whether those preparations have of themselves a necessary connection with the grace of conversion.

Nor 3. Is it asked whether the habit of a new heart is infused in the man using no means of his conversion at all - that is, neither reading, nor hearing, nor being shaken by the terrors of the Law - as if into a trunk or inanimate stump.

But we teach 1. That God converts men with no respect of merit, worthiness, goodness, or cause in man making it infallible - but out of His mere grace in our Lord Jesus Christ.

2. We teach that man in the use of external means behaves himself actively, not passively.

3. We teach that free will is not here the discriminating and separating cause of the converted from the non-converted, but the efficacious grace of God.

The first question therefore is, Whether God by any law founded on the merits of Christ confers prevenient grace on the one doing what is in him out of the faculty of nature alone. Valencia, Meratius, and others affirm it. We deny it.

1. Because Isa. 65:1 says, "I was sought by those who did not ask for me; I was found by those who did not seek me." Ezek. 16:6 - "I said to you in your blood, 'Live!'" Ezek. 36:26 - "I will give you a new heart, and a new spirit I will put within you." v. 32 - "It is not for your sake that I will act, declares the Lord GOD; be ashamed and confounded for your ways." Eph. 2:5 - "Even when we were dead in our trespasses, [God] made us alive together with Christ - by grace you have been saved." Col. 1:12-13 - "Giving thanks to the Father...who has delivered us from the domain of darkness." 2 Tim. 1:9 - "Who saved us and called us to a holy calling, not because of our works but because of his own purpose and grace." Titus 3:5 - "He saved us, not because of works done by us in righteousness, but according to his own mercy."

2. Because many indisposed and rebellious are called, like Abraham worshiping idols, the thief on the cross, Saul devastating the church of God.

3. Because no such law was made on account of Christ's merits - for thus, Christ would have merited the preaching of the Gospel, calling, justification, sanctification, for all

endowed with free will, indeed for Indians and Americans; and would confer on them all these gifts of grace actually, provided only they did as much as is in them, out of the faculty of nature alone - which is unscriptural.

4. Thus God would not have mercy on whom He wills, but because men will, Rom. 9:18.

5. God would not begin the good work in us, Phil. 1:6, but free will would begin it in us.

7. Free will would primarily and principally discriminate the one beginning the work of conversion from the one not beginning it, 1 Cor. 4:7.

It is asked, Does God give the grace of conversion to man, because he is better prepared, disposed and humbled to receive it, than another - although He does not give it on account of the worthiness or merit in those preparations, but out of equity and congruity, out of truthfulness, or liberal promise, by which He has obligated Himself to give the grace of conversion to those who rightly use the gifts of nature or more common grace? The Arminians and Jesuits say yes. We teach:

1. That ordinarily the use of external means, such as are reading and hearing the Word, precedes conversion.

2. And so in this respect God does not convert men in an instant, as water is changed into wine; nor unknowing and thinking nothing of the sort, as Balaam's ass spoke, and Caiaphas prophesied; nor unwilling and reluctant, as Simon carried the Savior's cross - but men prepared, humbled, and subdued and cast down by the conscience of sin and the terrors of the Law.

3. We acknowledge in these internal preparations a physical and material conduciveness in man, by God's grace, by which he is prepared for the grace of conversion; but we deny a moral conduciveness or formal preparation, by which God has obligated Himself by promise or pact, so that out of justice and truthfulness or promise, He is bound to give grace, because some man is thus prepared rather than another not prepared - against the Jesuits, Arminians, Pelagians, and Socinians.

1. Because the Scriptures cited before prove it.

2. Because in the whole of Scripture there is extant no promise, no such pact ("He who by doing this or that has rightly prepared himself, will obtain as a reward of his gratuitous work the efficacious grace of conversion").

3. Because no one is efficaciously called by works, but freely, by grace, out of mere mercy, 2 Tim. 1:9, Titus 3:5, Eph. 2:3.

4. Because it depends not on human will or exertion, but on God, who has mercy, Rom. 9:16.

5. Because the good pleasure of God alone is established by Christ as the cause of the Gospel being revealed to little children, and not revealed to the wise, not the wisdom of these, nor the humility of those, Matt. 11:25.

6. Because flesh and blood is not the cause of Christ being revealed, but only the heavenly Father of Christ, Matt. 16:17.

7. Because the Opponents deny predetermining grace to good acts, and subject habitual grace to the nod and motion of the created will, so that the will by nature influences the good work prior to divine grace. Hence, if God is moved to give grace on account of previous dispositions, then conversion will begin from the endeavor, influence and natural motion of free will. But on the contrary, God begins the good work in us, Phil. 1:6. Neither man, nor angel, first gives something to God, Rom. 11:33-34.

8. If, therefore, grace of conversion is given to this one, because he is disposed by grace, then he gives to God first, and God is obligated to repay him out of debt. And thus He does not give grace gratis, and not out of the sole intention of relieving our misery, but for the sake of gratitude. On the contrary, Paul there, "Who has given a gift to him that he might be repaid?" proves that no one of men or angels gives to Him first, because from Him are all things, which either man or angel has.

9. James 1:18 - "Of his own will he brought us forth." Therefore, not bound by such a law, by which He gives, on account of previous dispositions, such grace.

10. The praise and glory of our conversion will not belong to God alone, if grace is given for this reason, because free will, even by the aid of grace not at all predetermining the will, has prepared man for grace, and that indeed so, that notwithstanding grace, he could not at all have prepared himself.

11. Nor will there be reason for us to be grateful to God the author of conversion, if free will determining itself and not determined by God, moves or does not move God to give the grace of conversion, unless He wills to be lacking to His justice and truth.

It is asked, Does God at least out of congruity and His decency give the grace of conversion to all prepared and disposed for it? The Opponents say yes. We say no.

1. If by decency they understand a virtue in God opposed to indecency, so that God would act indecently, if He were to deny grace to the well-disposed, then God would be strictly obligated to give grace, which is absurd. But it is impossible for God to act indecently, and yet He would do nothing against His debt or decency, if He were to deny grace to the well-disposed. But if by decency they understand a congruous mode of operating in God, depending on His good pleasure alone, as it is decent for God to create the world, to redeem the human race - and yet He would have done nothing against His decency, by not creating the world, by not redeeming the human race - and if God gives grace to the well-disposed in this way out of His decency, then He gives grace out of His good pleasure alone, and by no true debt - which is our thesis.

2. Not by our works, but by His own purpose and grace, He called us, 2 Tim. 1:9. Therefore, He gives grace out of no debt or merit of congruity.

3. Because He said to His people expiring in their blood, "Live!" Ezek. 16:8. Therefore not out of merit of congruity.

4. Every merit is in some way a debt. But debt and grace are opposed to each other, Matt. 20:14-15.

5. There is no infallible connection between previous dispositions and the grace of conversion. Therefore, it is not given out of merit of congruity - for it conflicts with the goodness and equity of God to act against merit of congruity. The antecedent is proved: Because this connection is not founded on some promise, because there is no such promise in Scripture; nor in God's justice or mercy, because God does not act against justice, nor against mercy, nor in any way against His nature, if He were to deny grace to the well-disposed.

6. Grace would not be gratuitous in every way, if it were to rest in any way on our merit.

It is asked, Can not at least the prayer of the not yet converted obtain grace from God, not indeed by the title of obedience and obedience, but well by the title of deprecation and humble profession of misery - of which sort are the prayers of beggars, who begging pray for alms not commanded by a superior. Thus Martinez de Ripalda, On the Supernatural Being, vol. 1, book 1, disp. 19, sect. 1 and 2. And other Jesuits. We deny it.

1. Because there is no prayer, except what is commanded to us under the title of obedience and obsequy - otherwise prayer would be will-worship. For we are expressly commanded to pray, Matt. 7:7, Ps. 50:15, 1 Thess. 5:17, 1 Tim. 2:8.

2. Nor can the not yet converted pray, being destitute of the Spirit of adoption, who intercedes for us, Rom. 8:26. As Augustine notes, On the Gift of Perseverance, book 2, ch. 23. Nor can anyone pray without faith, Mark 11:24, James 1:6.

3. Because grace would thus be given to those asking and knocking on account of impetratory power, not on account of meritorious power. But the prayer of the not yet converted, destitute of the Holy Spirit and faith, obtains nothing. And even prayer which obtains, in some way merits, according to the Papists - because to obtain by praying, is to merit by praying.

4. Prayer is nothing other than deprecation, and the humble profession of our misery, and is badly contradistinguished from obedience, because we are obligated by God's command to deprecate and humbly profess our misery, 1 John 1:8-9. And therefore the prayer of the non-converted is badly compared with the prayers of beggars, who however are commanded to beg by the law of nature.

It is asked, Because God does not give grace to man on account of previous dispositions, or out of any debt and obligation, do the Opponents therefore rightly infer, according to our doctrine, that it is not necessary, indeed harmful and useless for the non-converted to hear the Word, read, meditate, acknowledge their misery, and use external means? The Opponents say yes. We say no.

1. Because the non-converted are obligated to means, and sin by not using means, even if grace is not given on account of the use of means - because this command is broader than the promise. For God can well command that, the obedience of which He is neither bound nor promises to remunerate.

2. Because external preparation is prerequisite in those to be converted, and yet conversion is given not on account of that preparation, but out of mere grace. Yet these preparations can be per accidens useless and harmful, inasmuch as Pharisaical men glory in these preparations, and are content with them, as if they were fruits of true conversion.

It is asked, Can not legal contrition be called a preparation for conversion, as temporary faith is a preparation and step to saving faith?

Response: This contrition and faith is rightly called a step to the thing, but not a step in the thing, or a material beginning, but not a formal one - as yellowness is a step preparing for the thing to whiteness, but is not a step in the thing, because it is distinguished in species from whiteness. But truly, thus also blackness can be a step to the thing and a preparation for whiteness. In the same way, all moral affections, like grieving over sins, desiring conversion, trusting in the Creator, rejoicing for a time in the good of the Gospel, and such things, which are in the unregenerate, are distinguished in species from the same affections and spiritual ones following conversion - because these affections differ in formal object. For the unregenerate grieves over sin, but not with a grief according to God, but only inasmuch as sin is procurative of punishment, not inasmuch as it is offensive to the goodness of the most merciful Father - and so concerning the rest.

It is asked, Can the not yet regenerate perform a truly good work, before they are regenerated? The Opponents say yes, their works can please God, although not as meritorious works of eternal life - yet they please God thus far, inasmuch as Christ will cherish, and bring to maturity the smoking flax, as Corvinus says against Molina, ch. 39, sect. 2 and 16.

We say that the moral works of the unregenerate can be truly good according to the substance of the work, and are not merely hypocritical (as brass is a true metal), and yet are not truly good considered Evangelically (as brass is not true gold), or are truly good κατ οἰκονομίαν universally, but are not truly good according to Evangelical complacency.

1. Because Prov. 15:8 says, "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the LORD." Matt. 12:33 and 7:18 - "A healthy tree cannot bear bad fruit." John 15:5 - "Apart from me you can do nothing," i.e., unless you abide in me, as branches grafted into the vine, and incorporated by faith, as is v. 4.

2. Because the unregenerate is dead in sins, not capable of the things of God, holding the wisdom of God as foolishness, and his fleshly wisdom is enmity against God, nor is it subject to the Law of God, nor can it be; nor can he of himself think any good, nor say that Jesus is Lord.

3. Without faith it is impossible to please God, Heb. 11:6. But the unregenerate is destitute of faith.

4. All good actions are to be referred to the glory of God, 1 Cor. 10:31, John 15:8, Matt. 5:16. But the unregenerate cannot refer his actions to the glory of God, because he is ignorant of God revealed in Christ the Mediator under the aspect of the ultimate end - and

therefore his end is the creature, or he is an end to himself; but that intention is idolatry, which places the creature in the place of the ultimate end.

5. Because in the unregenerate, as not washed by the blood of Christ, the mind and conscience are polluted. Therefore, the streams of actions flowing from there are polluted.

6. In them is the bitter root of concupiscence not yet remitted in Christ, nor subdued by the grace of regeneration, which always in all good acts privately and defectively influences, just as a dislocated leg influences the motion of limping.

7. The unregenerate cannot love God with the whole heart, with the whole soul, and with all their powers, since they are habitually turned away from God, and prone to hatred of God and neighbor; because in them dwells the flesh, the old man, the body of death altogether predominant.

8. Because Rom. 3:10-11 says, "As it is written: 'None is righteous, no, not one; no one understands; no one seeks for God.'"

9. He whose person is not pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, his works are not pleasing to God, Gen. 4:5, Heb. 11:4.

It is asked, Are the virtues of the heathen true virtues? The Opponents say yes, they are true, and are previous dispositions, which God would have compensated with further grace, unless it had stood in their way. We deny it.

1. Because no true virtues can be in those who are outside Christ, John 15:5.

2. Those virtues were done only for vainglory, not sincerely for God's sake; so that they are excellently called "splendid sins" by Augustine.

3. Because the unregenerate cannot perform works truly pleasing to God, and perfect in all causes with the perfection of parts, as has been proved.

4. The same thing the Fathers teach. Augustine, Against Julian, book 4, ch. 3; Theophylact on John 5; Arnobius on Ps. 29; Gregory, Moralia, book 2, ch. 22 - who want actions to be judged by the adverbs "well" or "badly," not by nouns.

Related to this is the minor question, Is a work therefore not tainted with sin, because it is not done from the intention of that sin by which it is tainted? The Remonstrants say yes. We say no.

1. Because there are other principles tainting a work than evil intention - namely, concupiscence, lack of faith and good intention.

2. Because a miser snatching the goods of his neighbor with the intention of giving alms would not sin in that act.

It is asked, Can the unregenerate avoid any sin whatsoever, and is not constrained by any necessity of sinning? The Remonstrants say that sin is not sin if it is inevitable and necessary. We say the contrary.

1. Because the wisdom of the flesh cannot be subject to the law of God, Rom. 8:7. The natural man cannot believe, or come to Christ, John 6:44.

2. He cannot pray, nor thirst for the righteousness of God.

3. Concupiscence cannot fail to taint all the moral actions of those whose mind and conscience are polluted, Titus 1:15.

4. Because the unregenerate are dead in sins, Eph. 2:1.

It is asked, Is sin not sin, unless it can be avoided by the sinner? The Remonstrants say yes, because the lack of original righteousness, according to them, is not sin, but punishment - and they deny that it is just for God to demand obedience from those who are punished with judicial impotence to obey; no differently than if a tyrant under pain of death should command that he read a book and discern colors, whose eyes have already been dug out on account of a crime. We say no.

1. Because God gave to all in Adam the power of obeying, and is not bound to restore it when lost; and yet all remain sinners, transgressors of the Law, and unequal to keeping it - just as a bankrupt debtor, who has withdrawn from the marketplace, remains a true debtor, even if he is not solvent.

2. Because thus original sin would not be sin (which is false), because in the persons of Adam's posterity it is inevitable.

3. Not rendering to the Law obedience perfect in every way subjects all mortals to death and the curse, Deut. 27:26, Gal. 3:10-12. And yet the Opponents do not deny that it is impossible for man to render perfect obedience to the Law.

4. Because those who have sinned against the Holy Spirit, and who are punished with judicial impotence to obey; who have grieved and quenched all sense of conscience, Eph. 4:19; who have a heart incapable of repenting, Rom. 2:5; for whom it is impossible to be renewed, Heb. 6:4 - they truly sin, and yet cannot but sin.

Hence, we exclude from the character of sin: 1. Necessity impelling by physical necessity. 2. Necessity compelling by fatal force. 3. Necessity coercing and violating liberty; but not all necessity in general.

It is asked, Are the afflictions of the faithful truly punishments, or only paternal chastisements? Arminius says, resp. to art. 9, that they have the character of punishment.

That the question may be satisfied, it is to be noted beforehand: 1. That punishment taken in general is a genus to satisfactory and castigatory punishment, as species.

2. It is to be noted that our theologians disputing against Purgatory, rejecting that saying of the Papists, "The guilt being remitted, the punishment remains, or the obligation to punishment," are to be understood of punishment properly satisfactory, which they pay who are scorched for some years in Purgatory; but they do not deny that after the remission of sin, castigatory punishment remains - as is seen in the example of David, from whose house the sword never departed, even after God had pardoned him adultery and murder. But because Arminius understands the afflictions of the faithful to have the character of punishment, even satisfactory in some way, which, namely, is inflicted by God as a severe Judge, we defend the contrary.

1. Because if the chastisements of the saints were simply satisfactory punishments, then the death of Christ would not destroy all punishments, both temporal and eternal, then the door to Purgatory would lie open to the saints, who suffer little or no punishment in this life - otherwise the justice of God would be endangered.

2. If the faithful can pay punishment as eight for sins, then by accretion and ἀναύξησιν of that punishment, they could also pay punishment as a hundred and a thousand, and successively even eternal, notwithstanding the λύτρον paid by Christ. Hence the faithful would pay two punishments essentially satisfactory, one in their own person, the other in Christ the Sponsor - and thus they themselves would die for their sins, which however Christ expressly denies, John 11:25-26.

3. Although a proportion is preserved between the chastisement and David's sin, 2 Sam. 16:22, yet the defilement of David's bed does not have the character of satisfactory punishment, because thus the blood of Christ would not purge from all sin, 1 John 1:7. Nor

was it a proportion of strict justice, but of paternal mercy, that that punishment should be a useful admonition to David to seriously think about the magnitude of his guilt, and to him and others to avoid such voluntary sins in the future.

4. Because the afflictions of the saints are also probative of sincerity and constancy, as Job's; confirmatory of the word of God and His cause, and illustrative of His glory, as of the Apostles, Confessors and Martyrs, who count these things a great honor to themselves and therefore rejoice, praise and glorify God. But if these afflictions were properly punishment, the saints would not praise God that they were counted worthy to suffer reproach for the name of Christ, Acts 5:41. For on account of punishment simply, we do not praise God.

Chapter 8. On the State of Grace.

1 Tim. 2:3-4.
This is good, and pleases God our Savior, who wants all people to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth.

This one passage is miserably twisted by the Opponents for the amplitude and universality of divine grace. Hence it must be inquired, whether the universality of grace is validly concluded from it by just consequence. Therefore,

It is asked, Do the Arminians justly contend and strive for the worthiness of the merit of Christ, for the amplitude, universality, sufficiency and excellence of divine grace? We say no.

1. Because by that grace, which being posited, all and each whom God has embraced with such grace can never believe and perish eternally, is not ample grace, not worthy, not sufficient (because grace actually saving is far more worthy). But such is their grace, as they themselves confess. Therefore, etc.

2. Because it is not saving grace, which is not even able to expel the hardness of the heart, even if it should operate most strongly, if perhaps the will of man should strive against it.

3. That is not ample and sufficient grace, which does not obtain dominion over free acts, but leaves conversion or non-conversion, eternal salvation or damnation in equilibrium, and commits it to the indifferent will of versatile and inconstant human liberty. But such is their grace.

4. Because that grace, which leaves us equally liable to be lost and damned as Adam was before the fall, and the devils not yet fallen, is not ample, sufficient, and worthy grace, such as was obtained for us through the death and merits of the Son of God.

5. Because no more are saved by their grace than by that which the Reformed Churches defend according to the Scriptures, although they sell sesquipedalian words about the sufficiency and amplitude of God's grace and the merits of Christ.

6. Because they propose to dispute whether the noblest action of grace is moral persuasion - which is to dispute whether the mere letter of the Law and the Gospel is the sole and unique saving grace of Christ - which is plainly Pelagian, as Augustine says, On the Grace of Christ, ch. 24: "Let the Pelagians read and understand, let them observe and confess that God works in the hearts of men, not only new revelations, but also good wills - not by law, and doctrine sounding outwardly, but by internal and hidden, wonderful and ineffable power."

7. Because the grace of which Scripture speaks as saving, is not only sufficient, but also effectual in the second act, and produces the effect, 2 Cor. 12:9, 10:5, 1 Cor. 10:13, Eph. 1:17-20. It works in us both to will and to do, Phil. 2:13. It removes the heart of stone; it puts in a new and fleshy heart, Ezek. 36:26. It causes all who have heard and learned from the Father to come to Christ, John 6:45. But their grace leaves and commits to the will of the creature, more versatile than a hinge, that we may overcome temptation or not, will and do or not, receive a new heart or not, come to Christ or not come.

8. Because, notwithstanding Arminian grace, men can show themselves finally rebellious to God's most powerful grace, make God's gracious counsel void, revoke eternal election and change it into the black decree of reprobation, deceive God's gracious intention, render Christ's intercession and advocacy vain and ineffectual, render God's good pleasure in Christ almost null (as to efficacy), finally make Christ's death idle and useless.

9. Because their grace leaves all God's gracious promises, either made by the Father to His beloved Son, or proposed by God to us, ratified or void, efficacious or inefficacious, according to our will - on which, according to them, it depends that they be fulfilled or not fulfilled.

10. They contend that we are justified by our works, which free will can perform or not perform, but especially by the act of faith, as the formal cause of our justification - and this is their grace.

11. Their grace fundamentally overturns trust, glorying in God, fear, hope, gratitude, the necessity of praying, humble submission to God - because free will is made the discriminating and separating cause of the converted from the non-converted, of the persevering from the apostate, of the saved from the damned.

12. Because if it had so seemed good to the free will of Adam, the love of God for man in Christ, saving grace, and His death and merits could have lain hidden for eternity, both from men and angels.

It is asked, Do the Arminians rightly contend for the worthiness and glory of mercy, love for man, and the merits of Christ? They say yes; we say no.

1. Because the whole glory of actual mercy, love for man, and efficacy of the merits of Christ, belongs to free will, if they are to be believed.

2. Because they teach that God embraces all the reprobate, and those eternally damned, with greater love than any mortal has, John 15:13.

3. Because all for whom Christ died, and whom out of His mercy and love for man He willed and decreed to be saved, can be damned for eternity.

4. Because God simply not willing it and against His will, as many sin and perish eternally as sin and perish - even those whom God has embraced with saving grace in Christ.

5. Because they teach that of the Indians, Americans, and many other nations, madmen, the deaf, the insane, infants, there is in Christ the Mediator no gracious election, no intention of applying the merits of Christ.

6. Myriads of infants snatched away by fate before adult age, are saved without the merits of Christ, indeed, since original sin is not sin to them, it is necessary that they die devoid of sin, and be co-adopted into the roll of the glorified, apart from all necessity of singing in heaven that song of eternal redemption to the glory of the Savior.

7. Because God has not actually reconciled the world, but only made it reconcilable; and Christ by His death acquired for us only a certain placability, by which He can,

notwithstanding justice, prescribe to men any condition whatsoever of obtaining eternal life - either good works, or faith, or abstinence from eating an apple.

8. Because Judas no less than Peter, Pharaoh no less than Moses, the reprobate no less than the elect, are loved to eternal life in the intention of God the Father and the dying Christ.

9. Because Christ is the Savior of all men by merit, power, example, doctrine, if indeed they will be saved (as they speak with the Socinians) - not by efficacy, and by certain and unfailing application of His death to those whom He graciously loved above others.

10. Because with Christ's death obtaining its end, all can perish eternally; and it can happen that Christ poured out His soul for His wife, for His subjects and members, and yet He can be a widower without a wife, a king without subjects, a head without members, a victor and triumpher over death, sin, hell and devils, without redeemed captives, for eternity.

11. Because the love for man and mercy of God, not able to save men without the overturning of liberty and free obedience, is a buskin and bare title.

12. Because that is not excellent love for man and mercy, which does not efficaciously deliver from the extreme evil, which is far more grievous than infernal punishments - i.e., from hardness of heart, incapable of repenting.

13. Because they deny that the fathers under the Old Testament expressly believed in Christ about to die; and therefore the death of Christ is not as ample as they preach.

14. Because they want venial infirmities to be expiated by the death of Christ without any application of the merits of Christ, even in Turks and Americans - nor is it necessary that they be touched with the conscience of infirmities; nor that they grieve over them and repent - but they acknowledge with us that final impenitence was never expiated even by the death of Christ, since the reprobate pay its punishment for eternity.

15. Because they want Christ by His death to have expiated the murders, parricides and adulteries, and all the sins of all the heathen who never heard of His death - yet the punishments of the same sins are to be paid by them for eternity.

It is asked, Is Arminianism and their doctrine about God's grace Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism? The Remonstrants deny it. We affirm it.

1. Pelagius was accustomed to confuse grace with nature, as Bonaventure teaches, dist. 2, fig. 38. And that grace extends equally widely as nature, Faustus taught (for I mix the Semi-Pelagians with the Pelagians here): "Everything is of grace, but [God] offers and presses it on all for salvation," as Augustine says, On Grace and Free Will, ch. 4. Thus Corvinus against Molina, ch. 43, §8, who says that grace and nature extend equally widely.

2. The Pelagians adorned nature itself with the title of grace. Augustine, Sermon 11 on the Words of the Apostle: "See, my brothers, how they preach that general grace by which man was created, by which we are men." Thus the Arminians in Script. Synod., art. 1, p. 63, and in Apol., ch. 11, and Corvinus against Tilenus, ch. 6, pp. 234-235, teach that the law of nature, good education, an upright disposition, and the remnants of the image of God in men, are grace.

3. Pelagius placed grace in law and doctrine, revealing and showing what ought to be done, as Augustine says, On the Grace of Christ, ch. 24, and Against Pelagius and Coelestius, book 1, ch. 3. And the Arminians sing the same tune in Script. Synod., art. 4, p. 173: "God converts men by an action not irresistible, but by gentle persuasion," as Arminius says, Antiperk., p. 253. And in Apol., ch. 17, fol. 166, they teach that the heart of stone is removed, a new one put in, by external instruction, in the way a teacher teaches a student, who, as Corvinus says with Socinus, says to the student, "I will make another man of you." But it is certain that the teacher neither infuses the Holy Spirit, nor adds new powers to the will of the student.

4. Pelagius taught that all men can believe, if the truth is revealed. Thus Prosper: "When the doctrine of the Gospel is known," the Pelagians say, "man by the course of free will can accomplish it." Thus Rem. Apol., ch. 34-35.

5. Pelagius, I confess, added to the illumination of the mind the arousing of the stupefied will, as Augustine, On Grace, Against Pelagius, ch. 10. But this arousing was done only persuasively, which the Arminians also teach.

6. Augustine teaches in the book On the Grace of Christ, ch. 5, that the Pelagians taught that God can only help, that we may be able to will and act; and in ch. 47 of the same book, that possibility alone, not will and action, is helped by God. And this the Arminians teach. 1. Because they teach that with the action of the most powerful grace, resistance is always possible; and therefore God gives (according to them) that we may be able to believe, love, etc., not that we may believe and love. 2. They teach that God gives a new heart only by gentle persuasion, which man can always resist - that is, He leaves it to our power to have a new heart.

7. Augustine, Against Pelagius and Coelestius, ch. 18: "We have," says Pelagius, "the possibility of both parts implanted by God." And Prosper, Epistle to Ruffinus: "By grace," of the Orthodox, "nothing is left to free will, but it is altogether destroyed." It is the common doctrine of the Arminians that indifference to opposites is essential to the will in every state, even of corruption, and unless this is posited, grace will be only the force of divine omnipotence, fatally necessitating the will and plainly destroying its liberty.

8. Pelagius taught that man by the works of nature merits grace. Prosper, Against the Collator, ch. 9: "The beginnings of good wills proceed from us by nature." Thus Faustus (as Augustine says, book 2, ch. 8): "Do you want to be made well? You see, because the gift of salvation is not bestowed, unless first the desire of the will is consulted." And in the centurion, because the will preceded grace, therefore grace also preceded regeneration. Thus the Remonstrants, Script. Synod., art. 2 and 3, pp. 327-328. And Corvinus against Molina, ch. 39, teach that from the good use of common gifts, even of the law of nature, men merit the grace of conversion.

9. The Pelagians said (as Augustine teaches everywhere, On the Grace of Christ, and the book On the Perfection of Righteousness, and Jerome, Epistle to Ctesiphon) that the commandments of God are easy, and possible to observe. Thus Arminius, Response to Articles 30 and 31, pp. 164-165: "I do not oppose that Augustinian opinion, which states that man can be without sin in this life." Also in the Articles to be Pondered: "He who says that the regenerate, through the grace of Christ, can perfectly fulfill the law in this life, is neither a Pelagian, nor does injury to the grace of God, nor establishes justification by works." They establish the same doctrine in their Apologetic Writings, and everywhere.

10. Pelagius taught that grace is necessary to work more easily, not to work simply. The Arminians teach that, permission being posited, i.e., Arminian grace being offered, man can believe, or can abstain from the act of unbelief; and therefore abstinence from the act of unbelief in Peter does not necessarily require greater grace than in Judas the traitor, who does not believe.

11. The Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians taught that each one is converted and helped for this reason, because he himself wills to be converted, not because divine grace effectually works conversion; and therefore they subjected divine grace to our will. Thus Cyril of Alexandria in the acts of the Council of Ephesus, ch. 5: "The Coelestians," he says, "boast that God gives salvation as each one is willing, not as God Himself wills; but as the nature of man is constituted, this itself, according to the merit of the will, both calls forth and repels the Holy Spirit." Thus the Arminians teach that, all things required for conversion being posited, man can receive or repel grace, can convert himself or not convert himself. Prosper, Epistle to Augustine: "They," the Pelagians, "so preferred the human will to the

divine, that one is helped for this reason, because he willed it, not therefore, because he is helped, he wills." Thus the Remonstrants say, because we will to be converted, therefore God wills to convert us, not the contrary. It was customary for Cassian to say, "The mercy of God is present, only the occasion of good will being offered to it by us." Cassian, Conference 13, ch. 7: "The goodness of God, when it has perceived even the slightest spark of good will shining in us, or which [man] himself has struck as from the hard flint of our heart, cherishes and arouses it." Peter the Deacon, On the Incarnation and Grace, last chapter: "Faustus, going against the Apostle, subjects the desire of grace to human labor." Thus the Arminians say that our will begins in the order of causality, before grace influences. Grevinchovius, p. 209; Corvinus against Molina. Hence these sayings of theirs: "Of two equally prevented by habitual grace, one believes through grace because he wills it; the other does not believe, because he does not will it." Also, "One is not converted for this reason, because he does not will to be converted, when sufficient grace is present, if indeed he would will to be converted."

It is asked, Is there sufficient grace given, by which all could be saved if indeed they willed it? First, the question is not about the absolute necessity of grace. For if we regard the justice of God, God could make grace through Christ to not even one. Arminius, Antiperk., p. 734. 2. The question is not only about grace conferred on those who are in the visible Church, but about that conferred on all men, who are within and without the Church. 3. It is asked not only about those who never obey God calling, but also about the hardened and those severely punished with judicial impotence of not obeying - whether they have sufficient aid of grace, by which they can rise again and be converted. 4. The question is not about grace immediately sufficient for conversion. Corvinus denies, against Tilenus, ch. 11, p. 425, that such is given to all. 5. Nor is grace here taken for the light of the Gospel. Corvinus, ibid., ch. 3, p. 119. 6. Nor whether grace is given to the one well using the light of nature.

But it is asked, whether God, now, after entering into a new covenant with man, gives to all and each, whether within or without the visible Church, grace sufficient in its kind, by which he could be promoted by degrees to conversion, so that even the judicially hardened could rise again; and that ordinarily, on account of Christ the Mediator; and that moved by a pact, or federal justice, by which He intends the salvation of all and each. Or whether God denies such grace out of His good pleasure. The Jesuits and Arminians with their Socinians affirm it.

But we teach that God gives only special grace in Christ the Mediator to certain ones only, from eternity graciously elected to glory, out of mere grace and His absolute good pleasure - the rest being left with certain external means, and more common aids, which they abusing, are rendered inexcusable.

1. Because Isa. 9:2 - "The people who walked in darkness have seen a great light; those who dwelt in a land of deep darkness, on them has light shone" - is expounded in Matt. 4:15-16 of the Gentiles before the advent of Christ, destitute of the grace of God and the light of the Gospel. Thus Isa. 49:6 - "I will make you as a light for the nations," is expounded in Acts 13:47 of the preaching of the Gospel, not such as was made to the obstinate Jews, in the same chapter; but of preaching, which the grace of internal revelation accompanies. Therefore, they did not have the heavenly measure and sufficient grace; for to sit in the shadow of death, and to have sufficient grace, are opposed, as light and darkness.

2. To whom God denies the Gospel, they do not have the grace of believing the Gospel. But God denies the Gospel to most nations. The major premise is Rom. 10:14 - "How then will they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how are they to believe in him of whom they have never heard? And how are they to hear without someone preaching?" The minor is proved from Ps. 147:19-20 - "He declares his word to Jacob, his statutes and rules to Israel. He has not dealt thus with any other nation." Matt. 10:5 - "These twelve Jesus sent out, instructing them, 'Go nowhere among the Gentiles and enter no town of the Samaritans.'" Acts 16:6-7 - "And they went through the region of Phrygia and Galatia, having been forbidden by the Holy Spirit to speak the word in Asia. And when they had come up to Mysia, they attempted to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit of Jesus did not allow them."

3. Those who are darkness itself; whose wisdom is enmity against God, and cannot submit to the law of God; who cannot receive and understand the things of the Spirit of God; who are dead in sins; who are outside of Christ, without whom they can do nothing - they do not have sufficient grace, by which they can be promoted by their degrees to saving conversion. But such are all mortals by their nature.

Objection: By this argument it is concluded that men indeed by nature cannot believe in Christ. But it is badly inferred from this that men by universal grace, which God has denied to no mortal, cannot believe in Christ.

Response: If this distinction is to be made, it is to be denied simply that there is anyone in the nature of things who cannot believe in Christ. For if all mortals can by sufficient grace, which is given to all from the womb (as they would have it), no one is simply impotent to believe - for he who is able by grace extending equally widely as nature itself, is simply able. And given this distinction, Adam before the fall could not receive and understand the things of the Spirit of God, could not believe the Gospel, according to their doctrine; yet he could by supernatural grace. Man therefore is thus dead in sins, as to performing

supernatural works after the fall, as Adam was dead in sins before the fall - which is absurd.

4. If God does not send prophets to foreign nations about to hear and obey, Ezek. 3:6; if He denies miracles to the Tyrians about to repent, and sends prophets and grants miracles to many who never obey - then God does not intend the salvation of all, nor give the grace of believing. But the former is true. Therefore.

5. If God gives the Word, signs, temptations, and external means to some, and yet does not give a heart to know, and eyes to see, and ears to hear - then He denies sufficient grace to many. But the former is true, Deut. 29:3-4. Therefore.

6. If such grace were present to all men, and God intended the obedience and salvation of all, then He would not deny that motion which He would foreknow to be efficacious and suitable for fulfilling His will, and He would give that which He would know to be altogether vain and inefficacious. But that the latter happens to most men, Scripture testifies, experience testifies. The major premise is certain, because those whom God pursues with mercy and a gracious intention of saving, He converts, as is Eph. 2:4 - "But God, being rich in mercy, because of the great love with which he loved us," Therefore (v. 5) "even when we were dead in our trespasses, made us alive together with Christ." Also 2 Tim. 1:9 - "Who saved us and called us to a holy calling, not because of our works but because of his own purpose and grace." Thus Titus 3:4-5 - "But when the goodness and loving kindness of God our Savior appeared, he saved us, not because of works done by us in righteousness, but according to his own mercy."

7. Because the hardened cannot believe, John 12:39. And it is impossible for those sinning against the Holy Spirit to be renewed again, Heb. 6:4-5, no more than for a new sacrifice to be offered for them, or for Christ to be crucified again for them, Heb. 10:26. Therefore, they do not have sufficient grace.

8. If the Apostle forbids praying for the one sinning unto death, 1 John 5:16, then such a one does not have sufficient grace.

9. If Christ says, Matt. 13:11, "To you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it has not been given," then sufficient grace of understanding those mysteries was lacking to the people.

10. If God reveals to infants and hides from the wise the mysteries of the Gospel, and if no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and

anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him, then that grace of revelation is not given to all. But the former is true, Matt. 11:25, 27. Therefore.

11. If God allowed the Gentiles to walk in their own ways and overlooked the times of ignorance, but now (the light of the Gospel having arisen) commands all people everywhere to repent, Acts 17:30, then sufficient grace of believing was lacking to them formerly.

12. If no one can come to Christ unless drawn by the Father, John 6:44, and it is certain that not all are drawn - therefore, all cannot come.

It is asked, Is that distinction of grace into sufficient and efficacious to be admitted? The Arminians say yes. We say that external means are sufficient:

1. For inexcusability. 2. For external discipline. 3. For absolving God's justice. But no grace is sufficient for conversion, which is not at the same time efficacious.

1. Because every sufficient cause produces the effect. But the sufficient grace of the Arminians does not produce the effect, namely, conversion.

2. Every sufficient cause is able to produce the effect. But their grace is not able to produce the effect, because it cannot vanquish the vicious power of resisting God calling, and infallibly move the will to obedience - for thus it would overturn liberty, as they teach. Therefore, it is not sufficient.

3. Such grace is not to be endured, which supposes that the Devil is stronger than God. But if such universal grace is posited, which cannot be efficacious, unless the power of resisting is in the will, as they say - then that wicked one who is in the world will be stronger than God, who dwells in the sons of God. But the Apostle, 1 John 2:14 and 4:4, teaches the contrary to be true. Because from the efficacious victory of the saints over sin, he implies that God is stronger than the Devil.

4. If there is some grace in the truly regenerate sufficient, which can always be made inefficacious, as they teach, then God, being faithful, would allow His own to be tempted beyond what they are able - contrary to 1 Cor. 10:13.

It is asked, Do the Remonstrants, Apol., ch. 17, fol. 159, rightly teach that God always joins to the Word the power and operation of grace, or at least is always prepared to join it? We say no.

1. Because if God is only prepared to give grace, and does not actually give it in every difference of time, then he who hears the Gospel is not equipped with sufficient grace in every difference of time. If they say that God is prepared to give grace, and will actually give it, if man will not be lacking to God about to give by not cooperating with God - then before the collation of grace, man does not yet have that sufficient grace, and thus does not sin for this reason, that he is lacking to God about to give grace - because no one sins, as they teach, who sins from a defect of grace and power to obey.

2. Because it is Pelagianism for grace to be given according to the merits and endeavors of free will.

3. Because it is said of many in the visible Church who hear the Gospel, that they are dead in sins, blind, impotent, etc. - all of which would be false, if the preached Word is always accompanied by grace, and the power of obeying.

4. Because the Word is preached to the judicially hardened, and to those sinning against the Holy Spirit, and also to most who out of incorrigible malice make little or no account of the Word of the Gospel and despise it. But that grace of obeying is denied to such hearing the Word, and that in just punishment for despising the Gospel, Arminius teaches, Antiperk., and Corvinus against Molina.

It is asked, Is the power of believing conferred on all mortals? The Arminian Synodists say yes, art. 4, p. 61. We say no.

1. Because men are dead in sins, and impotent to come to Christ, unless they are drawn by the Father, John 6:44.

2. Because either the power of believing is conferred by the Word, or infused apart from the ministry of the Word, or is in us by nature. Not the first, because when the Word operates resistibly (as they teach), and most resist the Word actually preached, the power of believing cannot be conferred on all by the preached Word. Not the second, because this is a figment of the mind and unscriptural. Not the third, because thus our carnal wisdom would no more be repugnant to the Gospel than to the metaphysical conclusions of Aristotle - since equally (according to them) the power of believing the Gospel is in us by nature, and the power of believing Aristotle philosophizing.

It is asked, Does the grace of God efficaciously determine the will? The Arminians and Jesuits deny it. We affirm it.

1. Because we seek such determination from God in prayers. Ps. 119:36 - "Incline my heart to your testimonies." Ps. 86:11 - "Unite my heart to fear your name." Ps. 5:8 - "Lead me, O LORD." Ps. 119:27 - "Make me understand the way of your precepts."

2. Because predetermining grace of the will is promised by God. Isa. 44:3 - "For I will pour water on the thirsty land, and streams on the dry ground; I will pour my Spirit upon your offspring," etc. Ezek. 36:26 - "And I will give you a new heart." Deut. 30:6 - "And the LORD your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your offspring, so that you will love the LORD your God." Thus Jer. 24:7 and 31:33.

3. Because we give thanks to God because He bends and inclines our will to good. Matt. 11:25.

4. Because grace alone separates the believer from the non-believer, 1 Cor. 4:7.

5. Because the glory of supernatural acts will not belong to God, if the created will so determines itself to those acts, that it could not determine itself to them.

6. Because no one could hope and trust that God, for His truthfulness and faithfulness, would infallibly bend his will to final obedience.

7. Because dominion over free acts will not belong to God, nor the glory of truthfulness in His promises of giving a new heart, and final perseverance, Jer. 32:34, Ezek. 36:26, 1 Cor. 1:8, Isa. 54:10 and 59:20-21. For He cannot accomplish these in reality and in the second act, unless by effecting that the free will infallibly embrace good.

Chapter 9. On Universal Redemption.

1 John. 10:11.
I am that good Shepherd. The good Shepherd lays down his life for the sheep.

From these words Our men conclude, that the Ransom or price of redemption was paid only for the sheep, or for those predestined and elected to life as sons of God, who are

actually saved; and so that Christ did not lay down his life with that intention, that all and each one either might become salvable or actually be saved. Hence the famous controversy, in which it is
Asked, Whether Christ died for all and each one? In forming the state of the question, the Arminians vary, and are not consistent with themselves.

1. Arminius, in Antiperkins, page 673: "That (immediate effect of the death of Christ) is not the actual taking away of sins from these or those, not the actual remission of sins, not justification, not the actual redemption of these and those, which happen to no one without faith and the Spirit of Christ; but the reconciliation of God, the obtaining of remission, justification and redemption with God; by which it was brought about, that God now can, as it were, justice, which has been satisfied, not hindering, remit sins to sinful men, and bestow the spirit of grace: to communicate which effects to sinners, He was indeed already before inclined from mercy."
Hence by the death of Christ satisfaction was made to the justice of God for the sins of all mortals. Therefore (unless I am deceived) the wrath of God against sinners is laid aside: For God from justice cannot be angry with those, for whose sins the justice of God has been most fully satisfied. But the Remonstrants in the Synodical Writings, article 2, page 343, assert the contrary. "For although (they say) God thus far shows Himself propitious to all in Christ, that He wills to lay aside His wrath against them, if they believe the Gospel; yet in the very act itself, He does not lay it aside, except toward those already believing."
Hence it follows: 1. That God is angry with those reconciled to Him in Christ. 2. That God is angry with most who are not obliged to believe the Gospel, as never having been revealed. 3. That God is angry with those, for whose sins, Justice has been satisfied. 4. That the contingent and free act of believing takes away the wrath of God, and changes God from angry to placated. 5. That the death of Christ alone, is not that which renders God placated; but also the act of Free Will.

2. By the death of Christ reconciliation and remission were obtained for all, and that absolutely, whether they believe, or do not believe: But actual reconciliation and remission are applied to no one, except under the condition of faith. Coll. Hag.
But that obtained remission is only potential remission, which consists with guilt and the wrath of God remaining upon those, for whom it was obtained.
Hence by the death of Christ, God the Father was made only placable, not placated; justice was able to be satisfied through it, not actually satisfied: And Christ suffered death, the curse, reproaches, for the acquisition of the mere possibility of making a new covenant either of works or of grace, or any other, which if men fulfill, they may be saved. It cannot be said that Christ paid the penalties due to Judas and Pharaoh.
Hence Christ 1. Died for those, for whose sins He did not pay the penalties. 2. The death of Christ is not expiatory of sins, but only reconciliatory of justice, I know not what, or

ablative of punishment. 3. Nothing else is required for the actual remission of all and each one's sins, besides the mere free act of believing.

3. They say (Synodical Writings, article 2, page 283) "that the effect of this impetration is not a bare power only of saving, but also a full will of saving."
But this full will, is only placability, by which God can lay aside wrath, on the condition of faith: But toward no one except one actually believing, does He actually lay aside wrath.

4. Thus far they want all to have been taken into favor by God through the death of Christ, so that on account of the sin of Adam alone, He willed to punish no one with eternal torments. Synodical Writings, article 2, page 285. They want it to be established that the end, fruits, and utility of the death of Christ stand: 1. Even if all were damned, and although the death of Christ were applied to none of mortals. 2. Even if God intended to apply the death of Christ to none of mortals. Thus Grevinch, against Ames, pages 46-47.
Therefore it seems to me that through the death of Christ the justice in God is rather redeemed, by which He could save men, than sinful men; and that Christ died for God, not for miserable sinners. Which the Jesuits also teach. Bellarmine, tome 4, on the grace of God and Free Will, book 2, chapter 5. Gregory of Valentia, tome 2, disputation 8, question 3, on the division of grace, point 4. For this is altogether for Christ to have given Himself for all, and to have died for all, i.e. by His merits to have obtained from justice for the eternal Father all the helps, which men need on the part of God, that they may return into His favor and obtain salvation.

5. They want Christ to have died for all and each man; yet He did not die for the obstinate world, for the unfaithful and impenitent, as such. Because, they say, Synodical Writings, article 2, pages 286-287: "Grace (of remission) was obtained for sinners, insofar as they are considered in the common state of the fall and sin, and other sins, with the sole exception of impenitence, and indeed by this law, that the fruit of that grace should return to those alone, who were about to believe in the redeemer; but to those who were unwilling to believe, it should by no means pertain. ---- For the unfaithful and rebels, as such, grace was not obtained."
Hence 1. Christ died for all men, but not for the impenitent as such. But the impenitent are men. Therefore, He did not die simply for all.
2. If for rebels, as such, the grace of reconciliation was not obtained; Therefore, grace was not obtained absolutely for all, but conditionally, if they are not rebels. Therefore, neither did Christ die absolutely for all, but conditionally, if they are not rebels: and therefore He died for non-rebels alone, i.e. for believers alone.
3. Final unbelief and impenitence, were not even expiated by the death of Christ; and thus it is a simply unpardonable sin, for which Christ did not pay the penalties due to justice.

4. There was no intention in Christ of dying for rebels, as such, nor of obtaining by His death for them the grace of reconciliation and remission: Yet Christ through preachers, offers reconciliation and remission to rebels, as such. Isaiah 6:9 and 65:2, Matthew 13:13-15, Matthew 23:37-38, John 9:39. That is, Christ, with evil deceit, (let blasphemies be absent) with a double heart, offers to rebels reconciliation and remission, provided they believe, with that mind (as He Himself says in His Word) that they might be saved; which remission, however, was no more obtained for them by the death of Christ than for the Devils.
5. Because the death of Christ precedes faith and unbelief in order, they badly infer that Christ did not die for the faithful or for the unfaithful, as such; for Christ died for the unfaithful as such; because for us, when we were yet sinners and enemies, He died, Romans 5:6, for sinners, for the unjust. Therefore, He expiated on the wood of the cross, whatever was in us of enmities and impiety, and so of unbelief toward God. And He also died for believers, for friends, brothers, sheep, as such: that is, that He might make us such by the merit and efficacy of His death.

6. Vain and foolish is that question, Whether Christ died for the elect believers and brothers alone, as to the application and fruit of His death? Because this is to ask, whether Christ, with that intention, so died for the elect and believers, that believers alone from the powers of Free Will aided by grace are about to apply it? Because for Christ to die for men, does not include the act of believing in Christ crucified, formally, but only consequently and effectively; because thus men could be rebuked, that Christ did not die for them: likewise there would exist in the Gospel such a promise (believe, that thus you may effect, that Christ died for you) likewise such a threat, If you do not believe, you will effect that Christ by no means poured out His blood for you.

7. Ridiculous is this question, Whether Christ died for all and each mortal, for Pharaoh and Saul, and others consigned to the eternal torments of Gehenna, as to the reconciliation obtained, of which they themselves will never be more partakers, than the Devils.

8. It is not asked about the intrinsic sufficiency of the death of Christ, namely, whether Christ died for all and each one sufficiently. For David Pareus retracted that formula of speaking; Beza notes that it is an impropriety of speech: because for Christ to die for men, is, for Christ with that counsel and intention, to lay down His life for men, that He might actually give them, reconciled to God, Righteousness, Remission of sins, and Eternal Life. But truly the death of Christ is in itself sufficient antecedently to every decree and counsel of God; and it can be said, that the death of Christ is sufficient for saving all mortals, but not that Christ died for that end, that He might save all sufficiently.

9. Whether life, obtained by the death of Christ, is offered to all in the visible Church, under the condition of faith, is not asked: for we teach that.
The oblation of Christ is twofold. One approbative and of simple complacence. Matthew 23:37, "How often would I have gathered" etc. Proverbs 1:24, "I called and you refused" etc. It is proved by reason: 1. The external calling cannot be made to the reprobate, without some oblation, which is pleasing to God calling by a simple complacence, for the reprobate to believe. The invitation to the supper proves it. Matthew 22. 2. They do not sin against the promises, to whom the oblation was not made. 3. They do not trample on the blood of Christ, to whom the oblation was not made: according to that, "We took care of Babylon." The other is an intentional and decretive oblation, which comes under the name of giving: and this is an oblation together with conferral.

10. Nor finally is it asked, Whether in God there is a velleity and general intention of saving all and each one? We deny such a velleity. But the adversaries teach that through the death of Christ the natural velleity of God of saving all was changed into a full purpose of saving all and each one, through the death of Christ, provided they believe in Christ. But neither can any affection or will in God be changed; nor is this full purpose of saving all, provided they believe, anything other than the decree of saving all believers; because a conditional decree posits nothing in reality, unless the condition is posited. And it is a wonder, that not even in God was there a conditional intention of saving all and each one, provided they believe in Christ crucified, unless Christ had undergone death for all and each one: because since a conditional will posits nothing, unless the condition is posited; how in God could there not have been such a conditional will, unless Christ had died? For there is, with the death of Christ posited, in God a conditional will of saving and justifying all mortals, provided they fulfill the Law most perfectly.

The Question therefore is, Whether Christ, from the eternal counsel and decree of the Father and His own, expended the Ransom on the wood of the cross, in the name of all mortals, for that end, that all might believe in Him and be saved? Or whether in the name and place of the elect alone, He expended this Ransom and price to God the Father? The Remonstrants affirm, that it was expended in the name of all mortals. We deny it.

1. Because for whom Christ died, their person He sustained on the wood of the cross: But He sustained the person of the elect alone on the wood of the cross, not truly of the reprobate. Therefore, He died for the elect alone. The Major is of Scripture: for to die for another is to die in his place, person and stead, so that he, for whom someone died, may live: Thus David wished to die for Absalom: thus Moses, to be blotted out of the book of life for the people of God; Paul wished to be accursed from Christ for the Jews, that the Jews might obtain eternal life. Add, that for Christ to die for sinners is for Christ to suffer in Himself the penalties both temporary and eternal, due to sinners. The Minor is clear:

because Christ died for His sheep, John 10:11, for us, Romans 5:8, for the unjust, 1 Peter 3:18, for His friends, John 15:13, for His Church, Ephesians 25:25.

2. Because Christ died for those alone, for whom He rose again from the dead, and intercedes at the right hand of God the Father in heaven. But Christ rose again and intercedes at the right hand of God the Father for the elect alone, as the Adversaries confess. Therefore, He died for the elect alone. The Major is clear: 1. Because Christ did not simply die for sinners, but such a death, which by dying He conquered, and from which He struggled forth by rising again. But this is the death, which will never have dominion over those for whom He died, 1 Corinthians 15:54-55. 2. Because Paul joins these two. Romans 4:25, "He died for our sins, and was raised for our justification." Whence it follows, that for whose sins Christ died, for their Justification He was also raised. 3. Because the special fruits of the death of Christ, are His resurrection and intercession, that we might become partakers of His resurrection and newness of life, and might seek those things which are above at the right hand of God the Father. Romans 6:4, Colossians 3:1-2, Ephesians 2:5. 4. Nor would Christ have been a perfect priest for us, unless He had not only offered His body on the wood of the cross for us, but had also entered into the Holy of Holies by the power of His blood. Hebrews 9:23-25. 5. Because for whom Christ as Priest offered Himself to God the Father, for them as Priest He intercedes and prays. But He prays for the elect alone, not for the world. John 17:9. Therefore. The reason for the major, because the typical Priest performed these two things for the people. Leviticus 6. And the Apostle testifies to the Hebrews 5:1-3 and 8:3-4 and 9:7 that by these two our true high Priest most fully fulfilled it and was it. It was fitting for our priest, not only to have offered His blood for us, but also by the power of that blood, as our Advocate, to appear for us in heaven, Hebrews 10:12, 20, and through His blood and the veil of His flesh, as if through a new and living way to open the heavens, and to make access to the Father.

3. Because for whom Christ died, them He embraced with the highest love, and with a charity greater than any of mortals has. John 15:13, 1 John 3:16, John 3:16, Ephesians 3:14, 20, 1 John 4:10, Romans 5:10. But Christ does not embrace all and each mortal with such love.

4. Because those for whom Christ died, are reconciled to God, Romans 5:10-11. They have in Him redemption, even the remission of sins in His blood. Ephesians 1:17, Colossians 1:13. They are redeemed from their vain conversation, 1 Peter 1:18-19. The chastisement of their peace was upon Christ, Isaiah 53:5. To take away their sin, through the sacrifice of Himself He was manifested, Hebrews 9:26. They are delivered from future death, Romans 5:9. They are made the righteousness of God in Christ, 2 Corinthians 5:21. They are redeemed from the curse of the Law, Galatians 3:13-14. But none of these things can be said about all

mortals, of whom most are under the Law, under the curse, under the wrath of God, in their sins, not delivered from death, children of wrath, lost, etc.

5. Because for whom Christ died, for them Christ by the merit of His death, acquired the grace of regeneration and effectual calling. 1. Because He is the savior both by merit and by efficacy. 2. Because in the new covenant a new heart and a new Spirit are promised to the redeemed, Jeremiah 31:33-34, Acts 5:31, Romans 6:4, Hebrews 2:14-15. 3. Because the grace of Regeneration is given in Christ, i.e. on account of Christ, as the meritorious cause. Ephesians 2:4-5, 2 Timothy 1:9, Titus 3:5-6. But Christ did not merit the grace of regeneration by His death for all mortals and the reprobate, as the Adversaries confess.

6. Because according to the Adversaries, the end, fruit and utility of the death of Christ can stand firm, even if no mortal had believed, and been saved. Therefore, Christ died for none, except insofar as they believe; nor can remission and eternal life be obtained for all, except insofar as they believe or are about to believe: And therefore Christ obtained nothing for those never believing.

7. Because for whom Christ died, for them the Devil and death and sins are conquered. Galatians 2:15, Hebrews 2:14, 1 Corinthians 15:56-58. But the Devil, sin, and death triumph over the reprobate, who are the servants of sin, and in whom death and the Devil reign. Romans 6:16, Ephesians 2:2, 2 Timothy 2:26, 1 John 3:10.

8. Because for whom Christ died, for them God intends sanctification and deliverance from this present evil age. Galatians 1:14. Redemption from their vain conversation, 1 Peter 1:18. He died for them for this end, that being dead to sin, they might live to righteousness, 1 Peter 2:24. That He might redeem them from all iniquity, and purify for Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works, Titus 2:14. That He might present the Church to Himself glorious, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it might be holy and without blemish before Him. Ephesians 5:25-27. But God intends no such thing in most mortals. 1. Because many are reprobated from the mere good pleasure of God. Romans 9. 2. Because God does not fail without intention. 3. Because God denies to most the grace of the Gospel and its preaching, without which such intended sanctification is impossible. 4. Because among those who hear the Gospel, to many He denies internal grace, special to the elect. Deuteronomy 29:4, Isaiah 6:9, Romans 9:15-18, Romans 11:4-7.

9. Because if Christ had died for all and each one, vain would be the argumentations of the Scriptures full of consolations, sought from the death of Christ. Romans 8:34, "Christ died, Therefore, no one can condemn those for whom He died." 2 Corinthians 5:15, 1 Timothy 1:15, "Christ came to save sinners, Therefore," v.17, "to the King eternal, immortal, invisible, be glory." Likewise, Hebrews 10:19-21, "We have a high priest, who by His blood opened the

heavens, Therefore, let us draw near with full assurance." But such consolations would be equally common to the reprobate and believers; which is absurd.

10. Because if Christ died for all and each one, then the Gospel about salvation obtained for all and each one would be revealed; because the intention of saving all through the death of Christ cannot consist with the denial of the Gospel to most nations.

11. Because those for whom Christ died are given to Christ by the Father, are not their own, but bought with a price, 1 Corinthians 6:19-20. But all are not given to Christ by the Father, because those given to Him cannot perish. John 6:37-38. Not all are heirs, Romans 8:14, John 1:12. Not all are Christ's, John 8:44.

12. Because for whom Christ died, for their sins on the wood of the cross He paid the penalties due to divine Justice, and satisfied God: But not for the sins of all and each one, not for final impenitence and unbelief of those rejecting Christ, not for the sins of many who have heard nothing at all about Christ, did He make satisfaction. 1. Because for unbelievers, as such, He did not die; as the Adversaries confess. 2. Because the reprobate pay the penalties of their own sins in Gehenna for eternity. But the Justice of God does not demand double satisfactions for the same sins.

13. Because the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God the Father, cleanses the conscience of those for whom it is offered from dead works to serve the living God. Hebrews 9:14. But the consciences of all are not cleansed by God, as is known by experience.

14. Because if Christ died for all with this counsel, that all might be saved; Then 1. The eternal election of all and each one to eternal life stands. 2. All are the covenanted people of God. 3. All are reconciled to God. 4. All can be saved, if indeed they will; and conversion will not be from grace, but from Free Will.

15. Because this is Pelagian, as Prosper says, Epistle to Augustine, "They say that our Lord Jesus Christ died for the whole human race, and that no one at all is excepted from the redemption of His blood, even if he passes through this whole life with a mind most alien from Him: because the sacrament of mercy pertains to all men; by which most are not renewed, because they are foreknown that they do not have to will to be renewed." And the Council of Valence against the Pelagians, chapter 4, "They define (the Pelagians) that the blood of Christ was poured out even for those impious, who from the beginning of the world up to the passion of the Lord died in their impiety and were punished by eternal damnation." And Augustine against Julian, book 3, chapter 3, "They are redeemed, but not liberated, they say." These are the paradoxes of the Pelagian heretics.

Eph. 1:7.
In whom we have redemption through His blood, the remission of lapses, according to the riches of His grace.

Whence we have from Paul, that the Redemption obtained by the death of Christ is altogether the same with the remission of sins in His blood. Whence these questions emerge.

It is asked, Whether Christ, by His death, obtained reconciliation for all and each one; but does not actually confer it on all and each one? The Remonstrants affirm. We deny it.

1. Because for whom He obtained reconciliation, to them He does not impute sins. 2 Corinthians 5:19, Colossians 1:10-11, and so He actually reconciles them. But He does not actually reconcile all and each one. Therefore.

2. Because obtained remission without application is only potential remission, and actually non-remission. But what Christ acquired by blood is not only potential remission; but the Church acquired by blood. Acts 20:28. The Church redeemed from all iniquity. Galatians 1:3, Titus 2:14.

3. If Christ obtained reconciliation for all by the amplitude of merit, and only by sufficiency; they say nothing else than that, with the death of Christ accomplished, there remains in Christ a sufficient Ransom useful for redeeming all mortals. But this is not against us. But if He obtained reconciliation for all as to efficiency, Then either conditionally if all believe; and thus reconciliation was not obtained, unless all first believe; and because all do not believe, therefore reconciliation was not obtained for all, because a conditional impetration, if the condition is never posited, never posits anything. But if it was obtained for all, as to efficiency absolutely, whether they believe or do not believe: Therefore, by second act and real efficiency, it is necessary that all are actually reconciled, even if they never believe; which the Adversaries will not say. Therefore, reconciliation was obtained for believers alone.

It is asked, Whether those for whom Christ died can perish for eternity? The Remonstrants affirm. We deny it.

1. Because Paul argues, Romans 8:34, "Christ died; Therefore, who will condemn those for whom He died." But it is vain, what they object, that Paul argues there not from the death of Christ simply, but from His death and resurrection. But with the Apostasy of the saints standing, the consequence of Paul is not valid, thus, "Christ died for us, and rose again, Therefore, none of us will be condemned," because all can fail from faith, and thus be condemned.

2. Because the death of Christ is void and vain, and Christ would lay down His life and yet not see His seed, as the Father promises Him. Isaiah 53:10, if all can perish for whom He laid down His life.

3. It is Semi-Pelagianism of the Massilians, that Christ died for those who pass through this whole life with a mind most alien from Christ.

It is asked, Whether potential reconciliation, not actual restoration into the favor of God, is the effect of the death of Christ? that is, Whether through the death of Christ this only was effected, that we are restored into such a state, in which God, His avenging Justice no longer hindering, has the will of laying aside His wrath toward us, and of opening to all the door of salvation, by which all could be saved, if indeed they willed and believed in the Son of God; yet so that it could happen, that the salutary fruit of the death of Christ, or saving faith or true sanctification, might extend to no mortal; nay more with the death of Christ for all and each one standing, it could have happened that all perished for eternity? The Remonstrants affirm. Synodical Writings, article 2, pages 281-282. Arminius, Antiperkins, page 673. Grevinchoven, against Ames, page 8. We teach the contrary.

1. Because the effect of the death of Christ, efficaciously intended by God, is that from enemies, we might actually become friends and reconciled to God. Romans 5:10, "For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we will be saved by His life."

2. Because the effect of the death of Christ, efficaciously intended by God, is not only this placability of God, but the actual application of the death of Christ. Galatians 1:4, "Who gave Himself for our sins, that He might redeem us from this present evil age, according to the will of God and our Father." Titus 2:14, "Who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify for Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Ephesians 5:25-26, "Christ gave Himself for the Church, that He might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water by the word," v.27, "That He might present it to Himself glorious, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it might be holy and without blemish." Luke 18:11, "The Son of Man came to save that which was lost," namely, that He might save lost sinners in that way in which He saved Zacchaeus and other

Publicans, Luke 19:10-11, namely, by applying to them His death. 1 Timothy 1:15, "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief." But Paul was saved, actually and by efficacy; God, therefore, by the death of Christ, intended for Paul and other sinners such efficacious salvation. 1 Peter 1:18, "Knowing that you were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers," v.19, "But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." Therefore, regeneration and redemption from the vanity of life, is that which Christ merited by His blood. 1 Peter 2:24, "Who His own self bore our sins in His own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes you were healed." Colossians 1:22, "He has reconciled us in the body of His flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreproveable in His sight." 2 Corinthians 5:15, "That you may determine this, (that) He died for all, that those who live should no longer live for themselves, but for Him who died for them and rose again," v.21, "For He made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him." Therefore, our sanctification, and actual redemption from the slavery of sin and from all iniquity, our justification and actual salvation, is the end intended by God in the death of Christ, and the fruit obtained for us by His merit. Therefore, the placability of God, and our reconcilability and salvability, which can consist with the eternal destruction of all (for whom Christ died), is not the fruit and end intended by God in the death of Christ.

3. This placability and potential reconciliation, by which God can, if He wills, save men, stands with the defrauding of the dead Christ of His reward and fruit. For if Christ laid down His life for His own, yet God the Father would by no means stand by His promises, nor give to His Son seed. Isaiah 53:10. Nor children, Isaiah 8:18, Hebrews 2:13. Nor the nations for an inheritance and the ends of the earth for a possession, Psalm 2:8. Nor that all nations would serve Him. Psalm 72:11. Christ would be defrauded of His reward. But it is absurd for the Father not to fulfill His promises to the Son at all, when He has faithfully performed all the conditions of the covenant.

4. We do not see what good was intended for the elect in the death of Christ; if God intended nothing else immediately, besides a bare placability, by which He could save all. For this is the good of God not of men, and thus God by the death of Christ would render Himself reconcilable, but us by no means reconciled.

5. Christ would have shed His blood for men for an ambiguous and doubtful end; if with His death accomplished, it could happen that none believe, none are actually redeemed from their vain conversation, none are saved; or that all believe and are saved.

6. With the Ransom paid and accepted by the Father, it could have happened that none of the captives were freed from the chains of sin and death.

7. Because God the Father would miserably fail of the end of declaring Mercy, Wisdom, Power, Justice, Veracity, intended through the death of Christ; since, with the far most excellent means applied, namely, the death of Christ, His Son, He would have attained no end at all.

8. Because Christ through death and His resurrection would by no means have triumphed over death, sin, and the Devils; if with death accomplished, miserable sinners, enslaved to sin, death, the Devils and hell, could have remained for eternity.

9. Because Christ would have been King and Head without subjects and members, Bridegroom without a Bride, Redeemer without the redeemed.

10. If God through the death of Christ did not actually reconcile us, but only acquired the power of reconciling us, justice not hindering, and of making any covenant whatever, either Legal or Evangelical; then Christ, made a curse for us from the Law and the curse of the Law, would by no means have liberated us; contrary to that of Paul, Galatians 3:10-13.

11. If salvation is uncertain, with the death of Christ accomplished, then the new covenant would not excel the covenant of works; contrary to Hebrews 8:6. Because the promises about actual salvation, in both covenants, would depend on an uncertain and contingent Will.

12. Because salvation, under the condition of faith in Christ crucified, would not be promised in the New Covenant; if with Christ dead, it is free for God either to make such a covenant or never to make it; nay more in place of the New Covenant, to substitute the prohibition of not eating the fruit: And so the New Covenant would by no means be sanctioned and confirmed by the blood of the Son of God.

13. If by the death of Christ it was only effected that God laid aside wrath toward all mortals; no one is now born a child of wrath by nature, nor would there be need of faith and regeneration, if we are already in favor with God.

John. 3:19.
This is the condemnation, that Light has come into the world, yet men love darkness rather than Light, etc.

By which words Christ asserts that the sin on account of which all, who are born in the Visible Church, and hear the Word of the Gospel, are condemned, is unbelief, and rejection of the Savior. Whence,
It is asked, Whether the Remonstrants rightly number these three among the fruits and effects of the death of Christ? 1. That God, on account of the sin of Adam alone, wills no one to perish for eternity. 2. That He rejects no one from Himself on account of actual sins, which precede the Evangelical calling, but has mercy on all to repentance. 3. That God rejects no one from the communion of heavenly life, or afflicts with eternal punishment, on account of the sins which they call of infirmity. We deny that these are the fruits and effects of the death of Christ.
As to the first, whatever the Remonstrants bring to the contrary, Synodical Writings, article 2, page 283, we deny to be the fruit of the death of Christ.

1. Because notwithstanding this death, we are all by nature children of wrath, Ephesians 2:3.

2. Because Scripture has nothing about the remission of Original sin alone, without the remission of all sins, since the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin, 1 John 1:7.

3. Because all Barbarians and Indians would have in the blood of Christ, poured out for them, a semi-remission and semi-reconciliation, without any faith in Christ or any knowledge of the Savior; which figment lies hid from the Scriptures.
4. Because the absolute liberty of Election and Reprobation in infants not yet born stands firm to God, Romans 9:11. Therefore, on account of the first sin of Adam, and the want of the divine image, and the natural propensity to evil, some dying in infancy are adjudged to hell.
To the second Question, whatever the Remonstrants bring to the contrary in the same place, page 285, we deny that it is the effect of the death of Christ, that God rejects no one, on account of actual sins preceding the calling to faith and repentance; but has mercy on all, if they suffer themselves to be recalled to repentance and faith, and actually believe.

1. Because if the discourse is about the calling of all nations equally common, children cannot sin before they have grown up to more mature age and the use of reason, because those sins are now expiated by the death of Christ, and as if not sins. But if the discourse is

about the Evangelical calling of adults, then God cannot reject the Indians and Americans on account of homicides, parricides, poisonings, blasphemies, and the adoration of the Devil, nor can they be condemned on account of any crimes (the contrary of which the Remonstrants teach everywhere). For those sins precede the Evangelical calling, because they are never called Evangelically.

2. Because if God has mercy on all, who suffer themselves to be drawn to faith (as this opinion says), then either that action, by which they suffer themselves to be drawn to faith, begins from pure free will; and thus salvation and conversion will not be from grace, but from nature. Or it begins from the grace of God determining the will, which they will not say. Or, if from grace not determining the will, but from such grace, whose influence depends on the influence of Free Will; then still salvation and faith will begin from a purely natural act; and they say nothing else than that God has mercy on all, if He has mercy on all, and draws all to faith, if He draws all; because for a man to suffer himself to be recalled to faith, is for a man to perform the free act of responding to God calling.

3. Because for certain sins to be expiated by the death of Christ, and not all, is for men to be semi-redeemed by the blood of Christ. But Sacred Scripture has nothing about a semi-redeemer; because everywhere it delivers a full and perfect redemption of all, who are redeemed in Christ.
To the third Question; Whether this is the effect of the death of Christ, that God rejects no one, as long as he lives, on account of the infirmities more or less common to all, from the communion of heavenly life, or deprives of the fruit of grace obtained, or afflicts with eternal punishment, except him who by new vincible rebellion rejects grace and the Redeemer? The Remonstrants affirm, in the same place, article 2, page 285. We deny it.

1. Because since the wages of every sin, even the least, is death, through the death of Christ no sins were made venial, and such, which God does not punish with eternal punishment, unless the sinner truly grieves for and repents of them.

2. Because thus any regenerate person could perfectly fulfill the Law, if all his sins of infirmity are venial, i.e. made such, which by no means merit eternal death: for such, it is necessary, are neither offensive to God, nor contrary to the divine Law.

3. The Indians and Americans must be saved, according to this opinion: because they do not reject grace and the redeemer by new and vincible rebellion, who are not obliged to believe in the Redeemer, because they have never heard anything about Christ, and so labor under an insuperable ignorance of Christ. Paul in that place Romans 10:14, "How will they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?" frees from the guilt of culpable unbelief and so of rejection of Christ, all those who have heard nothing about Christ.

4. Because unless one is born again, even if he does not reject the redeemer by new and vincible contumacy, yet he will not enter into the kingdom of God. John 3:3.

5. Because by this doctrine, there are no sins at all, besides unbelief and the rebellion of final impenitence and contumacy against Christ the Redeemer: Therefore, not the parricides, adulteries, etc. of those, who plainly ignore Christ from a defect of instruction, and dullness of mind, are sins proscribing men from heaven. But this is mere Libertinism.

6. Because this is to turn the grace of Christ into lasciviousness, if through the death of Christ it was effected, that men can freely commit all crimes, without fear of Gehenna and exclusion from the kingdom of heaven, provided they beware of rebellion against Christ, and unbelief.
To these also three other little questions are related.
It is asked, first, Whether because God proscribes no one from heaven, except him who opposes to Christ new and vincible rebellion, therefore the Remonstrants rightly conclude (in the same place), that the Gospel can be preached to all and each one at all times everywhere? We deny it.

1. Because there is no such power in men, either physically or morally, that they can preach the Gospel in the most remote regions of the world, where Christ has not even been heard of.

2. Because this vain consequence supposes, that the Gospel is preached or not preached from the merits or demerits of men.

3. Because certain nations render themselves unworthy of the Gospel, the Adversaries confessing; and therefore they are deprived of the proclamation of the Gospel by the order of justice: Can the Gospel be preached there to each and all at all times, the justice of God repugnant?

4. If because no one is proscribed from heaven, except him, who opposes to Christ new and vincible rebellion, therefore the Gospel can be preached to all and each one at all hours everywhere; then all nations before the Gospel is heard, in which state they cannot oppose new contumacy to Christ, either are worthy of the Gospel, which is absurd; or are not worthy, and thus those, who are neither proscribed from heaven, nor have merited eternal punishments, nor seem to be defiled by any sin, as the adversaries want, are unworthy of the Gospel, which is unjust.

5. If the Gospel can be preached everywhere, and at each moment; Therefore, the Gospel could have been preached in Bithynia at that moment, in which the Holy Spirit forbade the Apostles to preach there; which is absurd.
It is asked 2. Whether because God proscribes no one, except the rebel against Christ, from Evangelical grace and heaven; therefore, all and each one are obliged to believe in Jesus Christ announced by the Gospel, altogether by the same right and mode? The Remonstrants affirm, article 2, Synodical Writings, page 285.
We say, that all are obliged to believe in Christ by an equal right, i.e. by an equal Evangelical command, and an equal conscience, moved by the authority of God commanding; for all are equally bound to obey God. But we deny, that all, the elect equally and the reprobate, are obliged to believe by the same formal right, or by the same right of title and property in Christ the savior: because by this latter right, the elect alone are bound also to believe.

1. Because from the intention of God the Father and of Christ dying, Christ is not the savior of the reprobate, but only of the elect: For the intention of dying for someone, and election, or the intention of saving, in God are of equal extent. But the Arminians and Jesuits do not dare to say, that Christ is the Savior of the reprobate from the peremptory intention of God. The Jesuits from the absolute decree of denying to them congruous calling, deny that Christ is their Savior.

2. The remission of sins, the Righteousness of Christ, regeneration, and faith were not obtained for the reprobate by the merit of Christ. But all these things were acquired for the elect by the merit of the death of Christ. Therefore, there is not an equal right obliging the elect and the reprobate to believe.
It is asked, thirdly, Whether because God proscribes from heaven, and afflicts with eternal punishment only the despisers of the Redeemer, and those spurning divine grace; therefore all and each one not believing, for this reason that they do not want to believe in this their Redeemer, when they can through grace, are guilty of eternal punishment, and are deprived by their own fault of the fruit of the obtained reconciliation? Thus the Remonstrants affirm in the same place, in express words. We deny it.

1. Because the Indians and Americans, and those who have heard nothing about Christ and His Gospel, will perish without law, Romans 2:12. And much more without the Gospel; and are not bound to believe, according to that, Romans 10:14, "How will they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?" and according to that, John 15:22, "If I had not come, and spoken to them, they would not have sin," i.e. they would not have been guilty of the sin of unbelief.

2. Because it is unjust, for men not to be condemned on account of sin, truly and by nature and depraved habit inhering in them; and yet to be damned only for this reason, that they do not want to believe in Christ, about whom they have heard nothing; since faith is simply impossible from the defect and want of a revealed object. Therefore our Theologians rightly assert, that no one is damned on account of negative unbelief, but only positive.

Rom. 5:10.
For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son; much more, being reconciled, we will be saved by His life.

From this place it is clear, that all those, for whom Christ died, come under the name of enemies and foes; and so are unbelievers and rebels. Whence
It is asked, Whether the Remonstrants rightly assert, Synodical Writings, article 2, page 286, that Christ did not die for unbelievers and rebels, as such; but that by the death of Christ grace was obtained for sinners, insofar as they are considered in the common state of the fall and sin, and other sins, with the sole exception of impenitence: and indeed by this law, that the fruit of that grace should return to those alone, who were about to believe in the Redeemer; but to those, who were unwilling to believe in the Redeemer, it should by no means pertain? We deny it.

1. Because according to the Arminians, Christ died for all and each man. But the finally impenitent are men.

2. Because if grace was not obtained for vanquishing unbelief and rebellion against Christ; then this rebellion (according to the Arminians) is not sin: because it is not in the power of man to avoid that sin, for avoiding which, no grace, not even in the fullness of grace in Christ, is available to them, and the remission of which sin is physically impossible. But there is no grace obtained in Christ, by which men can avoid final unbelief: because Christ did not shed His blood to expiate that sin. Therefore they are not rightly condemned on account of that sin.

3. If grace of reconciliation was not obtained for rebels, as such; then all truly believing abstain from final rebellion (which alone is the cause of damnation) from the powers of pure nature; without any aid of grace, and therefore finally believe (which is to abstain from final rebellion and unbelief) and save themselves, from the pure powers of nature;

because for avoiding final unbelief, there is no grace, even in Christ, for men, as they teach.

4. They badly put for the same thing unbelievers and rebels. For by unbelievers they understand those finally contumacious against Christ: But many for a time, are rebels against Christ, as Saul and the repenting thief on the cross, who are not finally impenitent. And thus it is necessary that Christ died for certain rebels, as such, and for certain unbelievers for a time, as such.

5. They teach without any Scripture and reason, in this way: that Christ on the wood of the cross, satisfied divine justice for certain sins of those perishing, but not for all.

6. A futile reason is brought by the Hague Collocutors for this distinction, page 171, namely, that the death of Christ precedes in order, faith and unbelief; therefore it is absurd, that Christ died for believers or unbelievers. For the death of Christ, does not precede in order, our enmities towards God, injustice, impiety; as Scripture says, that Christ died for the unjust, the impious, and for us while we were yet His enemies. As if indeed our natural impiety did not in the first place include unbelief and hatred towards Christ; by which it happens, that we would not come to Him unless drawn by the Father, John 6:44. As if no one by nature were impious, and a hater of Christ! But if Original sin is not sin, as the Arminians think, Christ expiated no sins on the wood of the cross for those, who having heard the Gospel obey. For Original sin is not sin, and the sins, which precede the Evangelical calling, unless new rebellion against Christ is added, do not proscribe and exclude men from heaven; and those, who obey the Gospel do not oppose new rebellion. And He expiated no sins for those reprobate, who having heard the Gospel oppose new rebellion, and finally resist it; because the sin of origin in them is not sin; and rebellion cannot be sin, because grace was not obtained in Christ for avoiding rebellion: because Christ for such, as they teach, neither obtained grace, nor died.

7. Hence it follows, that men before adult age, at which time they begin to be capable of rebellion against Christ, are not sinners, nor children of wrath; but are innocent men, in pure naturals.

8. Christ blotted out all the sins of the elect, 1 John 1:7. Therefore, also their unbelief, and the guilt of the Evangelical calling always despised and rejected, until God, by grace, proper to the elect, conquered their hardness. Therefore, Christ died for unbelievers, as such, and because they were unbelievers, that He might blot out their unbelief by His blood, He died. Then, if we consider the intention and counsel of God, Christ died for believers alone, as such, i.e. for His sheep, friends, brothers, sons of God, the church; i.e.

with this counsel, that He might acquire by His merits remission of sins and salvation, faith and regeneration for those about to believe, and not for others.

2 Cor. 5:19.
God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself.

From which context it follows, that in the mind of God from eternity, all the sins of the elect were taken away; Whence it is asked, Whether through the grace of reconciliation, obtained by the death of Christ, the affection of Mercy, by which God wills all to be saved, whose egress would be hindered by justice, injured by sin, was changed into a full purpose of the will of giving eternal life to believers? Thus the Remonstrants affirm in the same place, page 284. We deny it.

1. Because there is in God no semi-mercy or semi-will of having mercy, which can be increased and changed into a full will: For neither is the will of God capable of increase or alteration.

2. Because the merit of Christ, and His death, since it is something temporal, can no more be the cause of the divine will, than a cause can be given of the divine essence itself.

3. Because the change of divine wrath and hatred, into love and benevolence, is not a change in God ad intra; but only a change of the effects of God angry and hating sinners, ad extra.

1 Pet. 2:24.
Who bore our sins in His body on the tree.

For Christ to bear our sins on the tree, is for Christ to bear the penalties due to our sins, which we ourselves were about to suffer in our own persons for eternity. Whence that famous question.

Whether Christ on the wood of the cross, in His death and passion, sustained the place, stead, and person of those for whom He died; so that He bore the penalties due to them, and God esteemed them as if dead, because Christ died for them and in their stead? The Remonstrants, for our good, want Christ to have died thus far, that His death should turn

to our good, unless it stood through ourselves: but they deny that Christ died for us, i.e. in our stead and place. The Arminians teach indeed in words that Christ died for us. Coll. Hag. page 185. "Christ died for our sins, bearing that death in our stead, which was owed to our sins." But Arminius institutes otherwise, Antiperkins, page 673. "I will say that Christ sustained our person not with respect to the act of offering, but of suffering. For He was made a curse for us, and made a sacrifice for sin." Whence it appears, since all men in general are sinners and liable to the curse, and Christ assumed human nature common to all, it is likely that He sustained the person of all men.

But this distinction is insipid. For the act of offering His body on the wood of the cross, and the very suffering of death, are one and the same motion really. When therefore he says, that Christ offered His body to God the Father, not in the place and stead of all mortals; yet suffered death in the place and stead of all mortals; he in truth says, that Christ on the wood of the cross by dying sustained the person of all mortals, and by dying did not sustain the stead and person of all mortals.

But Christ can be said to have sustained our person in various ways. 1. As if the elect had substituted Christ in their place and stead; as a City sends a Commissioner to an Assembly, who bears the stead and person of the whole City in the Assembly. We confess, that in this sense Christ by no means sustained our person. For the Lord (not men) transferred our iniquities to Him, Isaiah 53:6.

2. He can be said to have sustained our person, as if He satisfied justice, and by suffering for us, merited that right and title to eternal life, which we ourselves would have merited, supposing this, that we had suffered for our sins, what He suffered. The Adversaries ascribe this sense to us, and all oppugners of imputed righteousness; and they infer that we are equally just, as Christ Himself is. But we teach that Christ from the dignity of the suffering person, merited far more by His death, than we could merit, even supposing per impossible, that we had suffered all in so short a space, which He suffered. Whence Bellarmine, book 2, on justification, chapter 2, argument 5. "If the righteousness of Christ were truly imputed to us, so that through Him we should be accounted and reckoned just, just as if it were properly our own intrinsic and formal righteousness, ---- we ought to be reckoned equally just as Christ Himself; and we ought to be called redeemers and saviors of the world." But the Jesuit himself in the same place, argument 4, responds for us. "For if they only wanted (he says of Ours) the merits of Christ to be imputed to us, because they were given to us, and we can offer them to God the Father for our sins, because Christ took upon Himself the burden of satisfying for us, and reconciling us to God the Father; their opinion would be right." And certainly this is for Christ to have died in our stead and place, and it is the same, as if we ourselves had died.

3. Christ can be said to have borne our person, as if by dying He had performed all things for us and in our stead, which are required for our actual salvation; as if the condition of faith were not necessarily required from us, for actual justification and glorification. And the Arminians also calumniously ascribed this sense to us, which however we do not teach.

4. Yet Christ, in this sense, died in our place and stead, that He suffered the penalties due to us for sins for eternity; and by satisfying the justice of God for us by dying He thus far pleaded our cause, that God esteems it the same, as if we had died, and requires nothing else for satisfying His justice and our actual redemption from the guilt of sin; but for the application of that Redemption, demands faith effective through charity.

It is proved. 1. Because to die for someone is to die in the place of the dead, that he, who died, might live; as a surety or sponsor pays the price for a bankrupt, which is legally the same, with the creditor, as if the bankrupt himself paid the price. In which sense David wished to die for Absalom, and Paul to be accursed for the Jews, namely in the place of Absalom and the Jews, that they might live. Therefore, Christ did not die only for the good of the Elect, so that they can also die for eternity, as the Arminians teach.

2. Because Scripture says the same. Christ died for us, Romans 5:8, for sinners, the just for the unjust. 1 Peter 3:18. For friends, John 15:13. For His sheep, John 10:11. For the Church. Ephesians 5:25. For many. Matthew 20:28. That is, in the stead and place of sinners, the unjust, sheep, etc.

3. If Christ suffered that in His body, which we ought to have suffered; then He died in our place. But the former is true. Galatians 3:13. He was made a curse for us. But it is expressly said, that we were subject to the curse of the Law, according to that, "Cursed is he, who does not continue in all things, which are written in the book of the Law, that he may do them." If He was bruised for our iniquities; and the chastisement of our peace was laid on Him, and by His stripes we were healed, as the Prophet says, Isaiah 53:5. And if He bore our sins in His body on the tree, as it is 1 Peter 2:24. And if He innocent, who knew no sin, was made sin for us, 2 Corinthians 5:21. And if from the transgression of my people, the stroke was upon Him, Isaiah 53:8. Then rightly He died in our place. The reason is; because either He suffered, as a mere exemplar of obedience, which the impious Socinus asserts against the Scriptures: Or, from the order of justice, as a surety smitten in our place, which is the case: or finally, He shed His blood for a vague end, that that good redounding from His death, should return to us for good, as much as the labile obedience of the first Adam should turn to us for good; which is absurd. For thus, the second covenant is not more excellent than the first, the second Adam is not stronger than the first for saving.

4. He who so died, that He gave Himself a ransom, a counter-ransom, a redemption-price, such as is given for captives, where the ransom stands in the place of the captive; and a price, such as is given for things bought, where the price stands in the place of the thing bought; He died in our place and stead. But Christ died for us in this way. Matthew 20:28, 1 Timothy 2:6, 1 Peter 3:18-19, 1 Corinthians 6:20. And vain is that of Arminius, Antiperkins, page 673. "It is not of the essence of a Mediator, that He sustain the person of anyone. For He sustains the person of neither party." It is indeed true, that to sustain the person of the altercating and diffident is not of the essence of a Mediator in general: But our argument is not from a Mediator in general, but from such a Mediator in particular, who is a surety, and promised and rendered satisfaction of passive obedience to injured justice. Whence altogether, it is of the essence of such a Mediator, who for the other party poured out His blood and life, to sustain the person and stead of that party.

To this also is related another Question, Whether Christ intercedes generally for all, but specially for believers alone? The Remonstrants affirm, Synodical Writings, article 2, page 319. Corvinus against Molina, chapter 28, section 24. Who teach, that by those words John 17:9, "I do not pray for the world," Christ does not exclude others from His prayers, but in this prayer prays only for the Apostles: Otherwise elsewhere Christ prays for those crucifying Him, "Father forgive them": indeed they want Christ from a general and antecedent affection, to pray and intercede for all; but by a consequent will, for elect believers alone. We teach the contrary.

1. Because by no place of Scripture do they prove, that Christ prays for all. Isaiah 53:12. He prays for transgressors. An indefinite proposition in contingent matter is equivalent to a particular: For He does not pray for all sinners; because He does not pray for those sinning against the Holy Spirit, not for the finally unfaithful and contumacious, as such. For for whom He did not die as Mediator, for them He does not intercede, as Advocate, that His death may profit them to eternal salvation: But the Adversaries deny that Christ died for the finally unfaithful, as such.

2. Christ is always heard, as often as He prays to the Father. John 11:42. "For I knew that you always hear me." But the prayers of Christ were not heard for all and each one, because all and each one do not believe to the end nor are saved. But it is blasphemous, that the prayers of Christ are not heard; 1. Because thus they would rest on the piety and merits of the men for whom He prays; not on His own merits; if the prayers of Christ were heard for all and each one, provided that all and each one believed and persevered. 2. Because Christ intercedes by praying, lest the faith of those fail, for whom He prays, Luke 22:31.

3. Because it was of the Typical Priest, not only to sacrifice for the people; but also to enter with blood once every year into the Holy of Holies. But the Holy Spirit applies both of

these to Christ, Hebrews 5:1-3 and 8:3-4 and 9:7, 11 and 10:19-20, who not only offered Himself as a sacrifice to God the Father, but by the merit of His blood, entered into the Holy of Holies, i.e. into heaven. But the Arminians deny, that Christ intercedes in heaven, or enters by His blood into that celestial Holy of Holies for all and each one, but only for believers.

4. Christ can intercede for none according to the Arminians. Therefore, not for all. I prove the Antecedent. Because Christ, according to them, did not merit by His death faith and regeneration and perseverance in faith. Therefore, He cannot pray for our faith and perseverance. The reason for the consequence is; because the prayer of Christ the Priest rests on the value and merit of the perfect sacrifice offered by Him to God.

5. They do not dare to assert, that Christ now prays at the right hand of the Father for all the reprobate; not even generally. Because, if He thus generally rose again, ascended into heaven, and now intercedes at the right hand of God the Father for them, it is necessary. But they do not teach this, indeed they say that He rose again for believers alone.

1 Cor. 1:4.
I give thanks to my God always concerning you, for the grace, which is given to you in Christ Jesus.

Whence it is clear, that Christ is He, on account of whom, as the meritorious cause, all grace is given to us. Therefore.

It is asked, Whether the Remonstrants rightly teach, Apology, chapter 8, folio 95, that Christ by His death merited faith and regeneration for no mortals? We deny it.

1. Because Ephesians 1:3. God has blessed us with every spiritual blessing in Christ; Therefore, also with faith and regeneration.

2. Because we are God's new workmanship in Christ Jesus, whom He created for good works, Ephesians 2:10. Therefore, also for faith, which they call a good work; and Christ calls the work of God, John 6:29.

3. Because Paul gives thanks to God for this, 1 Corinthians 1:4-5. "I give thanks to my God always concerning you, for the grace which is given to you in Christ Jesus: that you were enriched in all things in Him." Therefore, that they were rich in faith in Him.

4. Because all the promises of God in Christ are also Yes and Amen. 2 Corinthians 1:20. Indeed, He merited all things promised, among which are first of all regeneration, circumcision of the heart, Deuteronomy 30:6, a new heart and a new Spirit, and so the implantation of faith; all which things are promised to us in the New Covenant. Ezekiel 36:26, Ezekiel 11:19, Jeremiah 31:33, Zechariah 12:10. Nay more it is absurd, that the things promised in the New Covenant, were not obtained for us by the merit of the blood of the New Covenant, and by the death of the Surety of the New Covenant, as Christ is called, Hebrews 7:22.

5. Because the spirit of regeneration is poured out on us, through Christ Jesus our Savior, from the kindness and philanthropy of God. Titus 3:4-6. For since faith and regeneration are the gifts of God, it is absurd that these are given to us, except on account of the merits of Christ; otherwise, God would give us these gifts, as the Creator of the world gives food to ravens. Than which what is more contradictory to the Scriptures?

8. The Arminians therefore deny that Christ merited faith and regeneration for us; lest they be forced to say, that faith and regeneration are given from the necessity and power of the merits of Christ. 2. Because it would be absurd, that Christ for all, by His merits, acquired faith and regeneration, as He died for all; since very few believe and are regenerated. 3. Because faith to them is not the gift of grace, obtained by the merit of Christ, as neither is regeneration, (if they had learned to speak sincerely) but the work of Free Will. 4. Because they think it absurd, that that, which is required from us as a duty, and a condition to be freely performed, and under the title of free obedience, should be obtained by the merits of Christ: because thus it would have to be necessarily given to us, which we nevertheless freely, not necessarily, perform.

John. 15:13.
Greater love has no one than this, that someone lay down his life for his friends.

It is asked, Whether Christ embraced those, for whom He died, with the greatest love? or, Whether another greater could be given, than that by which He pursues those, who actually believe and are saved? The Remonstrants teach this, especially in the Hague Colloquy, page 184. And Corvinus against Molina, chapter 28, section 17. That Christ does not signify in that place the highest love simply, but only in a certain respect. Because greater (they say) is the love not only to merit, but also to actually confer salvation. But we deny it.

1. It must not be distinguished, where the Law of God does not distinguish. But Christ says expressly, that no one has greater love than this.

2. Because this love is such, that if God delivers His Son for us, which is greater, He cannot not give all other things, lesser and therefore the grace of believing and persevering and eternal salvation. Romans 8:32.

3. Because this love of Christ is of such length, width, depth and height, that it is supereminent to all knowledge. Ephesians 3:18-19.

4. The love of Christ laying down His life for His friends, cannot even be called love (according to the Arminians); because this love very well consists with the hatred both peremptory and irrevocable of the decree of Reprobation, and the eternal destruction of all, whom He embraces with such love; nay with such denial of means, which God foreknows will efficaciously liberate them from the eternal wrath of God and destruction.

5. In Romans 5:10, Paul thus argues. "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we will be saved by His life." Whence it follows, that reconciliation by the death of the Son of God, is of greater love, than the glorification of the reconciled. But with reconciliation by the antecedent death of Christ standing, and common to all, elect and reprobate, (as the Adversaries want) it is not necessary that any of mortals be saved.

6. It is not that they may say, that God could not have shown greater love in that kind, namely, of antecedent love towards enemies: But that He showed greater towards friends, in whom the Father makes His abode; as Corvinus objects in the same place, section 19: 1.

Because Christ speaks of love towards friends themselves. John 15:13. 2. Because there is one love in God, by which He embraced His own from eternity. Here He speaks of the love of God as to affection, as it is manifested to us, in this especially, that Christ underwent death for us.

It is asked, whether the Remonstrants rightly define Reconciliation in Apology chapter 8, folio 98, to be the active efficiency of the will of saving, in place of the will of destroying. We deny it.

1. Because no efficient cause is given in creatures of the Will of God.

2. Because the Will of destroying is not mutable, migrating into the Will of saving.

3. Because Reconciliation is an external and temporal act in God, by which God declares that He holds as pleasing and acceptable the one believing in the Son of God; and it presupposes the death of Christ and the faith of man in Christ; and differs from Justification in reason, not in reality. And reconciliation on our part, is an act of obedience commanded to us. 2 Corinthians 5:20. "We pray in Christ's name, be reconciled to God." Therefore, it is not essentially such a will.

4. For there to be in God, the will of saving the reprobate, substituted through the death of Christ, in place of destroying, is false. 1. Because there is no peace to the reprobate. 2. There could not have been in God the will of destroying the reprobate before the despised Redeemer, as they themselves teach. But truly to destroy those, who do not believe in their infancy, is iniquity, or to destroy them on account of Original Sin, is to punish non-sinners (according to them). Or to destroy them, on account of intervening sins, between infancy and the sufficient proposition of the Gospel, is unreasonable. Because they labor under invincible ignorance who sin before grace given, through the preaching of the Gospel, when they are not yet capable of the Gospel sufficiently proposed.

Rom. 8:34.
Who is he who condemns? It is Christ who died, yea rather, who is also risen again.

From which place a solid argument of Christian consolation is available to all those, for whom Christ died. Whence.

It is asked, Whether the solid foundation of consolation, hope, and Christian certainty, is in this, that Christ died for all and each one; but of despair and perpetual doubt, that He died for the elect alone absolutely and believers; since from the Scriptures it is certain to no one, that he is elect and believes? The Remonstrants affirm. We deny it.

1. Because truly Christian hope and consolation, is proper to the elect and believers, and laid up for them in heaven, Colossians 1:5, 1 Peter 1:3, Romans 8:24. And the certainty of salvation both objective, and subjective, and of adherence, (which they call) is proper to believers alone, Romans 8:38-39, 2 Corinthians 5:1-2, Colossians 2:2, 2 Timothy 1:12, Romans 5:1, Romans 8:16. And therefore we profess, that our doctrine, does not at all sew pillows for all the armpits of the arms of the impious and unbelieving.

2. They make a miserable hope and vain consolation for wretched souls, who teach, this being posited, that Christ poured out His soul and blood for me and each mortal, Judas and Pharaoh; yet unless my Liberty more versatile than a hinge, does this one thing, that it makes me and all mortals partakers of salvation; it can happen, that I and all mortals perish together for eternity. Indeed, this consequence is as valid, Christ died for sinners, Therefore, the Devil will be saved: as this, Christ died for all and each one, Therefore, Judas the betrayer, be of good heart, you will be saved, you have enough consolation.

3. The Arminians teach nothing about the motion of the hearts of men, according to the foreknowledge of God, as the Jesuits do; nothing about the efficacious and indeclinable inflection of the heart to the obedience of Christ, as the Dominicans teach. But according to their doctrine, Free Will dominates in the providence of God, and all grace most strongly acting; it dominates in willing or not willing, in believing or not believing, in persevering or not persevering in grace. Whence arises a hope hanging, doubtful, uncertain, shaken by the fear of final falling away and apostasy, at every hour: and thence vain and slippery consolation. How miserable are these comforters!

4. Enough and more than enough hope, certainty, and consolation, is laid under this syllogism.
Whoever believes in Christ, will be saved.
But I believe in Christ.
Therefore, I will be saved.
The Major is of Scripture. The Minor can be proved from the Scriptures. Romans 6:16. And from those infallible signs, by which someone can be certain, that he believes; which can be discerned partly from the Sacred Scriptures, partly by the testimony of the Holy Spirit, partly by the sense of Christian experience, even by divine certainty.

5. The Arminian foundation of consolation and certainty, is universal election, or the universal intention of saving all, and dying for all, which has nothing solid in itself. For the unbelieving, unless they presume and nourish a vain hope, then have matter of despairing about eternal salvation, and of suspecting that they are not of the number of those, whom God by the complete, irrevocable and peremptory decree of election, destined to glory. But certainly we, command none to seek the foundation of hope and consolation in the secret intentions and hidden decrees of God, but in the revealed will of God, collated with the conscience of each man.

It is asked, Whether the reprobate, by the death of Christ, were made reconcilable to God? The Arminians simply affirm it.

We distinguish, and teach, that in that sense, they were made reconcilable through the death of Christ, in which Prosper, response to the Chapter of the Gauls, chapter 9, says, that Christ is the Savior of the whole world, on account of the true assumption of human nature, and on account of the common perdition in the first man. Hence, although Christ did not die for the reprobate, yet they were made reconcilable through the death of Christ, in this sense.

1. Because Christ assumed the nature, which is common, although not as it is common to all, but as it is the nature of Abraham the father of believers, Hebrews 2:16. Hence the Devils were by no means made salvable through Christ, indeed, who did not unite to Himself the Angelic nature in His person.

2. Because Christ expiated the common sin of Adam, on the wood of the cross, although not as common, but as it is in the elect and believers.

3. Because the grace of the preaching of the Gospel was obtained by the death of Christ, for the reprobate born in the visible Church; and an approbative oblation of Christ and of simple complacence was made to them. Whence they are called to the supper. Matthew 22, Luke 14:16. And they are called to Christ. Matthew 11:16, Matthew 23:37-38, 1 Corinthians 1:18, 23, Acts 14:46, Proverbs 1:24-25, Isaiah 6:10-11, Isaiah 65:2-3. But these things cannot be said about the Devils.

But the reprobate were not, by the death of Christ, made reconcilable to God.

1. As if a conditional and decretive oblation of Christ were made to them, by which God offers Christ to them in that mode, by which He determined actually to apply His merits to them efficaciously; as believers were made reconcilable by the death of Christ.

2. They were not made reconcilable, as if Christ bore their persons on the wood of the cross, and suffered the penalties due to them.

3. Nor were they made reconcilable, as if Christ by His death, merited for them, reconciliation, remission, and eternal salvation.

4. Nor as if in the promises preached, God intended for them, the things promised by the Gospel, either absolutely, or conditionally.

It is asked, Whether all and each one, even the reprobate, are bound to believe that Christ died for them? The Remonstrants affirm. Corvinus against Molina, chapter 29, section 16.

We deny it. 1. Because what is false, no one is bound to believe. But that God, either elected all and each one to glory, or that Christ died for all and each one, is false, as proved elsewhere. Therefore.

2. Because to believe that Christ died for all and each one, is not the proper and adequate object of saving faith. For the object of faith is an incomplex being, namely, Christ, a sufficient savior, made the author of salvation to all obeying Him, and believing.

3. Because for Christ to die for sinners connotes the counsel of God, and so the decree of Election to glory. But the counsel, intention and decree of my election, is not properly the object of my faith, but is revealed to me by experimental sense, and the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit.

4. Not all the elect are bound immediately and without a certain order, to believe, that Christ died for them. Therefore, much less are the reprobate bound.
I prove the Antecedent. 1. Because the elect are bound, first to be burdened with the mass of sins, and conscious of their misery, and to rest with trust and leaning of heart on Christ, as on a sufficient Savior and saving all believers; before they are bound to believe, that Christ died for them. Because only the burdened and laboring, are immediately bound to come, i.e. to believe. Matthew 11:28, Isaiah 55:1. 2. They would be bound to nourish vain presumption, if secure and not conscious of their misery, they were bound to believe, that Christ died for them.

It is asked, Whether Corvinus, after Arminius Antiperkins, rightly said against Molina chapter 29, section 17, "It is not rightly demanded from the reprobate, that they believe in Christ crucified, since He did not die for them: because it is injustice for men to be condemned, because they do not embrace by faith that grace, which does not at all pertain to them, nor was obtained in their name?" We deny it.

1. Because the equity of the obligation of believing, by which the reprobate are bound to believe in Christ, rests on the authority and dominion of God the Legislator; but not on any right of property, by which Christ from eternal election was destined to them as savior. Because thus Arminius could have said, that the reprobate are not obliged to believe in eternal life, remission of sins, because God in the decree of Election, willed eternal life, not to pertain to the reprobate at all.

2. It cannot be said that Christ pertains to the reprobate in no way. For 1. By the right of Evangelical oblation. 2. By the right of the sufficiency of the death of Christ. 3. By the right of common nature assumed. 4. By the right of the common first transgression expiated by Christ. 5. By the right of the New covenant, preached to the reprobate from the grace of Christ. 6. By the right of the command of God ordering, that the reprobate receive Christ by faith, Christ pertains to them.

3. Arminius ought to have opposed this Mystery of the Gospel by a valid argument (which it would be fitting for dust-worms to adore and admire, rather than to scrutinize, much less to disapprove) The reprobate are bound to believe in Christ, and to rest with trust on Him, as the sufficient Savior of all believers; yet Christ, from the intention and decree of God, is not their Savior, nor destined to them, as the author of salvation and Mediator.

It is asked, Whether no one can rest with trust on Christ, as on a sufficient Savior, unless he first knows, that Christ was given to him as Savior from a certain intention of God? The Remonstrants affirm. We deny it.

1. Because the one about to believe in Christ cannot have persuasion about reconciliation obtained for himself through Christ, before he believes; because through the act of believing such persuasion is implanted.

2. Because no one can be certain about the special gratuitous love of God, in the Decree of Election, until there is something in him, which specifically discriminates the elect from the non-elect; because it is always doubtful to him in that case, Whether God pursues him with the hatred of reprobation, or with the gratuitous love of Election? But faith is the first thing, which specifically discriminates the elect from the non-elect.

3. Before anyone believes, granted that Christ died for him, in that sense in which the Arminians want Him to have died for all, he has as much reason to fear eternal destruction, as to hope for eternal salvation. Because to the one not yet believing and resting with trust on Christ, nothing is certain about the efficacious or inefficacious intention of God of saving himself, or not saving himself: Because through the fiducial act

of believing alone, is generated persuasion about the efficacious intention of God of saving.

Chapter 10. On the Covenant of Grace.

Heb. 8:8.

For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: v.9 Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. v.10 For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people.

In these verses we have: 1. The foundation of the New covenant, namely, that it rests on the good pleasure of God; which he intimates, when he says that those with whom God made this covenant are accused of sins.
2. We have here promises of the covenant plainly spiritual, namely, that he will give a new heart, and inscribe his Laws on their mind.
3. We have the contracting parties in this covenant, namely, Jehovah and the family of Israel and Judah; but not all and each mortal.
4. Thus also the perpetuity and stability of the New covenant is asserted, namely, that it is eternal and very dissimilar to that prior covenant, which they violated.

Hence it is Asked 1. Whether God from his free good pleasure alone, or from any necessity, made the covenant of grace with man? The Remonstrants indeed in words teach that this covenant was made freely; but in reality deny it.

1. They teach that all men are loosed and freed from that obedience, which the Legal covenant demands. Thus Corvinus against Molina, chapter 8, section 7. Therefore, either fallen man had to be lawless, and subject to no Law; or it was necessary, that God make this covenant of grace with all. And this is the first necessity.

2. Because they teach that no one can sin, unless there is in him sufficient grace of obeying and avoiding sin. Whence, either God was obliged to provide sufficient grace according to the tenor of this covenant; Or, if he had never made such a covenant, men would have lived in perjury, homicide, hatred of God and neighbor, and yet would have been innocent and free from sin. And this is the second necessity.

3. They teach, that God cannot justly condemn men, on account of the sin of Adam, and that which by Theologians is called Original Sin, which in their judgment is not sin. Apology, chapter 7, folio 68. Corvinus against Molina, chapter 9, section 5. In Synodical Writings, article 4, page 145. Yet they teach that all the posterity of Adam are born children of wrath by nature, guilty of condemnation and death, both temporary and eternal. Confession, chapter 7, thesis 3. Arminius, public disputation 7, thesis 16. But it was altogether unjust, for men to be liable to condemnation on account of no sin. Because therefore he could not actually inflict eternal death, therefore he was necessitated, to make the covenant of grace, and to send his Son in the flesh, lest he be forced to execute most unjustly the law of works, violated by Adam, in all his posterity. And this is the third necessity.

But we teach, that all men are subject to eternal death, and that God made this covenant, from his mere grace, and compelled by no such necessity. Ezekiel 16:8, "Now when I passed by thee, and looked upon thee, behold, thy time was the time of love; and I sware unto thee, and entered into a covenant with thee, saith the Lord God, and thou becamest mine." And chapter 36:32, "Not for your sakes do I this, saith the Lord God, etc."

Hence it can easily be satisfied to another Question, namely, Whether the antecedent love of God, by which from a natural affection he was inclined to the salvation of all, was the foundation from which it was done, that God made a covenant with all mortals? The Remonstrants affirm. We deny it.

1. Because there is in God an antecedent affection of justice, inclining to the destruction of sinners; as Grevinchoven confesses, page 20. Therefore, there is in God equally a

foundation of not making this covenant with man, as of making a covenant. Because there cannot be place for love tending to creatures (antecedent), except insofar as prior love (toward justice) permits. Arminius in declaration of article 19, page 12. If they say, that through the death of Christ, divine justice was so satisfied, that he can from antecedent love save all and each one, and therefore make this Covenant of Grace with all and each one, and therefore God now after satisfaction rendered for all and each one, cannot will their destruction. I meet it, that such actual satisfaction was not rendered, unless all and each one actually persevered in faith, according to the doctrine of the Adversaries; and therefore God even now inclines to the destruction of all and each one, unless they believe. Then, the death of Christ, is part of the new covenant, by which Christ bequeathed remission and peace to friends, in his Testament. And therefore the covenant of Grace is not by nature posterior to the death of Christ; nay rather, because God made the Covenant of Grace with the elect, therefore he gave Christ to death for them.

2. Because such antecedent love is a mere dream; as is proved elsewhere.

It is asked, Whether the Fathers under the Old Testament had no other promises, than corporal ones, and those which are only of this life; Or whether they looked by faith to Christ, and the promises of eternal life? The Remonstrants affirm that the faith of the Old people did not at all look to spiritual things. Thus Arminius responds to article 31. The Bishop, disputation 5, on the Old covenant, thesis 5. We on the contrary believe that the Jews were saved through the same Messiah, and were justified by the same faith, by which we are, and looked to promises spiritual, of remission of sins and eternal life.

1. Because in Genesis 3:14, the blessed Seed, is preached to Adam. And Genesis 22:18, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Isaiah 7:14, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel": which is cited by Matthew, chapter 1, verse 23. Isaiah 9:6, "For unto us (Jews) a child is born, unto us a son is given." Acts 2:39, "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Acts 3:24, "Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days." Acts 10:43, "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Acts 15:11, "But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they." 1 Corinthians 10:3-4, "And [our fathers] did all eat the same spiritual meat; And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ."

2. Because they not only believed and knew the Savior materially, (as the Arminians and Socinians want, who say that they believe in Christ, who have heard nothing about Christ) but also formally, and under the reason of Mediator. John 8:56, "Your father Abraham

rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad." And Isaiah in chapter 53 prophetically weaves the very Evangelical History of the Passion of Christ, no less than the Evangelists.

3. Because there stand out clear promises of grace and eternal life to be conferred on them, and promises merely spiritual. Genesis 17:7, "And I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." Deuteronomy 30:6, "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart." Isaiah 49:10, "They shall not hunger nor thirst; neither shall the heat nor sun smite them" (which is expounded of the joys of eternal life, Revelation 7:15-17). Verse 15, "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee." Verse 16, "Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands." Isaiah 45:7-14. And 59:21. Jeremiah 31:31-35. Jeremiah 32:40. Ezekiel 36:26. Of the covenant of grace, of the eternal marriage. Hosea 2:19, between Christ and the Church, which through the whole Song of Solomon is plain.

4. Because the faith and hope of believers under the Old Testament rested on God with certain expectation of eternal salvation. Thus the Patriarch Jacob dying, Genesis 49:18, "I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord." Psalm 73:25, "Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee." Verse 26, "My flesh and my heart faileth: but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever." And verse 24, "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory." Thus Job 19:25-27. Jeremiah 14:8. Jeremiah 17:7-8. Psalm 17:15. Psalm 16:10-11. And 52:1-2. And 26:1-3. And 39:6-8. And in infinite other places.

It is asked, Whether the Covenant of grace was made with all and each mortal, even with those, who have heard nothing about Christ? The Remonstrants affirm. We deny. For we teach that the doctrine of the Covenant of Grace is proposed to all in the Visible Church; but as to the counsel and eternal Election of God, the Covenant of Grace was made with the Elect alone. This is clear.

1. From the very practice of God, who made this Covenant only with Noah and his posterity, with Abraham and his posterity, with the Jewish people and not with others; and he himself testifies that in this the people of the Jews were distinguished from all other nations, Deuteronomy 7:7, Psalm 147:19-20. Therefore the Apostles were forbidden to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. Matthew 10:5-6. They were forbidden to evangelize Bithynia; which ought not to have been done, if the Evangelical Covenant were made with all.

2. From the words of the Covenant it is clear. Jeremiah 31:31, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah."

3. The promises of the Covenant are not universal. Therefore, neither is the Covenant itself. I prove the Antecedent. Because God promises to take away the heart of stone, and put a new heart and a new spirit, from some only, and that not with respect to their obedience or disobedience, but for his name alone. Ezekiel 36:22, 26, 32. Therefore not all are children of the promise, but the elect only are counted for the seed. Romans 9:8.

4. Because some are said to be without Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise; and by special and singular grace, God makes this Covenant with some, not others. Genesis 17:7. Ezekiel 16:8, "Yea, I sware unto thee, and entered into a covenant with thee, saith the Lord God, and thou becamest mine." Zechariah 13:9. 2 Corinthians 6:16. Hebrews 8:10.

5. Because those with whom this new Covenant of Grace is made, will never depart from God. Jeremiah 32:40-41. God will never cast them off, for all that they have done, but they will remain in the Covenant as immovably, as the natural Covenant of God with the Sun and Moon, with day and night. Jeremiah 31:35-37. They will no more fall out of this Covenant, than the world be destroyed with the waters of Noah (which God swore would never be). Isaiah 54:9-10. Nor will the mercy of the Covenant be taken away from them any more, than God can profane his Covenant, and change the pronouncement of his lips, and retract what he swore by his holiness he would do, and so lie. Psalm 89:34-36. And therefore they will never perish. But among mortals there are very many, who depart from God, whom God despises and forsakes, who fall out of the Covenant externally proposed, and perish for eternity. Therefore, this Covenant was not made with all mortals.

6. Because the difference would not stand between the Covenant of Grace, which is eternal and inviolable, if this Covenant were made with most breaking it, and the Covenant of Works made with Adam, or this Covenant insofar as legally proposed; which difference nevertheless necessarily remains, as the Prophet says, Jeremiah 31:31-33.

7. It is alien to the wisdom of God, that God should make a Covenant with those Nations, and exhibit Christ the surety of the Covenant as dead for them, who yet have heard nothing, even by report, about that Covenant, about the promise of the Covenant, about the grace and mercy of the Surety; nay, that God would not only by his providence hinder, but expressly prohibit the promulgation of the Covenant. Acts 16:7. Matthew 10:4-5. And God would regard them as violators of the Covenant of Grace, and despisers of the death,

blood, and grace of Christ, who have not drawn in even the sound or syllable by their ears about the grace and gracious Covenant of God.

8. Because it would be necessary for all infants, having died by fate before the use of reason, to be saved for eternity; whether they were born from believers, or from those who are outside the Church, from Pagans, Atheists; because this Covenant of Grace, which they want to have been made with them, they have never transgressed. And they utterly deny that they are guilty of the violated Covenant of Works, or of any sin; and therefore they do not need reconciliation in Christ: Therefore it is necessary that all be saved to a man. But Scripture teaches, that with God his liberty of Election and Reprobation stands firm, before infants have done any good or evil. Romans 9:11.

It is asked, Whether grace determining the will to good and supernatural acts, is a thing promised by God in the New covenant? The Remonstrants deny. We affirm.

But it must be known, that predetermining grace is twofold. For there is one, by which the will is predetermined as to specification, namely, to good and supernatural actions in particular. This predetermination flows from an infused habit of supernatural grace; such as are believing, hoping, repenting. There is another grace predetermining as to exercise, when the will is predetermined to this or that determinate act. Hence our opinion is established by these assertions.

Assertion 1. Grace predetermining as to specification, is promised to all truly covenanted in general: namely, a circumcised heart, a new spirit, a new heart. Deuteronomy 30:6, Ezekiel 36:26-27.

Assertion 2. Grace predetermining as to specification in all determinate acts, is not promised to the covenanted. Because thus the covenanted could not sin; which is repugnant to Scripture and experience.

Assertion 3. Grace predetermining as to specification in certain acts, is promised to all the covenanted: namely, grace by which it happens and has happened, that the truly regenerate cannot fall into the sin against the Holy Spirit, or final Apostasy; nor can they commit any great sin with the whole effort and impulse of the will; because the seed of God remains in them, 1 John 3:9. They have the anointing of God remaining in them, 1 John 2:29. The fear of Jehovah is promised to them, lest they depart from him forever, Jeremiah 32:40.

Assertion 4. But we defend against the Socinians, Arminians and Pontificians, that in this new covenant such grace is promised, through which from a supernatural habit, they

cannot but in most acts love God, believe in Christ, subdue the flesh and affections, repent, and persevere in the state of grace.

1. Because in this covenant grace is promised, by which we never depart from God, Jeremiah 32:40. By which the Spirit will never depart from the Covenanted and from their seed, or from the seed of their seed forever, Isaiah 59:20-21.

2. Because circumcision of the heart to love God with the whole heart and with the whole soul is promised. Deuteronomy 30:6. Inscription of the Law on the heart, Jeremiah 31:33. The spirit of God, by which God effects, that we walk in his commandments. Ezekiel 36:27.

3. Because unless such predetermining grace were promised, our state in Christ would be no more stable, than in the first Adam; and here equally as there, it would be easy to fall from the favor of God and the state of grace: Nor would Christ here, the surety of the New Covenant, Hebrews 2:12, be stronger than the free will of Adam, by which he ruined himself and all his own.

4. Because the Covenant of Grace would not be from both sides an eternal Covenant, contrary to the clear testimonies of Scripture, Jeremiah 31:35-37, Jeremiah 32:40-41, Isaiah 54:10, Isaiah 59:21.

5. Because the perseverance of the Saints would be neither promised by God, nor certain and ratified: which we will afterwards demonstrate from the Scriptures to be false.

6. Because unless such grace were promised to us, man would not have whence he might pray for the constant inflection of his will to faith and obedience; nor whence on account of such inflection, he might trust in God; nor give thanks for such influence of grace, contrary to the Scriptures. Psalm 119:27, 29, 33-37, 43, 66. Psalm 86:11. Song of Solomon 1:2, 7. Matthew 6:10. Ephesians 1:16-17. Ephesians 3:14-16. Colossians 1:9. 1 Thessalonians 5:23. 2 Thessalonians 1:3.

It is asked, Whether the Covenant of Grace is eternal; or whether our permanence in this Covenant so depends on the nod of Free Will, that we can remain in it, or fall from it according to our choice? The Remonstrants deny that this Covenant is eternal. We affirm that this Covenant is immovable and eternal.

1. The eternity of the Covenant from both sides is asserted in express words. On the part of God, Jeremiah 32:40. "And I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, to do them good." And the eternity of the same on our part is

asserted in the same place, and that from the infallible promise of God: "and I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me."

2. Because final perseverance in grace is promised to the Covenanted. Jeremiah 32:40-41. Jeremiah 31:33-35. Isaiah 59:21. Hosea 2:18. Psalm 1:5. 1 John 4:14. Matthew 16:18. John 6:37. And 10:28-29. And 14:16.

3. Because this Covenant is equally certain, constant and inviolable, as is the natural Covenant of God about the perpetuation of day and night, the revolutions of the Sun and Moon. Jeremiah 31:35-37. And than that, which by the interposed oath of God's Holy One, is known to be most true. Hebrews 6:18. And that the world is not to be destroyed by the waters of Noah. Isaiah 54:10. And therefore it is established in the immutability and veracity of God, who cannot lie. Psalm 89:34-37.

4. Because it rests on that holy and never to be violated Covenant, made between the Father and his Son, of giving him long-lived seed. Isaiah 53:10. Children, Isaiah 8:18, Hebrews 2:13. Of giving him dominion from sea to sea. Psalm 72:8. Psalm 2:8-9. And a willing people. Psalm 110:3. Provided he lay down his life for his own. But this Covenant between the Father and the Son, can in no way be made void.

5. The death and effusion of the blood of Christ, by which the Testament of the Covenant was confirmed, would be vain; and there would be place for another Covenant, another Surety, who by other blood would confirm that other Covenant; if indeed this Covenant could be made void.

6. Because predetermining grace, pardon of lapses, and repentance are promised in this Covenant.

7. That distinction which the Holy Spirit establishes between that Covenant which Jehovah had made with the house of Israel, in the day when he brought them out of Egypt, and this New Covenant, would perish, that that was made void and violated, but this is eternal and inviolable. Jeremiah 31:31-33.

Rom. 9:8.

But the children of the promise are counted for the seed.

It is asked, Whether the promises of the New Covenant are universal, and pertain to all equally, from the first intention of God, and antecedent will? The Remonstrants affirm.

We deny that the promises from the decree and intention of God, pertain to any except the elect, although the oblation of the things promised under condition, is made to all and each one, who are in the Visible Church.

1. Because the promises cannot pertain to those from the intention of God, who neither hear nor can hear such promises; nay who cannot from the prohibiting and impeding providence of God. For it is an axiom of the Jurists, Promises not promulgated, are no more obligatory to the fulfilling of the condition of the promises, than is a Law not promulgated, but hidden in the mind of the Legislator. For who would imagine God speaking thus: I promise, Pagans and Americans, remission of sins, the Righteousness of Christ, and eternal life obtained for you by the death of Christ; and I have decreed all these things to you from eternity, if indeed you believe; meanwhile I have decreed never to reveal such a promise to you, nay more by my impeding Providence, to hinder it from being revealed to you.

2. The promises about the inscription of the Law on the heart. Jeremiah 31:33, Hebrews 8:10. About giving a new heart. Ezekiel 36:26. And circumcised. Deuteronomy 30:6. Are not made to the reprobate, from the intention and decree of God. Because either they are made to the reprobate absolutely; and thus God would engender a new heart and a new spirit in all the reprobate; which is repugnant to experience and the Scriptures. Or conditionally, God would give the reprobate a new and circumcised heart. But this is nowhere extant in the Scriptures (he who performs this or that duty, God will give him a new heart and a new spirit). Then we are not called by God from works, which we had done, but dead in sins he makes alive. Add, that to have a new heart equally obliges all, according to the Arminians; Therefore, the Adversaries do not rightly infer the decree of God, from the obligation imposed on men, namely, God wills by an obliging will, that all and each one believe and obey God and be saved; Therefore, he decreed that all and each one believe and obey. And thus if these promises, do not pertain to all and each one from the counsel of God, neither do the rest.

3. God in the promises, either wills salvation and remission to all and each one, if they believe; so that the condition suspends the volition and decree of remitting and saving; or so that it suspends not indeed the decree of God, but actual remission, and glorification. The first cannot be said. Because it is unworthy of the infinite perfection of the divine will, that his fixed and eternal decrees, be suspended from the unstable nod, and temporary act of created Free Will. But if the condition suspends only actual and temporary remission and collation of eternal life; then the promises, from the counsel of God, of giving

remission and eternal life, pertain to those alone fulfilling the condition, i.e. to believers alone.
1. Because the decree of glorifying, is equally restricted, as glorification itself, as Arminius himself confesses in his Declaration. For as God glorifies no one except the believing, so he decreed to glorify no one except the believing: and as he condemns no one except the finally impenitent, so he decreed to condemn no one, except such.
2. Because, as the Jurists rightly teach, A conditional volition, and a promise from the hypothesis of such a condition, posits nothing, unless the condition is first posited in reality. Likewise, a conditional donation, is not a donation, unless the condition is first fulfilled. Likewise, a conditional promise does not oblige the promiser, unless the condition is posited. Because therefore, Judas the traitor, and the reprobate never believe, the volition of the salvation of Judas and of the reprobate, was never any in God.
3. Because according to the sum of the Gospel, God does not intend to give remission and salvation to the reprobate however and confusedly considered; but this determinate one, which was obtained under the mode, or through the mode of a reward, under the condition of faith, as the Arminians everywhere teach: Because he does not intend in the Gospel salvation to the reprobate absolutely and under no condition. If therefore the condition of Faith is never posited, (as certainly in the reprobate, according to the Adversaries, in most; according to us, in none) such a condition is a mere non-entity and nothing, indeed, they never believe. Therefore, it is false, that God in the promises intends remission and eternal life, by the mode of a conditional reward, to Judas the traitor, and to those who never believe.

But the Adversaries say, that the intention of God in promising salvation to the reprobate, is suspended, until all the reprobate actually and finally believe. But this is to imagine in God, an intention suspended from eternity; and to imagine that God intends salvation to them, by an incomplete, suspended, doubtful, indeterminate act, until all actually believe; which God foreknows will never be in the future. Therefore, it is certain that God did not equally intend, and indeed from his primary will promise remission and eternal life to all and each man.

4. The Evangelical promises, do not extend more widely from the intention of God, than God himself in the Gospel, extends them. But God himself in the Gospel, extends them to believers alone. He who believes, will be saved; as also the threats, he who does not believe, will be condemned. For salvation and faith extend equally widely. No one is saved, except the believing: and no one believing, is not saved. Therefore, the intention of God saving is borne to believers alone.

If they say, that God intends to save more, provided more believed, than are actually saved; and that by an antecedent will and intention: because by such an antecedent intention, he

intends to save all and each one, provided all and each one believed. I respond as above, that a conditional intention is nothing, posits nothing, unless the condition is first posited. But that condition is never posited. For never do all believe. Therefore, there is never such an antecedent intention in God. 2. Nowhere in the Scriptures does God say, that he wills to save others, than believers. Otherwise, this promise of the Gospel would be: God wills, intends, promises, before the posited condition of faith, to save all and each mortal; which is false.

5. If the promises of the Gospel, from the intention of God, pertained to all and each mortal, and so God willed, to save all and each one, by an antecedent intention; Therefore, by the same reason, the threats of the Gospel would pertain to all and each mortal. And thus God, would intend all and each mortal, by an antecedent intention, to perish for eternity, and would antecedently destine all and each one to eternal destruction. The reason, because the conditional will of God is equally in the threats, as in the Evangelical promises, and God is equally propense to Justice, as to Mercy.

6. There are infinite places, both of the Old and New Testaments, where Remission, Righteousness, and Salvation is promised to the believing and repenting. But no place appears, where God says, I decree and will, that all and each one have remission and eternal salvation, provided they believe. Likewise I decree and will, that all and each one perish for eternity, provided they do not believe. But our opinion is in the Scriptures; but theirs by no means. Matthew 11:28. "Come to me all" (not simply, but) "all who labor, and are heavy laden." John 3:16. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that everyone" (not simply, every man but) "everyone who believes, should not perish, but have eternal life." Thus John 5:24. John 7:37. Isaiah 55:1. John 11:26. Romans 3:22. Galatians 3:22. Acts 10:43. Acts 2:38-39. And therefore from the bare word (all) the Adversaries deceive from a divided to a conjoined sense: because Prosper rightly observes, On the Calling of the Gentiles, book 1, chapter 3. "The people of God have their own fullness." And expressly Scripture expounds the Evangelical promises about all believing, thirsting, burdened by conscience of sins.

7. That doctrine is not to be admitted, which extends Christian consolation equally widely to all men, homicides, adulterers, Pagans, Turks etc. by this Syllogism: The promises of God pertain to all who are men, whether they are Pagans, Turks, parricides etc.
But I am a man, a Turk, a parricide, etc.
Therefore, the promises of God pertain to me.

8. To whom from the intention of God the promises of the New Covenant pertain, they are truly covenanted and restored to grace, and for them Christ acquired the promised spiritual goods of the New Covenant, by the merit of his death and blood. But all and each

mortal are not Covenanted, nor restored to grace through Christ, and reconciled to God. The reason for the Major is, because the promises of the Covenant from the intention of God would pertain to Devils, if Devils were covenanted, and restored to grace through Christ and reconciled. But the Minor is clear, because for Pharaoh, Herod etc. to be restored to the grace of God, and for Sodomites to be bought by the blood of the Lamb, is monstrous.

Matt. 10:5.
Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not.

It is asked, Whether the Gospel, or word of this covenant, is preached to nations and men, regard being had to merits or demerits; or from mere grace and the good pleasure of God? The Remonstrants, article 2, page 326, say, that the Gospel is preached from grace; but that to certain nations it is not preached, the cause is, their own wickedness and depravity; since God of himself, and from his antecedent will of saving all, is ready to grant his Gospel to all nations and men.

But we assert, that it depends on the sole good pleasure of God, apart from all merits or demerits of men, that the Gospel is preached to these Nations, but not to those,

1. Because God does whatever he is bound to do. But God, Psalm 147:19, "He shows his word to Jacob; he has not done so to any nation." Acts 14:16. "Who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways." Acts 16:6-7. "Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia. After they were come to Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia: but the Spirit suffered them not."

2. Because nowhere in the whole Scripture does such a pact exist; whoever will have done this or that, and will have rightly used the gifts of nature, they in reward, will obtain the benefit of the Gospel. Nor such a threat; whoever are more wicked than others, and use the gifts of nature less rightly, he will deny them the proclamation of the Gospel.

3. Because in Romans 9, "God has mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardens."

4. The whole reason, why the Word of the Covenant was announced to the Jewish people, and not to other nations, is in the good pleasure of God. Deuteronomy 7:7 and chapter 9:5. "Not for your righteousness."

5. Because God denied the aids of the Gospel and miracles to the Tyrians and Sidonians, who would have been more flexible, and more teachable to the Gospel and virtues of Christ. Matthew 11:21-22. And granted the same aids to the Jews, who were much more obstinate than them. And he sent Ezekiel the Prophet to the rebellious and stubborn house of Israel; and denied the prophetic word to nations of unknown speech, who would have been much more obedient to the Prophets of God, Ezekiel 3:6-7.

6. Because the Gospel is the pure gift of God. Matthew 11:25-26. And it is lawful for God to do what he wills with his own. Matthew 20:15.

7. Because if the matter were to be transacted by Free Will, all things required for acting standing, and indifferent to meriting and demeriting the proclamation of the Gospel; then thanks for the grace of the granted Gospel would have to be given to Free Will, not to God and his grace.

8. Because God, the Adversaries not refusing, sometimes grants the Gospel to worse and more wicked men, and denies it to better men; and thus from his absolute liberty gives the Gospel, to whom he wills; denies, to whom he wills.

9. Because calling would otherwise be from works, not from grace: contrary to 2 Timothy 1:9, Titus 3:3, Ephesians 2:3-4.

10. Because from the contrary opinion it would follow, that God wills the Gospel to be preached to all and each mortal. Which because it is absurd, the Arminians reject the cause of the Gospel not being granted to the free will of the Preachers, refusing to go to Barbarous nations for the sake of disseminating the Gospel. But 1. since God now does not call Preachers outside the order, and to Preachers called, as in the time of the Apostles, God does not bestow the extraordinary gift of tongues, without which the preaching of the Gospel among Barbarians and unknown peoples is very difficult: and allows Princes, Republics and societies of merchants going there for the sake of gain, to fail in the duty of communicating the Gospel to those peoples; and of assigning sufficient revenues from goods dedicated to God, where they are left over, or of constituting new and sufficient ones from acquired wealth; this is an argument, that God does not will the Gospel to be preached to them. For he who does not will the means without which not, also does not will the end. And meanwhile God may will Princes, Republics and societies of Christians, to be obliged to communicate the Gospel to them; Whom that will of God will not excuse. 2.

This is to speak against the Justice of God; nay it is contrary to the Justice of God, that an innocent nation suffer the penalties of the sloth and disobedience of the Preachers, who are connected with them by no necessity of blood.

11. Because prayers, from faith, cannot be poured out to God for granting the Gospel to the Jews and other nations; if the cause of the Gospel granted or not granted is Free Will, not even determinable by God to merit the Gospel.

It is asked, Whether the Covenant of works, made with Adam, is rigid and such, that God could not execute it out of rigor on his posterity? The Remonstrants consequently teach this in the doctrine of the punishment of Original sin, which is none to them. Corvinus against Molina, chapter 9, section 5. Apology, chapter 7, folio 84. We deny it.

1. Because God would be unjust and cruel, if on account of the first sin of Adam, he threatened him and all his posterity with death, both temporary and eternal; and yet it would fight with the Mercy, Clemency and Goodness of God, on account of that sin alone, which infants did not perpetrate in their own person, but was only committed in another's, for infants to suffer the eternal torments of Gehenna: Because, as it fights with the Veracity and Fidelity of God, to promise such goods, which, his justice or goodness being safe, he cannot in reality perform; so it fights with the Justice and wise Goodness of God, to threaten the creature with that punishment, which he cannot actually inflict, unless he wills to hear God cruel and rigid, by inflicting such punishment, which fights with the Justice, Goodness, Clemency, and Mercy of God. But God is not unjust and cruel. Therefore he could, according to the threat of the Covenant of works, on account of the first sin of Adam, justly punish him and all his posterity, even infants, with temporary and eternal death; nor would this fight with his Mercy, Clemency and Goodness.

2. Because since God from mere grace, and his absolute good pleasure, sent his Son into the world. John 3:16, Titus 3:4, he could have not sent him, and thus would not have been unjust: even if Adam and all his posterity, had suffered death both temporary and eternal.

3. Because every Law of God is just and holy: Therefore, also the threats of the same Law, put into execution, are just. For a Law cannot be just, whose threat is unjust.

4. Because the Remonstrants imagine such an administration of the Covenant, on the part of God, by which the whole human race would have necessarily perished for eternity, to fight with the will of God of saving all and each mortal; when yet there is no such will in God, and the eternal destruction of one man equally fights with such a will of God, as the eternal perdition of all and each man.

5. From this doctrine they conclude, that Original Sin is not properly sin, nor meriting eternal death; which from the Scriptures, has been demonstrated before to be false.

It is asked, Whether no mortal now is subject to the Law, as it is Law, and to the Covenant made with Adam, as such; because this Covenant was broken, and involves all in punishment, and therefore cannot at the same time oblige to obedience? The Remonstrants affirm. Corvinus against Molina, chapter 8, section 7.

We deny it. 1. Because the Law, as Law, now would not condemn homicides, perjurers, who have heard nothing about the written Law; who yet in Romans 2:12 are said to perish without Law. For if the Law, as Law, did not oblige them to active obedience; neither would it oblige them to punishment from Justice, on account of active obedience not rendered.

2. Because, some are under the Law, and some under grace, and married to Christ. Romans 7.

3. Because, no mortal would be liable to that curse of the Law, Deuteronomy 27:26, on account of sins now committed after the fall: For no one sins by doing against the Law, not obliging to active obedience.

4. Christ therefore would have died, only for the first broken Covenant, made with Adam; nor would he have been made a curse for our actual transgression of the Law; the contrary of which is taught by Paul, Galatians 3:10-11, 13-14.

Chapter 11. On the Mode of Conversion.

Eph. 1:18-19.
That you may know, what is the exceeding greatness of his power towards us who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, Which he worked in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places.

Whence it is evident, that the powers of Efficacious grace are no less than the Omnipotence of God himself; and so we believe in Christ by that strong, valid and irresistible action, by which Christ was raised from the dead. Whence about the mode of Conversion

It is Asked, Whether grace works conversion irresistibly, or not? But that the state of the Question may be fixed, these things are to be noted beforehand.

1. Resistance is the reaction of the agent in the patient; as Zabarella says about Reaction, chapter 5. Or rather Resistance is the hindrance, or repulsion of action, or non-admission of action, which follows the form, by which form strives to conserve itself, and at the same time strives to hinder or retard the action of the contrary agent, by resuffering and reacting: So that I do not assent to Zabarella denying that there is reaction or repassion; for every resisting thing as such reacts and resuffers, otherwise it yields, it does not resist. And it is either between Physical agents, as when fire resists water, or hyperphysical, as when Angel strives against Angel; or between moral agents, as when man struggles against sound counsel. Whence Resistance is threefold, Physical, Hyperphysical, Moral. Then the powers of agents and patients, either are equal, whence hard and incomplete resistance; or unequal, whence resistance to victory and complete.

2. We confess, with respect to 1. Persuading and inviting grace, which by some is called prevenient, exciting and calling externally, grace is by no means irresistible, but is often resisted by us. Jeremiah 7:13. "I spoke and you did not hear." Psalm 81:14. "Oh that my people had hearkened unto me!" 2. With respect to internal and operating grace, there is in all the elect a propensity to resist; although it is not complete, on account of the surpassing powers of grace: Because every contrary is apt by nature to resist its contrary; but the habit of corruption and internal grace are contraries; and this resistance is as it were Physical.

3. The Adversaries concede that illumination happens irresistibly. Synodical Writings, article 4, page 16. "Whether we will or not, we cannot not know."

4. Similarly they teach that the affections are drawn, and the powers of believing are given to them irresistibly. Corvinus against Tilenus, chapter 12, page 467.

5. We say that the habit of sanctifying grace, and a new heart are infused irresistibly. The Arminians deny such infusion, because they establish that conversion is an act of our Free Will.

6. Three things are to be distinguished in the will. 1. The power of believing. This is conferred irresistibly, as they say. 2. There is the sense of the pulsations and persuasions

of the Holy Spirit. About this Corvinus says against Bogerman, pages 270-271: "The will cannot not feel the pulses, persuasion and allurements of the illuminated mind." And against Molina, chapter 33, section 31: "We indeed confess that man behaves passively in the first moment of conversion; but with respect to sense, not with respect to assent." The third, which is in the will, is assent or dissent; and about this third the Confession, chapter 17, thesis 7, Corvinus against Bogerman, part 1, page 363, against Tilenus, chapter 5, page 223, Episcopius, disputation 15, thesis 11, thus establish: "God (they say) never so instructs man with new powers of grace, but that it always remains in the will of man, to use them or not; nay all things required for operating being posited, the will can assent or dissent to God calling."

Hence it is not asked, 1. Whether grace is resistible, with respect to external means? for it can be resisted by them. 2. Nor, whether grace previous to conversion is resistible? for we concede that. 3. Nor, whether men can resist more common grace? For temporary ones resist such grace. Luke 8:13, 1 Timothy 1:19. Nor, 4. Is the question about habitual grace, proper to the elect: for that is also resistible; otherwise the elect and truly regenerate could not sin. Nor 5. Whether the mind is irresistibly illuminated, and whether the Will and affections feel irresistibly the persuasions and invitations of the illuminated mind? The Adversaries grant us this; although we do not see, how they can deny, that the free Will can call away the intellect from weighing the reasons objected to the Intellect, that thus the act of illuminating may be hindered. Nor 6. Is it asked, Whether God forces the free Will? which we also deny. Nor 7. Whether the corruption of the Will, is apt by nature to resist the divine action of grace? But the Question is:

Whether God so affects the Will with new grace, namely, with the special grace of Regeneration, which flows from the eternal Election of God; that it is in the power of the Will, to completely and finally repudiate that grace, and so finally to obstruct its most valid action, that it can plainly refuse to obey God calling, and to open the door to him knocking? The Arminians affirm. Or whether the grace of God, proper to the Elect, brought into act, so conquers the vicious rebellion and hardness of heart, that it cannot completely and finally resist God calling, but that it is necessary, by a hypothetical necessity, to obey God?

We teach, that the will, can by no means resist the internal grace of God.

For the illustration of this controverted question, these things also can be noted.

In the year 415. There arose Pelagius, Julian Faustus, and many others, who called irresistible grace, Fate. Today there are four opinions extant. The first is of the Dominicans, acknowledging the insuperable force of grace; but teaching, that man is not

converted for this reason, because he does not will. Thus Alvarez, Gumel, Rispolis, the Doctors of Salamanca, and of Alcala, Bañez. The second is of the Jesuits, asserting congruous calling in 1. Persuasion. 2. In the attemperating of persuasion to such a disposition; that perhaps the efficacy of conversion is resolved into an afternoon drinking bout. 3. In the prop of Middle knowledge; which is the brain-sick figment of ill-employed wits. The third opinion is of the Pelagians, Arminians, Socinians, Pseudo-Lutherans, positing resistible grace.

But here there are five things in the will. 1. The illumination of the mind. 2. The vivification of the affections. 3. The conferring of the power of believing. 4. The sense and perception of the persuasions and pulsations of the Intellect. And they say that all these things happen from God irresistibly. 5. Assent and dissent, about which is the question. The Arminians formerly with their Arminius took refuge in Jesuitic congruity, Hague Conference, page 311. now they have deserted it.

But neither was this controversy only born with Pelagius, but is much more ancient. It was also born and moved in the time of the Apostles by the carnal Romans. Chapter 9, verse 19. If God has mercy on whom he wills, and hardens whom he wills; Therefore, he is angry without cause: for who has resisted his will. Paul does not respond with the Arminians, that one is the resistible will of God, another the irresistible; one is peremptory, another not; one is efficacious, another inefficacious; But, Nay but, O man, who are you that replies against God? etc.

We prove our opinion against the Arminians by these arguments.

1. Because God effects faith in us, by that force and power of his, by which he raised Christ from the dead. Ephesians 1:18-19, Colossians 2:12. And by his power perfecting all the good pleasure of his will. 2 Thessalonians 1:11. And by that divine power, according to which he gives us all things, which pertain to life and godliness. 2 Peter 1:3.

2. Because no one resists the drawing of the Father. John 6:44. and all who have heard and learned from the Father come to Christ. verse 45. Therefore, they come necessarily: For the proposition is of necessary truth; and so they cannot not come.

3. Because God does not only give the power to believe, but works to will and to do in us. Philippians 2:13. And it is given to us to believe and to suffer; Philippians 1:29. And he effects that we walk in his precepts. Ezekiel 36:27. Therefore, the grace of God so efficaciously works, that it takes away both resistance and resistibility. In the same place, verse 26: "I will take away the stony heart." But the stony heart is the habitual principle of resisting God calling.

4. Because a new heart and a new spirit, by which it happens, that we actually walk in the precepts of God, fights diametrically with the final and complete power of resisting God calling, and of deceiving the gracious intention of calling in God. For thus men would have a new heart and would never be converted, and thus would be converted and not converted.

5. Because God promises us the removal of resistibility. Deuteronomy 30:6. "And the Lord your God will circumcise your heart, and the heart of your seed, to love the Lord your God with all your heart." Therefore, he takes away the hardness and foreskin of the heart. Ezekiel 36:26. "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you." But the Jews would object (as the Arminians do today) it can happen, that remaining stony, we resist you, Jehovah, giving a new heart. He responds: "I will take away the stony heart." Jeremiah 31:33. "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts." But it can happen, that we remain untaught, and resist you: Therefore he prevents that. verse 34. "And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them." Such promises are. Jeremiah 24:7, Isaiah 44:3, Ezekiel 11:19-20, Zechariah 12:10, John 14:16.

6. Because God the Father promised the Son, a willing people. Psalm 110:3. That he would see his seed, Isaiah 53:10. The ends of the earth for his inheritance. Psalm 2:8. Dominion from sea to sea, from the river to the ends of the earth. Psalm 72:8. Therefore, he promises his Son, that many are to be converted to him: And God is true in his promises. Therefore, these cannot resist God converting.

7. Because if a man dead in sins contributes nothing to his regeneration, by which he may merit or procure it; and his conversion is a resurrection from the dead, and a new creation; then man cannot resist God's call, or struggle against Him who regenerates. But the former is true. John 3:3 and 5:25. Eph. 2:5

8. Because the action of God regenerating would not be stronger than the persuasion of an orator and a pleasant allurement; if it were able to be overcome by man. Nor would God here be stronger than a preacher, than the Devil, than Cicero or Demosthenes.

9. If this grace can be overcome by man; then it is common to the unregenerate; as it would be given to them, but when given, it would be rejected. But this grace is proper to the sons of God. For in Rom. 8:14, only the sons are led by the Spirit of God. And in 1 Cor. 1:23, Christ is the power of God only to those who are inwardly called. John 14:17, only the

sons of God receive the Holy Spirit; the world cannot receive Him. John 7:37-38, John 4:13, John 14:17.

10. Because God uses His omnipotence in the action of internal grace, and indeed such that with God all things are possible. Matt. 19:26. By this omnipotence He converts many from confidence in riches to faith and repentance. And here He employs a power greater than that which is in the Devil and sin. 1 John 4:4, 1 John 2:14, John 12:31, John 14:30. Thus the conversion of many is inferred from the will and power of God. Rom. 11:23, Rom. 1:16, Jude 24, 1 Pet. 1:5, John 10:29, 2 Cor. 9:8, Rom. 15:13, and 16:25.

11. Because if man could resist internal grace and that which is proper to the elect, then God's decrees of election could be rescinded, His counsels changed, His intentions deceived; contrary to the Scriptures. Ps. 33:10, Isa. 14:26-27, and 46:10-11.

12. If this grace can be overcome, then God would not give repentance and faith, contrary to the Scriptures. Acts 5:31, 2 Tim. 2:25, but only offer it: but faith offered and not received is not God's gift; but faith received would be our gift.

13. Because if this grace can be overcome, then the act of Conversion would be committed to man's Free Will, and the efficacy of Christ's merits, the salvation of the elect intended by God, would depend on whether it is or is not, not on God's grace, but on our Free Will: Although the Scriptures make Conversion the work of grace. Deut. 30:6, Jer. 31:33, Ezek. 36:26-27, Ezek. 12:10, John 6:44-45.

14. If grace can be overcome, God will call many inwardly, whom He neither predestined, nor justified, nor glorified; contrary to Rom. 8:29-30.

15. We pray to God in vain for Conversion, if, with all the actions of divine grace in place, it could happen that we resist and are not converted; for we would pray for that which God cannot do, unless He overturned freedom: And thus conversion would be non-conversion and non-obedience.

16. In vain we would give thanks and glory for Conversion to God, if the will could impede it: For God thus is not the infallible and efficacious cause of conversion.

17. Man himself would separate and distinguish himself from the unconverted, by his Free Will alone: For the converted would say, I did something by my Free Will, without Christ; and I have this, which I did not receive from God's grace, namely, I did not resist God's grace; although another, equipped with the same habitual grace, resisted. Yet the

Scriptures ascribe the glory of our conversion to God, as the separating and distinguishing cause. Rom. 1:8, Eph. 2:4-5, Col. 1:12-13, 1 Thess. 1:2-3, 1 Tim. 1:15-17, Rev. 1:5-6, 1 Pet. 1:3-4.

18. Because it would be in the power of Free Will, not in God's power, that any were saved, that there was a Church in the world, that Christ the Bridegroom had a wife, the Head members, the King subjects; that the glory of forgiving mercy would be declared: Because all mortals could resist God's call through Free Will.

19. Because Augustine falsely ascribes to God from the Scriptures dominion over human wills. He would wrongly say in On Rebuke and Grace ch. 14 and On Grace ch. 14: God has the most omnipotent power of inclining human hearts wherever He pleases; and of doing what He wills with the wills themselves, etc. It is not to be doubted that human wills cannot resist, so that He Himself may not do what He wills.

The Remonstrants, Synodical Writings, article 4, p. 58, thus form the question about resistibility: Could man, when God seriously wills that he believe and be converted, be unwilling to believe and be converted? Or thus, When God intends the conversion of men, does He (so that the effect of conversion may certainly and necessarily follow) employ such efficacy of grace, which being posited man could not fail to be converted and believe; and which not being posited, he could not be converted and believe? We disapprove of this statement of the Question.

1. Because they do not have a syllable about internal grace.
2. Because they ask, could man fail to be converted, when God employs that efficacy, i.e., that efficiency, so that he is necessarily converted? Which is as if they were asking, conversion being posited, could it happen that conversion is not posited?
3. Because for the Arminians, there is one peremptory intention of converting, another inefficacious; one absolute, another conditional. And so they confusedly form the question.

4. Because when God (according to them) intends the conversion of Barbarians and Indians, indeed even of the damned, by velleity, as Corvinus says against Molina ch. 31:1, 17, they ask whether God, concerning the Indians who have heard nothing of Christ, and the damned, employs such efficacy of grace, which being posited, their conversion necessarily follows? Which is an absurd Question.

Martinez de Ripalda, on the supernatural being, vol. 1, book 2, disp. 30, sect. 6, n. 28: If you want the will (against the more recent Thomists) to act immediately as that which, because it is itself that which is immediately rendered knowing or desiring through a supernatural act: But thus Calvin, who does not know that it happens through the will, that man wills. Behold, Kemnitius voluntarily confesses that it is the will which properly (adverbially) wills;

the mind, which properly understands. Although the salutary action of acting and willing is not properly of the will and mind, but of divine grace: because it proceeds adequately and immediately not from the proper power of the human will and mind, but only from the alien power of divine grace. Resp. But he imputes to us that we want the will to behave purely passively.

But in the State of the Question, we want Grace and the teaching Father to have the respect of a twofold cause.

1. Grace is the cause really drawing, inwardly teaching, predetermining, sole and adequate. And Free Will is acted upon, drawn, taught. But here there is no collaterality between Grace and Free Will; for thus our will would be a co-cause socially calling, preventing, drawing, and the grace of God another co-cause. But the Father alone draws, and the Father alone adequately makes us hear, John 6:44-45, not the will with the Father: indeed here we behave passively. The Father alone teaches Peter, and adequately; flesh and blood does not teach itself, as an associate cause. Matt. 16:17. For half of Simon's blessedness would have to be attributed to flesh and blood, equally as to the Father. 2. We would powerfully call ourselves equally as God, and our rich mercy would intervene, as an internal collateral cause of vocation actively. 3. It would be of Free Will, that we are called or not.

2. Free Will thus drawn and moved is a vital associate cause, but subordinated to prevenient grace. He alone knocks by preventing, not only by morally stirring and exciting by hortatory admonition; but by real influx. But we do not alone open and answer: but He who alone calls and prevents, also follows by the same operating grace to will in opening and answering.

Martinez de Ripalda on the Supernatural Being, vol. 1, disp. 30, part 29: The Fathers of the Church assert that natural or innate faculty for supernatural works belongs to man. Augustine, on the gift of perseverance, ch. 5: From which it appears that certain ones have in their very genius the divine gift of intelligence naturally, by which they are moved to faith, if they either hear words or behold signs congruous to their minds. Note that "naturally"; also that "congruous to their minds"; which indicate that the very action of believing is congenital and in some way natural to the nature and genius of men; not because the adequate faculty is congenital and natural. Therefore, at least because the incomplete faculty is natural and congenital. Likewise Augustine on the Predestination of the Saints ch. 5: To be able to have faith is of nature -- to have faith is of grace. It is a possibility not only passive but also an active power; because we are able, eliciting the act of faith, to believe.

Resp. We do not deny a remote and certain potency of grace; but that this stunned and sleepy potency is brought to act through congruous and moral motion alone (namely, the letter of the Law and Gospel) by persuasive motion, without the infusion of real potency and habit, we deny. 2. There is both a passive and active possibility. It is passive, because it needs supernatural power to become more proximate and active. It is not a potency such as is afforded to stones or wood and to beasts, as Augustine; but rational, vital, which formally erupts into act. Nor is it an intermediate power, as Augustine On the Spirit and the Letter, ch. 33, where he doubts and disputes. Let us first say and see that, whether it satisfies this question, that Free Will naturally attributed by the Creator is that intermediate power which can either be extended to faith or inclined to infidelity. And so this natural potency of believing is remote.

Martinez retorts there, 25: A purely remote potency does not have any other power in the effect than that by which the immediate and proximate power operates; since through that alone and not through itself, it immediately attains the effect. But a purely remote potency, without the proximate, is not only weak and infirm, but utterly null. But Hugh of St. Victor explains the natural activity (of believing) by the example of sight, eliciting vision together with light, which is not a visive potency purely remote.

Resp. Scripture, John 6:44, Rom. 8:7, 1 Cor. 2:14, denies any natural potency of coming to Christ, i.e., of believing, unless a new power is infused. Therefore, natural potency is passive by this name. 2. If the potency of believing is denied. 3. Therefore, it is a remote potency. 3. A purely remote potency is utterly null, is denied. Above, he cannot come. John 6:44, yet is a subject capable of drawing grace. 4. But it cannot be said that a remote potency does not immediately attain the effect, even if it does not attain except by the mediation of grace alone. For ignited iron heats by a remote potency, and also immediately attains the effect; not through the intervening fire alone: for it heats immediately through the density of matter, by which the powers and degrees of fiery heat are more strongly united. 5. Infelicitous is the invention of Hugh of St. Victor in Elucidatory Questions on the Epistle to the Romans p. 238, who expressly says that the soul has the potency of meriting naturally; where certainly the eye is and the visive faculty is unharmed, sound, placed in darkness; nor does light add a new real potency of seeing, but supposes the vision to be whole, sound, and unharmed, and the potency of seeing even in darkness to be proximate. The Jesuits also concede that a new habit is infused, but so that acts may be elicited more easily and sweetly: for they want the natural potency to be weak, but not diminished entitatively. 2. As to cooperation, they teach that it is indifferent and general. 3. By moral persuasion alone, which adds no powers to Free Will.

Martinez, ibid. sect. n. 8: 26: Not infrequently the Fathers run into the immediate and partial power of nature for supernatural acts. --- The human will does something in the

fulfillment of the commandments, as does grace; and indeed immediately, as does it: otherwise grace alone would do everything immediately. Augustine, On Rebuke and Grace, ch. 2: For they are acted upon that they may act. N. 38: Just as therefore the immediate and native activity of the eyes renders man visive of light, even in the absence of light; so the native faculty of the will renders man able to keep rectitude, even in the absence of grace. Although there is this difference, that light is owed to the eyes, which completes their immediate activity; grace is not owed to man, by which the power of keeping rectitude is completed. -- Neither is the will alone the adequate cause of salvation, nor grace alone.

Resp. 1. Grace alone acts immediately in the genus of efficient cause of willing, determining, inwardly teaching and effectively. The will alone also in the genus of vital cause formally and freely willing. Thus neither alone does the whole.

2. If native faculty renders man able to keep rectitude, even in the absence of grace; then man not drawn by the Father, i.e., in the absence of grace, is able to come to Christ, i.e., to believe. What else did Pelagius say? Nor does light add any real potency to the eyes.

Martinez sect. 9, n. 40: If "to assist" denotes an action immediate also in God, it will also denote it in man. A purely remote cause does not assist. He responds, something, not the whole. Thomas I, q. 23, art. 8, to the last arg. & 2: Someone is assisted by another in two ways. 1. Insofar as he receives power from him, and thus to be assisted is of the weak: and thus who assists the spirit of the Lord? i.e., no one. 2. Someone is said to be assisted by another, through whom he executes his operation; as the Lord through a minister. And in this way God is assisted by us, insofar as we execute God's ordination. 1 Cor. 3:9: For we are God's helpers.

Resp. Thomas is speaking of God insofar as He uses means; namely, of natural assistance, not of the assistance of grace, which is the present question. For we do not assist God or the grace of God in believing, nor do we provide the assistance of grace: Thus we love God in heaven, we enjoy God. But would we in such vital actions be said to assist God? By no means.

Martinez, sect. 10, n. 44: Ownership in a good work does not belong to man by reason of passion, as this or that color is said to be proper to man; but by reason of action; indeed, by the title of the dominion of freedom. John 15: And that your fruit should remain. Rev. 2: I know your works. Augustine to Simplicianus, book 1, q. 2: That we might will, He willed to be both His and ours; His, by calling; ours, by following. The ownership of grace, or of God the supernatural helper in a salutary act, divided with man, testifies to the immediate action and power of God's aids, distinct from the power of the Will. 2. If the Will does not flow into the act through itself immediately, but through grace by the sole immediate

action of grace; certainly by the title of action no other ownership or selfhood can belong to the Will in a work of piety than that which belongs to grace: and therefore the Will itself, as distinct from grace, can by no right of ownership divide the supernatural act with divine grace: But just as the whole action and the whole power is of grace alone, and of the will only by denomination (merely) from grace; so the whole ownership and selfhood will be of grace alone, and of the will only through the selfhood and ownership of grace.

Resp. Thus the Jesuits strive to divide the glory of Conversion between God and miserable man, so that they envy God and the grace of God the glory alone. But the halving of action is one thing; the halving of glory another. Likewise, the action of believing vitally by created Free Will is one thing; and the action of conversion by the efficacious calling of grace is far another. For this argument does not conclude that ownership of the action of knocking through internal grace belongs to the Will, and the action of opening through the same internal grace belongs also to Grace and is divided also with the creature: which, unless it is proved, it does not follow that part of the glory of God's Conversion belongs to Grace, part to the creature's Will; but that the glory is to be ascribed to God entirely and totally.

2. The ownership of action is one thing physical, another moral. By reason of the former, the Jesuits must by all means concede that the physical ownership of the action of plowing, speaking, walking, indeed of hoping, is divided between God and man: But they do not at all prove that the moral glory of such actions is thus to be divided. Indeed we do not deny that the Will flows actively immediately into the act of believing; but moved, bent, and determined by internal grace, which effects to will and to work. But neither does it follow from this that there is that bipartition of the moral ownership of the action of believing, between God and creatures.

3. Nor do we deny that the act of believing is ours, and that some moral ownership is also to be ascribed to the Will; indeed, Christ praises the faith of the Canaanite woman, the centurion, Abraham, and others, and remunerates it.

Martinez, Sect. 11, n. 47: Grace is not the total cause, but the partial cause of a supernatural act. 1 Cor. 15:10: Not I, but the grace of God with me. Bernard calls us fellow soldiers; Jerome, associates, in the supernatural work with God.

Resp. And Calvin calls us partakers of labor with God. But because the principal causality is with God by efficaciously calling, effecting that we will and believe, although we are the ones and we alone who will and believe; Therefore the grace of God is rightly said to be the adequate and complete cause dominating, determining, effecting to will. Nor here does the Will have any fellowship, although in another genus it has partnership, as a moved and

efficaciously determined cause has a partial subordinate influence, and a partial inferior activity, which our side by no means denies. Nor does habit alone do the whole: Indeed habit is not illuminated, as the intellect; it is not excited, as the will; nor does a supernatural habit perceive a supernatural object; nor does habit formally choose, reject, will, desire, or suspend an act; nor is a supernatural habit a vital principle, but Free Will alone is such a principle, through which a living thing moves itself from within; nor is a supernatural habit, as such, free, but only assists Free Will.

It is asked: Whether the whole gracious operation of God, which the Holy Spirit uses in the conversion of man, is only moral, so that God here acts only by inviting, persuading by reasons, and alluring both by threats and by promises and commands; Or whether God acts through real and physical efficiency of grace, both by infusing the habit of grace, and by physically and really predetermining the will? The Arminians complain of injury done by us, in that we teach that they hold that the whole business of conversion is accomplished by persuasive and moral action. Thus Corvinus against Molina, ch. 45, §. 2, 3, and ch. 45, §. 7; Grevinchovius p. 301. But that this is their mind is clear. 1. From ch. 10, 11, §. 4 of their Confession, where they require only two things for engendering faith. 1. Probable arguments, 2. Teachableness. And in the Hague Conference, p. 122, they say that it can be disputed whether persuasion is not the most noble and suitable action of God, which He can use in the conversion of man? And they teach that men are rendered willing from unwilling by allurement alone. And Arminius, Antiperkins, pp. 751, 770, §. in the drawing of the Father acknowledges no other action than persuasion. Then, they acknowledge no other action administered through the Word than persuasive; for (they say) that is the nature of the Word, that it acts only persuasively. We defend the contrary.

1. If God here acted only persuasively, the action of God converting would not be greater than that of a preacher, Cicero or Demosthenes, indeed than that of the Devil: And thus Pastors would be said to create a new heart in us, to vivify the dead, to regenerate the carnal, through the letter of the Law and Gospel alone; which Pelagius taught, as Augustine says in On Grace, against Pelagius and Caelestius ch. 3.

2. Because God infuses the Spirit of supplication. Zech. 12:10, gives a new heart, and removes the heart of stone. Ezek. 36:26, quickens us. Eph. 2:4-5. Therefore, not by moral action alone; because life is never infused by moral action alone.

3. Because persuasion adds and infuses no internal powers to the faculties of the soul and corrupt Free Will; for you will not restore sight to the blind, the power of walking to the lame, riches to the poor, by speeches more than golden.

4. Because for God to regenerate no otherwise than by morally persuading, supposes that neither the Intellect, nor the Will, nor the Affections are corrupted by nature otherwise than from the mere darkening of the mind and lack of literal revelation; and that we are impotent to performing supernatural acts (Faith and repentance) no otherwise than as a man is by nature impotent to learning the Mathematical Disciplines and Metaphysics.

5. Because it would be as easy for us to be converted as it is for a drunkard to embrace Cicero's advice about drunkenness.

6. Because he who embraces moral counsel is rather the principal and efficacious cause of the duty which is advised, when he performs it, than he who advises: therefore no other glory of conversion would be owed to God than that of the invention of the Gospel; and to Free Will alone would be owed the glory of Faith and the embrace of the Gospel.

7. Because the one persuading has no dominion over the will; and therefore if God here is only a persuader, God will not be the Lord of conversion and salvation; nor is it in His power that these are converted, not more, not others.

8. Because in vain do I pray for the grace of one merely persuading, who is a bare persuader, by which I may obey the persuasion; since it is in my power alone to obey or not obey.

It is asked: Whether the Arminians sufficiently ascribe to God from Bellarmine on Grace and Free Will, book 1, ch. 13, in that they attribute external persuasion flowing from the letter alone to men and the Devil; but to God internal persuasion, which always infuses light, and breathes the beginning of good will? Thus Suarez also distinguishes on the divine aids of grace, book 3, ch. 15, n. 17. We deny that enough is here ascribed to God.

1. If in regeneration God acts no otherwise than by morally persuading, then man would not be otherwise impotent to performing supernatural acts (Faith and repentance) than as a man is by nature impotent to learning the Mathematical Disciplines and Metaphysics.

2. Because such moral suasion by the letter alone leaves the Intellect, Will and Affections corrupted, and only removes the darkening of the mind.

3. Because persuasion alone does not confer new powers on the soul's faculties, nor remove their natural corruption and resistance.

4. So conversion would be as easy as for a drunkard to follow Cicero's counsel against drunkenness.

5. The converter himself, not God, would be the principal cause of conversion, as the one embracing good counsel is more the cause than the counselor. So the glory would belong to Free Will, not God.

6. God would have no dominion over men's wills in conversion, unable to convert any unless they permit. It would not depend on God who or how many are converted.

7. Prayer for God's converting grace would be vain, as He could only morally persuade, while it remains in our own free power to yield or resist.

The Arminians, from Bellarmine, ascribe bare external suasion to men and Satan, but internal suasion, infusing light and inclining the will, to God. So Suarez also distinguishes God's grace. But this still does not give enough to God:

1. As the action would not exceed that of human orators or the Devil, only working on the mind, not the heart.

2. Scripture ascribes to grace an infusion of a new heart, quickening the dead, etc. which moral suasion alone cannot do.

3. Persuasive words, even if from God inwardly, no more confer new powers to a corrupt soul, than golden speeches can give sight to the blind or wealth to the poor.

4. It supposes the faculties are only hindered by mental darkness, not innerly depraved.

5. Conversion would be as easy as for a drunk to follow good advice.

6. Man himself, not God, would be the chief cause, and deserve the glory, of his conversion, as the persuaded contributes more than the persuader.

7. God would not be Lord over men's wills, or their conversion and salvation. It would not depend on His power whom or how many He converts, but on their self-determination.

8. It would be vain to pray to God for conversion, as at best He could only advise us, while it remained in our own power to obey or not.

1. Because if this infusion of light is objective, and from the letter of persuasion alone, it is only external persuasion, as they call it; but if this infusion is the real conferral of a new

power to Free Will, then it is not persuasion, but a physical action and more than persuasion: for no persuasion infuses new powers in us.

2. Pelagius in this way acknowledged internal persuasion. Augustine against Pelagius and Caelestius, book 1, ch. 7: He assists us through His doctrine and revelation, while He opens the eyes of our heart -- while He illuminates us with the ineffable gift of heavenly grace -- while by the revelation of wisdom He rouses to the desire of God the will astounded. Indeed in this way gold also inwardly allures the mind of a thief, but only objectively.

It is asked: Whether all those whom God calls outwardly, He also calls inwardly, so that there is in them the power of obeying, if they will? The Remonstrants affirm. We deny.

1. Because He called the Jews outwardly through the word, signs and trials; and yet He did not give them a heart to know, nor ears to hear, nor eyes to see, even to this day. Deut. 29:3-4, that is, He did not call them with an internal calling.

2. Because in John 12:37, through the preaching of Christ and His excellent miracles, God called the Jews outwardly: and not at all inwardly. v. 39: For they could not believe, because God had blinded their eyes.

3. Because in 1 Cor. 2:14, the natural man is called outwardly, otherwise the Gospel would not be foolishness to him: But he is not called inwardly, because he cannot understand the things of the Spirit of God.

4. Because all who have heard from the Father are called inwardly, and come to Christ. But many, who hear God calling outwardly through preachers, are not called inwardly, nor do they come to Christ. Therefore, etc.

5. Because some hear the mysteries of Christ, and they are not revealed to them, because God has not revealed them inwardly, and because no one knows the Father except he to whom the Son wills to reveal Him. Matt. 11:25-27. Therefore, there are some called outwardly who are not called inwardly.

6. Because Christ was preached to the Jews as a stumbling block, and to the Greeks as foolishness. Therefore, they are called outwardly. But to those called (namely, inwardly), both Jews and Greeks, Christ is the power and wisdom of God. 1 Cor. 1:23-24.

7. Because those who are more stupid than a rock at the preached Word, and have made their faces harder than a diamond, Jer. 5:8, who are as incapable of the Word as infants just weaned from milk, Isa. 28:9, who are blinded, 2 Cor. 4:4, hardened, Matt. 13:15, who mock

the Word calling outwardly, Acts 17:32, Acts 26:24, 2 Pet. 3:1-2, whose heart is covered with a veil, because they are destitute of the Spirit of the Lord, who removes the veil, 2 Cor. 3:14-16, are called outwardly, but not inwardly.

It is asked: Whether sufficient grace is ordinarily given to all hearers of the Gospel? The Remonstrants affirm. We propose our view in the following assertions.

Assertion 1: Literal knowledge and understanding of the Word, without the operation of the Holy Spirit, is given to unbelievers and the reprobate. Matt. 11:25-26, Matt. 23:23.

Assertion 2: The Holy Spirit, through the Word, convicts the reprobate of sin. John 5:45 and 7:28.

Assertion 3: The Word is an instrument subordinate to the Spirit, active, and possesses its own energy.
1. Because the Word is living and powerful, 2 Cor. 10:4, Heb. 4:12.
2. Because Cicero's oration is efficacious and powerful; Therefore, much more efficacious is the Gospel, the sword, the arm and the power of God.

Assertion 4: That efficacious and living quality which accompanies the Word is not a habitual quality inhering in the Word; because many are blind and stupefied at the Word.

Assertion 5: That power which accompanies the Word is twofold. One is innate to the Word, which does not operate without the Spirit. The other adheres to the Word, which is the energy of the Holy Spirit, which either convinces or converts. Therefore the Word is powerful, but through God, 2 Cor. 10:4. It is the sword of God, but in the mouth of Christ, Rev. 19:15, the bow from which He shoots arrows, Rev. 6:2.

Assertion 7: The power of the Holy Spirit is terminated in the mind, will, and affections, animating those powers of the soul. But the Word itself does not animate, nor does any habitual grace imbue or inform it. And therefore the Holy Spirit elevates the Word to a nobler action than to the bare act of persuading. For this reason the Word is a preparatory instrument of conversion, with respect to the act of persuading; but consummatory, with respect to the physical and supernatural act, to the eliciting of which the Holy Spirit concurs: because the Word has a merely objective and moral influence, and impresses the Grammatical and literal sense on the Intellect of the man called (the Arminians profess to acknowledge no other influence, either of the Word, or of the Holy Spirit, Apology ch. x, fol. 11.) But the Word is an instrument elevated by the Holy Spirit, with respect to internal and supernatural revelation; because the Spirit introduces the grammatical sense to the Intellect, with a plainly celestial, divine and supernatural evidence. Hence our Theologians

make a twofold revelation of the Word: one literal, objective, moral, external, which is not lacking to the reprobate: the other spiritual, supernatural, real and internal; and the Word in both revelations is an instrument subordinated to the Holy Spirit, there preparatory, here consummatory.

Hence

Assertion 7: We say that sufficient grace does not ordinarily accompany the preached Word.

1. Because the external call is often without the internal, as has been proven.

2. Because the Adversaries confess, Arminius Antiperkins p. 665, and Corvinus against Molina ch. 36, sect. 4, that when the Word is preached to the signally obstinate, then the energy of the Spirit rests, and thus the Word is a bare letter. Whence they confess:
1. That God has two contradictory wills concerning those obstinate ones; because He invites them through the preached Word to repentance, and meanwhile does not will that they repent, because He denies them sufficient grace.
2. That the commands proposed to the obstinate are illusory, just as if God should command rocks to speak, and dust to reason; which they often object to us, but in vain.

3. Because saving grace is a precious gem, granted only to a few elect. Matt. 13:11, Matt. 16:17, Ps. 25:9-10, but not to all who hear the Gospel.

4. Because the promise of a new heart is not made to all, but only to the sons of promise.

It is asked: Whether no grace at all, not even common, accompanies the Word of the Gospel? Resp. In the first act, grace convincing the impenitent accompanies the Word of the Gospel.

1. Because as the law is the letter that kills, so the Gospel is the ministry of the Spirit. 2 Cor. 3:6.
2. The Gospel is the saving Word, Titus 2:11, the word of reconciliation, 2 Cor. 5:19.
3. Because if no grace accompanied the Gospel, the hearers of the Gospel would not be more inexcusable than the hearers of the Law. But they are more inexcusable. John 15:22, John 3:17, Matt. 11:21-22, Matt. 10:15, Heb. 2:3 and 6:4-5 and 10:29.

But in the second act, from the abuse of the Gospel, the Gospel is to the obstinate, equally as the Law, a dead letter, a sealed book, Isa. 29:11, Christ, a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense, the Gospel, an aroma from death to death, 2 Cor. 2:16.

It is asked: Whether the essence of Conversion is situated in the free act alone of assenting to the Word and believing, or in the infusion of a new heart? The Arminians locate its essence in the free act of believing alone. We state that conversion essentially and in the first act is not in the free act of believing, although active Conversion and the second act of Conversion to God, which is commanded to us as a duty, is essentially in such an act; but in the infusion of new life.

1. Because Conversion, as to the first act, is the work of God alone, giving a new heart, regenerating, vivifying, infusing the sanctifying Spirit. Here we behave entirely passively, as clay in the hand of the potter.

2. Because new creation is essentially the infusion of new divine life. But a free act is not such an infusion.

3. Because, according to the Arminians, a new heart can be infused into man, i.e., the mind illuminated and the affections imbued with a new power, while the will remains not yet converted and renewed, because one free act of assenting to God calling is lacking. Whence man will have a new heart, and a new Spirit infused; yet he will not be a new creature; which is absurd.

4. Because one born again would differ from one not born again, one regenerated from one dead in sins, by the free act alone; nor would a sleeping man be truly born again after one free act of assenting to God calling, indeed, that free act entirely ceases in sleep.

5. Because this opinion makes regeneration a habit acquired by many acts of Free Will; as the habits of Logic, Grammar, and the Arts and Sciences. And the grace of Regeneration will thus be a bare name.

6. Because with the loss of this one act of assenting to God and believing, we do not see how man does not totally fall from the grace of regeneration.

It is asked: Whether in conversion some supernatural habit is supernaturally infused by God into man; or whether every gracious habit in regenerate man is acquired by frequent acts of faith? The Arminians deny the infusion of habit. We assert it.

1. Because Scripture so asserts. Ezek. 36:26: I will give you a new heart, and put a new spirit within you. Isa. 44:3: I will pour water on the thirsty land, and streams on the dry ground; I will pour out my Spirit on your offspring. Zech. 12:10: I will pour out on the house of David the Spirit of grace and supplication. Jer. 31:33: I will put my law in their minds and

write it on their hearts. And that such a Spirit is given neither by merit nor by frequent acts of free will is evident from Ezek. 36:32: It is not for your sake that I will do these things, etc. Be ashamed and disgraced for your conduct, etc.

2. Because in this the regenerate man differs from the unregenerate, that this supernatural habit is in the regenerate, but not at all in the others. Gal. 2:20: I no longer live, but Christ lives in me. The life I now live in the body, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me. Eph. 4:23-24: to be made new in the attitude of your minds; and to put on the new self, created to be like God in true righteousness and holiness. The act of faith which can be put off with the garment is not put on here. 1 John 3:9: No one who is born of God will continue to sin, because God's seed remains in them. This birth is the principle of new life, John 1:13.

3. Because the saints are the temple of God, and the Spirit dwells in them. 1 Cor. 3:16, there is given in them by Christ a spring of water welling up to eternal life, John 4:14. But they are not the temple of God by the bare power of believing; because the bare power of believing does not denominate a sinner habitually faithful, even according to the Adversaries. Nor is the bare act, which passes away, and which a sleeping man puts off, a spring of water welling up. Therefore, it is a habit. But it is not a habit acquired by our labor and zeal, because we are called by grace, not by works. 2 Tim. 1:9.

4. Although the active infusion of God's life is not the obedience which God demands from us, as the Arminians say in Synodical Writings, article 4, pp. 154-155, yet the passive infusion is commanded to us, and we are obligated to have new life, both from the sum of the Law, Matt. 22:37, and from God's express commands, Ezek. 18:31, Eph. 4:24, Col. 3:10.

It is asked: Whether the Remonstrants rightly teach, Synodical Writings, article 4, p. 154-155, that because habit is not required for operating simply, but only for operating better, therefore an infused habit is not required, but sufficient and concomitant grace alone suffices, without such a habit? We deny.

1. Because to require some gracious habit, or supernatural power, only for believing more easily, and not for believing simply, is the grace of the Pelagians; because they said that grace is not necessary simply, but only for believing more easily; as we row with oars, and more easily with the wind: Whence thus, pure nature, without grace, will suffice for supernatural acts.

2. If their habit acquired by frequent acts is the formal principle of supernatural acts, why should not an infused habit by greater right be such a principle? And if an acquired habit is such a principle, the whole praise, both of conversion and of salvation, will be owed to

human industry, not to grace given from heaven. But if such an acquired habit is not the formal principle, therefore, that habit confers not the entity, but the facility, to the substance of the act.

3. If the habit of God's life is not infused in us whence the second acts of faith remain, then faith is not the gift of God. 1. Because neither the habit of faith is infused, nor is the power of believing infused, which denominates a man faithful: because the power of believing, according to them, is consistent with final infidelity; and they deny that believing itself is infused, because thus Free Will would be overturned.

It is asked: If the power of believing alone were from God, and the free act from man, would the principal work of conversion still be from God? because the conferral of the power of eating and drinking is a nobler act than eating and drinking? The Remonstrants affirm, Hague Conference, p. 335. We deny.

1. Because the conferral of the power of believing, according to the Adversaries, is not the conferral of new divine life, as the conferral of the power of eating and drinking is the conferral of natural life: For to believe in act, to them, is Conversion; and by the bare act, the converted man differs from the unconverted.

2. Because the conferral of the power of believing is not conversion, nor any formal act of conversion. For such a power is conferred on many who never believe. But to believe, according to them, is Conversion. And therefore the principal work of conversion is given to Free Will, taken away from God.

It is asked: Whether because God converts us by an irresistible force, the will is therefore coerced, because here are (as the Remonstrants say, articles 3-4, p. 20): 1. An external agent armed with irresistible power. 2. A will struggling against and resisting. 3. The lesser resistance overcome by the greater? We deny.

1. Because the Will is made willing from unwilling and reluctant by an external agent, through the removal of the heart of stone, and the infusion of a new heart, Ezek. 36:26.

2. Because a will willing unwillingly, and acting against its inclination, is a coerced will. But there is no such will here.

It is asked: Whether because God indeclinably determines the Will to one thing, He therefore overturns Liberty? The Remonstrants affirm. We deny.

1. Because God infinitely wise and omnipotent does not overturn the nature of second causes, except in the case of the miraculous transmutation of substances; as when He converted water into wine and the staff of Moses into a serpent. But conversion is not such a miraculous transmutation of substances; But of qualities of the same substance remaining in its nature.

2. Because God so moves the free will that it most freely moves itself to the same thing to which it is premoved by God.

3. Because if certain created infallibilizing motives infallibly bend the will, with Liberty remaining unharmed, much more can the Creator of wills Himself accomplish this.

It is asked: Whether only the elect are called inwardly? The Remonstrants teach, article 3-4, p. 32, that all in the visible Church, both elect and reprobate, are called inwardly. We teach that only the elect are called inwardly.

1. Because Rom. 8:30: Whom He foreknew, He also predestined; whom He predestined, He also called; whom He called, He also justified; whom He justified, He also glorified. Therefore only the elect, who are justified and glorified, are called inwardly: for the reprobate, who are not justified and glorified, are also called outwardly.

2. Because the called are opposed in 1 Cor. 1:24 to those to whom Christ and the Gospel are a stumbling block and foolishness; and therefore who perish.

3. Because to whom alone God efficaciously intends glory, to them alone God gives efficacious means to glory; among which is the internal call.

4. Because only they who are ordained to eternal life, and as many as are so ordained, being called, believe and obey the divine call, Acts 13:48.

5. Because the internal call flows from this fountain alone, that God chose those thus called to eternal glory, Eph. 1:4-6.

It is asked: Whether the internal call adds nothing to the external call, beyond the mere will and desire of God, by which He wills all to be converted and saved? The Remonstrants affirm, articles 2-3, p. 10. We deny.

1. Because it adds internal grace, which from the eternal election of God is infallibly efficacious, Rom. 8:28, who are also said to be called according to His purpose.

2. Because the infallible effect of the internal call is the creation of a new heart and new spirit, by which it happens that we walk in God's precepts, Ezek. 36:26-27. But the external call has no such effect.

3. Because the hardened and obstinate reprobate would be called plainly in the same way as the elect who are certainly to be converted. For the external call shines upon both according to the Scriptures; and God wills both to be saved, if the Adversaries are to be believed.

4. Because the external call is mere persuasion, and the will of saving the called, according to the adversaries, posits nothing real in the called; whence it follows that their internal grace of conversion is mere Pelagianism.

It is asked: Whether the efficacy of grace depends on grace or on Free Will? To understand the Question, it is to be noted that it is not asked: 1. Whether grace has its intrinsic power of operating from Free Will? For grace is the formal principle of supernatural acts from itself; as is conceded on both sides. 2. Nor is it asked whether the actual efficiency of grace, according to specification, is from Free Will? Because it is not from Free Will, but from the nature of grace, that grace acts in the mode of grace, i.e., in a supernatural and spiritual mode, and agreeably to its nature and character, in the manner of an agent determined to one thing. 3. Nor is it asked: Whether not to will or to will, to assent or dissent, and such vital acts flow from grace, as from a formal principle? Because grace itself is not that which formally wills and does not will, but only the will equipped with the habit of grace.

It is asked, therefore: Whether Conversion, rather than non-Conversion, and assent given to God calling, rather than dissent, is from actual grace determining the free will, equipped with habitual grace, according to the eternal purpose of God's election; Or from Free Will, indifferent indeed, but determining itself to one of the opposites? The Arminians, from the event, i.e., from the actual influx of Free Will indifferent from itself to acting or not acting, suspend the efficiency and second act of grace. But we want the actual efficiency of internal grace to be: 1. From the intention of God gratuitously electing. 2. From habitual grace, as a formal principle. And 3. From actual grace.

1. Because thus Scripture, Deut. 30:6: The LORD your God will circumcise your hearts and the hearts of your descendants, so that you may love him with all your heart. Ezek. 36:26-27: I will give you a new heart and put a new spirit in you. Deut. 29:3-4: Your eyes have seen those great trials, those signs and great wonders. But to this day the LORD has not given you a mind that understands or eyes that see or ears that hear. Isa. 44:3: For I will pour water on the thirsty land, and streams on the dry ground; I will pour out my

Spirit on your offspring, and my blessing on your descendants. v. 4: They will spring up like grass in a meadow, like poplar trees by flowing streams. Where the efflorescence and second act of grace is attributed to the Spirit poured out, Zech. 12:10: And I will pour out on the house of David, etc. a spirit of grace and supplication; and they will look on me whom they have pierced; and they will mourn over it as one mourns over an only child, and grieve bitterly over it as one grieves over a firstborn. Jer. 24:7: I will give them a heart to know me; and they will return to me with all their heart. Matt. 11:25: I praise you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because you have hidden these things from the wise and learned, and revealed them to little children. Yes, Father, for this is what you were pleased to do. John 6:37: All those the Father gives me will come to me. v. 45: Everyone who has heard the Father and learned from him comes to me. Phil. 1:29: For it has been granted to you on behalf of Christ not only to believe in him, but also to suffer for him. Phil. 2:13: for it is God who works in you to will and to act in order to fulfill his good purpose.

2. Because all solid consolation and patience of the Saints, all faith, all gratitude is overturned; if the cause efficaciously determining to believe is changeable human Liberty, and not the special grace of God.

3. It fights against true humility; for if actual Conversion is from Free Will, not from grace, then the converted one owes the glory of Conversion to himself, not to God and His grace.

4. If the efficacy of grace as to the event depended on Free Will, then Conversion and salvation will be of him who wills and runs, not of God who has mercy; nor will God have mercy on whom He wills.

5. In vain do we pray for the Conversion of men, or give thanks to God for the grace of conversion; contrary to the Scriptures, Eph. 1:17-18, 2 Thess. 1:3, Col. 1:12-14.

6. The whole ministry of the Gospel is overturned, which tends to this, that man, stripped of all his own glorying, should glory in none but God, and Christ his Savior, and His grace, 1 Cor. 1:26-31, Matt. 11:25. All the arguments adduced above for the irresistible and indeclinable operation of special grace also validly prove this our assertion.

It is asked: Whether non-conversion is to be ascribed to God, denying efficacious grace, by which man would be converted, but not to man, refusing to believe, and struggling against God's call; if one is not converted for this reason, because God denied efficacious grace? The Remonstrants say the blame for non-conversion is cast on God, not on man, if the efficacy of grace does not depend on Free Will. We deny.

1. Because God denying efficacious grace, which He is bound to give to no one, will be the negative physical cause of non-conversion; but He will not be the moral and culpable cause of non-conversion privatively and morally: because it is lawful for God to do with His own what pleases Him.

2. Because God so denies efficacious grace, which He is not obliged to give, that the one himself not converted, against God's command, acts and rejoices that he lacks that efficacious grace, and from the innate liberty of his depraved will, maliciously struggles against God calling.

3. Because God here is an agent above all Law, but man subject to the Law and acting from what is not owed and against legal obligation; but God is here an Agent, not from a debt of Justice or natural equity, but from His pure free good pleasure.

4. Because if non-conversion is imputed to God on this account, then conversion will be from the good use and influx of Free Will; which is for grace to be given according to merits, and Pelagian.

It is asked: Whether it can happen that of two, endowed with equal habitual grace, one is converted because he wills, but the other is not converted because he does not will? The Arminians affirm. We deny.

1. Because the man converted through Free Will would separate himself from the unconverted, and would have something in which to glory, and would say, I have the act of Conversion from myself, which I did not receive from God, which the other equipped with equal grace did not will to have.

2. Because Free Will, not grace, would be the cause of conversion.

3. Because there would be no reason why the converted should ascribe the thanks of his conversion to God.

It is asked: Whether it is from Free Will, or from the nature of more remiss and more intense grace, that the supernatural acts of believing, repenting, are more intense or more remiss. The Remonstrants say it is from Free Will. We deny.

1. Because Paul says, 1 Cor. 15:10: But by the grace of God I am what I am, and his grace to me was not without effect. No, I worked harder than all of them—yet not I, but the grace of God that was with me.

2. Because he who believes and repents more intensely would have something which he did not receive from God, and could glory in it as if he had not received it.

3. Because in vain we would pray for increased faith, and the Apostles would wrongly say: Lord, increase our faith; if more and more intense faith were from Free Will, not from the grace of God.

4. Thanks would not be owed to God for more intense faith.

5. Nor would it be necessary to humbly acquiesce in the wise dispensation of God distributing grace in the measure which seems good to Him.

6. If more intense faith is from Free Will and not from the grace of God, then faith simply and in a positive degree will also be from Free Will, and will not be the gift of God.

It is asked: Whether God therefore influences by actual grace in a supernatural work, because the created will influences; Or the will therefore influences, because God first by nature influences by His actual grace? The Remonstrants say God therefore influences in the work, because our will first by nature influences; not the contrary. We deny.

1. Because the gracious influence of God is the cause of all supernatural acts: Therefore, it is the cause why we obey God calling.

2. Because the bride rightly says, Song 1:4: Draw me after you; let us hurry.

3. Because our will would thus prevent God's grace, but grace would not prevent the will.

4. Because the whole glory of Conversion would be owed to Free Will going before, not to grace, which would only be a follower.

5. Because the eternal decrees of God of Election, Calling, Adoption, internal Calling, Conversion, Perseverance, and therefore Glorification, would depend on him who wills and runs, not on the grace of God having mercy in every way gratuitously.

6. Because this was the blasphemous opinion of Cassian, book 3, ch. 13: Sometimes (the grace of God from man) either demands or expects certain efforts of good will, lest it should seem to confer its gifts on one entirely sleeping or dissolved in inert leisure. Thus Prosper against Cassian's Conference, book 13, ch. 11: A great question, whether because we have offered the beginning of good will, God has mercy on us; Or because God has

mercy, we attain the beginning of good will? And this was Cassian's merit; and against this Prosper and Hilary disputed with the Massilians. Augustine, Epistle 107, to Vitalis.

It is asked: Whence depends the certainty and indeclinability of Conversion, on Free Will or on the Grace of God? The Arminians say on Free Will. But we say on the Grace of God.

1. Because Conversion and the number of the elect to be saved would be uncertain and contingent, if the certainty of conversion depended not on the decree of Election and on the grace of God, but on a cause in every way changeable, slippery, fallible, contingent, and indifferent to acting or not acting.

2. It would be in the power of Free Will that no one of mortals should be converted and saved.

3. The existence of the Church, and that Christ the King, Bridegroom, Head, should have Subjects, Bride and Members, would depend on Free Will, not on the Grace of God.

4. Because God could not convert and save more than those who are actually converted and saved.

It is asked: Whether the Remonstrants rightly deny that the Lord irresistibly opened the heart of Lydia; because He dealt with her will by precepts, promises, reasons and arguments? That is, Whether the irresistibility of grace conflicts with precepts, promises, threats? We deny.

1. Because God commands faith in the Gospel, and yet works it in us by that surpassing greatness of power, and efficacy of might, which He exerted in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead, Eph. 1:20.

2. Because the irresistibility of grace, and the invincible Dominion of God over the will, are perfectly consistent with the liberty of the will.

It is asked: Whether the Remonstrants rightly say, Apology, ch. 17, p. 184, that the Lord opened the heart of Lydia, because the whole substance of Paul's sermon, namely, the precepts, promises, reasons and arguments were from God? We deny.

1. Because thus God would also be said to justify men, because the whole substance of the Law, the precepts, promises, reasons and arguments of the Law are from God.

2. Because thus that internal grace, by which God opened the heart of Lydia, would be nothing other than Pelagian grace, namely, the words of God, which consist of the precepts, promises, reasons and arguments of the Law.

3. Because thus God did not otherwise open the heart of Lydia than that of Simon Magus, and Judas the traitor; because the whole substance of the sermon made to Judas and Simon Magus, the precepts, namely, promises, reasons, and arguments of the Law, are from God.

4. Thus Plato opens the hearts of Aristotle and Aristotle of his disciples, to understand Physics and Metaphysics; because all their arguments, by the aid of more common grace, were devised by them.

Concerning the MODE OF CONVERSION.

It is asked: Whether the efficacy of grace depends on congruous calling? That is, Whether men are therefore converted to God, because God employs persuasion adapted to such a person, so disposed, in such a place and time, which He foreknows will move the will to obey God; although that persuasion of itself, and simply, could have been resisted? Bellarmine, Fonseca, Suarez, Valencia, and Arminius (Antiperkins, p. 665) and the Remonstrants (Colloquy of the Hague, p. 311) affirm. Although after more mature judgment and more deeply pondered, they abandon that opinion. Remonstrants, Confession, ch. 13, thesis 10. We deny.

1. Because all persuasion, of whatever kind, is Pelagian grace; and can no more heal the corrupt will than golden words can restore sight to the blind, and life to the dead.

2. There can be no adaptation to any disposition of natural man; who regards the Gospel as mere foolishness.

3. Because this opinion rests on the stolid and profane invention of Middle Knowledge.

4. Because it resolves the efficacy of grace into Free Will, which can reject all persuasions.

5. Because it overturns the Dominion of Divine providence over human wills; and supposes that no more and no fewer can be converted by God than God foreknows before every act of His will.

6. Because it casts the cause of non-conversion on God not calling congruously, which they condemn in our Theologians.

7. The cause why men are not converted, from the Scriptures, is not because they are not called congruously; but because they are not of the sheep of Christ, are not drawn by the Father, because God did not give them a heart to understand, because they have not heard and learned from the Father, etc.

Chapter 12. The Justification of a Sinner.

Rom. 3:28.
Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith apart from the deeds of the law.

The question is, Are we justified by our works?
From which the state of the Question must be established. But it is agreed: 1. That man is not properly justified by himself, but by God. 2. That gratuitous love in Christ concurs in some way. 3. That faith is required beforehand, although there is a controversy about the mode of the presence of faith. 4. That good works cannot be absent from one truly justified. 5. That full remission is required, because nothing defiled may enter the kingdom of heaven. 6. That man by his own self cannot contribute as much as suffices for the satisfaction for sins required in Justification. 7. That man truly and really is made, from unjust and impious, just, and is not just in imagination and bare opinion; although, where that Justice is, in Christ inherently, in us imputatively? or in us inherently and infused? is asked. 8. That satisfaction rendered to the Law is also included in the justification of a sinner.

First, therefore, it is Asked, Are we justified by faith, i.e., by fiducial reliance on Christ? Hence the question is not about faith, by which we assent to every Word of God as true, but about faith by which we confidently recline in Christ, or in God through Christ the Mediator, as the object which, and in the Word of promise, as the good, as in the object by which.

2. Are we justified by faith alone? That is, by faith alone, not by solitude of existence, as if existing faith lacked hope, charity, and a sincere zeal to please God in all things by God's grace, and to obey Him, and thus justify? For that is a dead and vain faith, nor does it have any action about Christ apprehended fiducially: But by faith alone by solitude of office, solitude of the act of apprehending Christ, and His justice, and alone by solitude of organic causality; so that there may be excluded from the reason of condition, merit or instrument, hope, charity and all operations disposing us preparatorily to justification, and all good works, whether done by the powers of nature alone, or even by the aid of divine grace?

3. Are we justified by faith alone? That is, not by an innate power, merit, excellence, or worthiness of faith; but correlatively, because faith apprehends Jehovah our righteousness Jer. 23:6, namely, Christ, who is our righteousness imputatively.

But are we justified by works? 1. Not insofar as works are done by the powers of nature without the aid of grace; thus the Papists think that the works of the Law are to be called, through which Paul denies that we are justified.

2. Are we justified by works, not insofar as they are considered in themselves, not insofar as they merit justification (Thus Vorstius speaks in his Apology to article 24, pages 34-35.) But by works, insofar as works are a certain part of faith, or as it were coalesce into one certain result with faith itself? As the Remonstrants in their Confession, chapter 10. Insofar as faith necessarily has good works conjoined, and the amendment of the whole life instituted according to the precepts of Jesus Christ, indeed which by natural property includes the obedience of faith, to which obedience, faith can not and should not be opposed by right? This is what Socinus says about the Savior, book 4, chapter 11. And so faith and works, i.e., obedience to the precepts of Christ, as the form of faith, justify us before God.

3. Are we justified by faith, as a good work, and our partial Justice, graciously reputed by God for full Justice? The Papists, Remonstrants, Socinians, want us to be justified by works considered in that way, and by faith, as a good work. We deny it.

1. We are justified by faith apart from works. Rom. 3:28. Not by works of righteousness which we have done. Titus 3:8. And Gal. 2:16. through faith. Rom. 5:1, by faith. Only through faith Gal. 5:6. Rom. 3:24. freely, by grace Luke 8:50. Do not fear, only believe, and she will be saved.

2. In what way Abraham, the father of all believers, is justified, in that way and reason we are justified. But Rom. 4:3. Abraham believed, and it was imputed to him for righteousness; not as a debt, i.e., by works even following faith, because thus Abraham would have something in which to boast. Therefore. The reason for the major premise. Because it was written not only for the sake of Abraham, but also for our sake. v. 23-24.

3. Because Christ was made sin for us so that we might become the Righteousness of God in Him. 2 Cor. 5:21. He was made a curse for us (Gal. 3:13, 14.) so that the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles in Christ Jesus. 1 Cor. 1:30. He was made for us by the Father, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption.

4. Because the promise of salvation is not made to the one fulfilling the Law, but to the one believing. And therefore the inheritance is by faith, so that it might be according to grace, to establish the promise to all the seed. Rom. 4:16.

5. Because Rom. 5:19. As by the disobedience of one man many were made sinners, so by the obedience of Christ many are made righteous.

6. There is no peace of conscience, and confidence, and hope of glory, except from the act of believing in Christ, who fulfilled the Law for us.

7. Because it detracts from the glory of the merits and death of Christ, and from the mercy and grace shown to miserable sinners; if we are justified not by faith alone in Christ, but also by our works.

But it can be Asked, Are we not justified by works done by the aid of the grace of regeneration, as the Papists teach; or by the obedience of works, insofar as it is the offspring, issue, and natural property of faith, as the Remonstrants teach? Confession ch. 10 theses 2-3 and ch. 18 thesis 3 and Apology ch. 10. We deny it. 1. Because this is the most valid consequence of Paul. Rom. 3:9. Both Jews and Greeks are all under sin etc. v.19. Every mouth is stopped, and all the world becomes guilty before God on account of sin. Therefore, no one is justified by works. Hence it follows that that righteousness and obedience of works, by which we are justified before God, is free from sin, and such as absolves man from condemnation and all guilt of sin. But no mortal lives, who even by the grace of regeneration renders the obedience of works free from all sin: For cursed is

everyone who does not continue in all things which are written in the book of the Law, to do them. Deut. 27:26. Gal. 3:10. Prov. 20:9. 1 John 1:8.

2. Because, if justification were by works done by the aid of grace, in no way determining the free will to good works, but leaving it to its absolute indifference; then man would have something in which to boast before God. For not in grace, but in Free Will must he boast, who is equipped with grace in no way separating the believer from the non-believer, the one working from the one not working: Because Free Will, according to the doctrine of the Jesuits and Arminians, makes the separation; and therefore also the just and suitable matter for boasting before God, in nature, not in the grace of God.

3. Because these words, Rom. 4:4, 5, according to the Jesuits and Arminians, would have this sense. But to him who works (i.e., who fulfills the righteousness of the Law, without any sin, and by his own violation of the Law) to him the reward (of Justification, Remission and eternal life) is not imputed by grace, but by debt. (i.e., by that perfect rule of the Moral Law, by which eternal life and remission of sins is owed by merit and justice) But to the one not working (i.e., not exactly fulfilling the Law of legal righteousness by his own powers), but who believes in Him who justifies the ungodly (i.e., relies confidently on Christ to obtain absolution and remission of sins), his faith is imputed for righteousness (i.e., he is justified by gracious acceptance, not by his own merit. From which it follows 1. If anyone produces good works from the powers of grace, to him is owed, not by the grace of God, but by debt, the reward of remission, and the justification of the Adversaries is not by the grace of God, but by legal debt.

2. It follows that God gives grace, by which the Law may be perfectly fulfilled and exactly: and in this way indeed, justification would be by grace, and at the same time by debt secondarily and according to what. But such grace happens to no one, by which he is free from sin.

3. It follows that Adam before the fall could not be justified by works of the Law and legal debt; because the grace of fulfilling the Law was supernatural grace, as the Papists, Arminians and Socinians teach with them. From which all the regenerate are justified in that way by grace, even under the covenant of Grace, by which Adam was justified by grace under the covenant of works. And this certainly can neither be refuted nor evaded; because they teach that God would have been unjust and cruel, if He had given to Adam a law impossible by the powers of pure nature; and therefore for this, that He might be a just Legislator, He was obliged to give supernatural justice, by which the Law and justification through the Law would be possible for Adam, and not exceeding his powers. And they chant the same song about fallen man, namely, that God commands nothing impossible to man; and therefore that the same Law under the Covenant of Grace may be possible, God

is obliged to give grace sufficient by its degrees at last, by which man, working through supernatural grace, could obtain justification through works no less than Adam once did.

4. Because if we are justified by works of the Law, but done by the powers of grace; the distinction between the Covenant of works, or the Law, and the Covenant of Grace, or the Gospel, is empty. Because Gal. 3:17. And this I say, that the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul the covenant that was confirmed before by God in Christ, that it should make the promise of no effect. v. 18. For if the inheritance is by the law, it is no longer by promise; but God gave it to Abraham by a promise. Hence in no way, by doing good works, is man justified, unless he perfectly fulfilled the Law (Do this and live) and continued in all things which are written in the Book of the Law, to do them. v. 10. And so Christ died for him in vain, and was made a curse and malediction. And the Papists and Arminians remove this distinction, full of sweetest consolation, who teach that the Gospel is nothing other than a new Law, or the Law made perfect; indeed to be the very Law itself, but made easy and possible for us with the grace of the Spirit, so that through it we can be justified. Bellarmine on justification book 4, chapter 3-4. But it is indeed true that the same moral doctrine is in the Law and in the Gospel, more broadly accepted; but in the mode of justifying, the two Covenants, Law and Gospel, struggle with opposite fronts. Because the Gospel justifies by believing, not by working through grace; because thus grace would establish and strengthen legal justification, and render it possible and easy; but by believing in the promise, through which alone the inheritance of life happens, and not through works of the Law done by the aid of grace. For thus the Gospel promises would not be valid, except on the hypothesis that we perfectly fulfill the Law through the grace of God, which is not the Gospel and Covenant of grace, whose only condition is faith in Jesus Christ.

5. Because the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, indeed, because Christ died for us, i.e., in our place and stead, as Sponsor and Surety, He was made a curse for us, and sustained in Himself the malediction and penalty of the violated Law due to us. From which necessarily flowed from Christ to us Surety righteousness, or such as a Sponsor renders for debtors. But this is imputed righteousness.

It is Asked, whether Arminius rightly taught in his letter to Hippolytus, that it cannot be done, that God should impute the righteousness of Christ to us for righteousness, because the obedience of Christ is that very righteousness taken according to the most severe rigor of the Law; but the righteousness of the sinner is gratuitous? Also whether Episcopius rightly disputes in disputation 22, thesis 4. It is not properly the righteousness of Christ, much less active or passive, or that which Christ merited by both of those, and we obtain through Jesus alone: For the righteousness of Christ is not properly that which is imputed; but that, on account of which righteousness is imputed to us believing in Him?

That is, whether the righteousness of Christ is by no means imputed to us, but on account of the righteousness of Christ, which He has by dying and making satisfaction for us, it has come about that our good works, and thus the act of believing are imputed to us for righteousness, by the gracious estimation of God? The Arminians affirm it. Thus Arminius himself responds to article 31. If the Creditor, to whom a hundred florins are owed, receiving ten holds it as paid, and so imputes it as paid to the Debtor. And the Papists assert the same with the Socinians. Socinus dialogue on justification p. 16, 19. Smalcius disputation 4 against Frantzius.

But we believe that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, and that by it we are justified before God.

1. Isa. 53:5. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. v. 11. for he shall bear their iniquities. v. 12. because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he bare the sin of many. Gal. 3:13. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us. Phil. 3:9. And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith. Rom. 3:21. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested. 22. Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe. 23. For all have sinned. 24. Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. But this righteousness v. 21-22 is directly opposed to inherent righteousness v. 23 which is defiled by sin. But this is the righteousness of Christ alone imputed.

2. Because our justification consists in this imputation. Rom. 4:6. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, Saying, v.7. Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered.

3. Because Christ by dying satisfied God in the place and stead of sinners, just as if they themselves had undergone death in their own person; for Christ acquired righteousness by dying and obeying the Father, not merely personal, but surety righteousness. For he is righteous, who exactly pays the penalties due to sin, and fulfilled the law of God by obeying. But he did not pay for himself, but for others, and obeyed the Father both for himself and for us. And surety righteousness is proper to those for whom the surety bond is undertaken.

4. That Christ was made our righteousness by dying for us, and obeying the Father; that He was made a victim, curse and sacrifice for our sins, is expressly said in the Scriptures. 2

Cor. 5:21. Rom. 3:25. Rom. 5:6, 7, 10. John 15:13. 1 Pet. 3:18. Isa. 53:12. But that Christ died and obeyed the Father for this purpose, that our good works, done by the powers of grace, might be satisfactory to the righteousness of the Law, and be considered for our righteousness before the Tribunal of the tremendous Judge; so that the act of Christ justifying, redeeming, saving, is in this, that Christ through His merits made us Justifiers, Redeemers and Saviors of ourselves, is nowhere written. For thus this would be the power of the merits of Christ, that it communicated to our works the meritorious power of justification, remission of sins and eternal life; which fruit of the death of Christ nowhere appears in the whole Scripture.

5. Because that one argument of Arminius to the contrary does not conclude. For the Surety righteousness of Christ is, and conformed to the Law of God through all things, and also gratuitous. Conformed to the Law of God, because Christ most perfectly satisfied the rigor of the Law through all things. And as it is imputed to us, and formally, so that it may be ours through the active imputation or reputing of God, and our faith graciously apprehending it, it is altogether gratuitous. Nor do these conflict. For he who as a Sponsor pays a thousand florins for a friend, if the debtor owes nothing more, it is by legal justice a perfect payment strictly and according to the rigor of the law: But indeed as far as that payment is imputed to the debtor, who was not solvent, it is a gratuitous payment.

Rom. 4:3.
For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness.

We acknowledge here a metonymical and figurative locution. For that which we apprehend is imputed to us for righteousness, as one says, my hand has meditated; i.e., the riches acquired by the industry and labor of my hands have meditated. Hence it is Asked, Whether the act of believing is imputed to the believer, not figuratively, correlatively and metonymically, but properly; so that it may be our formal righteousness before the Tribunal of God? Arminius affirms it in his disputation on justification, and Bellarmine book 1 on justification chapter 17. We deny it.

1. Because we are not justified by any work in us. Eph. 2:5. by grace ye are saved. Titus 3:5. Not by works of righteousness which we have done. Rom. 11:6. And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace.

2. Because the judgment of God is according to truth. Rom. 2:2. God cannot consider the act of believing as a perfect fulfillment of the Law, because to believe is not exactly and through all things to keep the Law.

3. We are justified by the grace of God, and the redemption which is in Christ Rom. 3:24 and the imputed righteousness of Christ. Therefore, not at the same time also through any acts in us.

4. It is unscriptural that Christ merited that our faith would be meritorious of the remission of sins and eternal life; since faith, actions, and all our sufferings are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. Rom. 8:18. 2 Cor. 3:17-18.

5. The righteousness by which we must appear covered before the Tribunal of God is free from sin and cannot consist with sin. Rom. 3:9, 22, 23. Gal. 3:10, 11, 12, 13. But the faith of the elect consists with sin. 1 John 1:8. Ps. 130:3 and 143:2. Prov. 20:9.

1 John 1:8.
If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

It is Asked, Whether by the grace of God, which He lavishes on the elect and faithful in this life, we can perfectly keep the Law? The Remonstrants affirm it with the Papists and Socinians. We deny it.

1. Because besides that the Apostle John asserts the contrary in the cited place, it is said Prov. 20:9. Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin? James 3:2. For in many things we offend all. 1 Kings 8:46. for there is no man that sinneth not. Eccl. 7:20. For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not.

2. Because cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. Therefore, those who seek Justification from the works of the Law are cursed; because the reason for the consequence is no other than because no one, whether regenerate or unregenerate can continue in all things which are written in the Book of the Law.

3. Because all have a culpable defect and impotence of fulfilling the Law; and a morally impure and vicious cause cannot produce morally pure and perfect effects. And Paul, a

chosen vessel, truly says of himself Rom. 7:14. For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. v. 18. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing. v. 19. But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.

4. Fallen men not yet fully reformed to the image of God, who are bound to love God with all their heart, with all their soul, and with all their strength; they cannot perfectly fulfill the Law, even through the grace of God which is granted in this life. But all the regenerate are such and are bound to love God thus; because this is the sum and end of the Law, to which all mortals without distinction are obligated. The reason for the major premise. Because no one can love God most intensely after the fall, in this life; because there is no love of God here which cannot be increased and perfected.

The things which the Adversaries invent are vain and false, that men are obligated to love God above all things objectively, by willing the highest good to God, and above all things appreciatively, by preferring God to all other things; but that we are not obligated to the end of the Law, except in vow and endeavor, i.e., the Law does not obligate us to love God above all things intensively, because this is impossible in this life. But the Law does not obligate to the impossible.

Resp. 1. This distinction is vain and fallacious. Because Christ from the greater appreciation of some person or thing than of Himself the Savior, argues a less intense love of the Savior. Matt. 10:37. Luke 14:26, 27. For he who loves God with less love than created things, and thus makes less of and esteems God less than parents and children; he, according to the Savior, loves God too remissly and tepidly, and loves the creature more intensely than the Creator. And he who loves God appreciatively above all things, and thinks He is to be preferred to every object of love, he loves God most intensely: For the degree of estimation of the loved thing is followed by the degree, measure, and intensity of love. But there is no one of the saints in this life who does not more often, by an inordinate and excessive love of himself or his own or even of sin, violate this love of God and show in practice that he makes more of those things than of God; as the pious Eli 1 Sam. 2:29; and all the saints, when and as often as they sin. And thus the members of this distinction coincide.

2. It is false that the end of the Law does not obligate; nor is the reason valid, because the end is impossible; because this impossibility has been culpably contracted by us: Nor is it an impossibility simply said and absolutely, but only according to what and conditionally.

3. If we are bound to love God with all our strength, then the remission of strength as three, if the Law demands intensity of strength as eight, will be a violation of the Law.

4. Because no one, not even the most righteous of mortals, dares to appear before the Tribunal of God with his own inherent righteousness. Ps. 143:2 and 130:3. Job 42:5 and 9:3. 1 Cor. 4:4.

5. All who keep the Law obtain eternal life under the title of legal obedience. But no mortal obtains or can obtain eternal life by this title. Therefore. The major premise is evident. Rom. 2:13. Gal. 3:12. The man that doeth them shall live in them. The minor premise is evident from the whole Gospel. Rom. 8:3, 4. Gal. 3:21. Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. Also v. 22. But the scripture hath concluded all under sin. Also Gal. 2:21. I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain. Also, Gal. 3:10. For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse.

6. Because if anyone offends in one point, he has become guilty of all, as James says ch. 2 v. 10. But there is no mortal who does not offend in one point. Therefore etc.

7. He who seeks righteousness and life through the fulfillment of the Law has become a debtor to the whole Law. Gal. 5:3, 4. But the regenerate man has not become a debtor to the whole Law; but is under grace, not under the Law. Rom. 7:6.

8. Those who can fulfill the Law, by the grace of God, to them the Spirit has been given in such measure that the infused grace is no longer imperfect and augmentable, but perfect and sufficient to love God with the whole heart, with the whole soul, and with all the strength. But to no mortal has grace been given thus. 1. Because it belongs to all to grow in grace. 2 Pet. 3:18, Phil. 3:12. 2 Thess. 1:3. 2. Because the Spirit divides to each one as He wills. 1 Cor. 12:11.

9. Because Scripture says the Law is a yoke, which neither we nor the Jews can bear: and which is impossible to observe on account of the impotence of the flesh, that there might be a place for the fulfillment of the Law through Christ. Rom. 8:3. Rom. 7:14, 15, 16, 17 taken with v. 24 and ch. 8:1.

11. The Adversaries confess that men cannot so avoid all sins that it is not necessary for them to say daily, not only humbly but truly, Forgive us our debts; nor is there anyone (they say) who can avoid at least venial sins. But every sin, however venial (as they call it), is a violation of the Law. Therefore, those who cannot avoid such things by grace cannot fulfill the Law by grace.

Rom. 6:23.
The wages of sin is death.

Since Paul asserts that every sin taken indefinitely merits eternal death, which in this place is opposed to eternal life,
Therefore
It is Asked, Whether the distinction of mortal and venial sin is to be maintained? The Remonstrants affirm it, while in their Apology ch. 11 fol. 130 they say that to love God with the whole heart is only to worship the true God, not Idols; or to be diligent and studious in the observance of those commandments which properly regard God; nor is perfection of such righteousness here expressed, which the most rigid judgment of God, considered Mathematically or Arithmetically, as a perfection absolute in all numbers and degrees, which precisely excludes blemishes and imperfections, requires.
We say 1. Every sin in the regenerate is venial by accident, even though it may be most grave; because the regenerate person truly grieving over it and doing penance, obtains forgiveness of it in Christ, from the mercy of God. 1 John 1:7. Thus the blasphemy and persecutions of Paul are venial. 1 Tim. 1:13.

2. Sin is called venial, a sin of weakness, because it was not committed out of malice; and it is venial by accident, because it is conjoined and is in the same subject with more grave crimes, of which one obtains forgiveness in Christ Jesus. Hence we freely acknowledge degrees of sins. Augustine Enchiridion ch. 64 and Letter 89. There are certain sins which are called crimes; certain without which one does not live here.

Among the Hebrews there is a certain sin which is called "pride", from the root "he acted proudly, arrogantly" (to which is contrasted an imprudent error, or sin from ignorance) and "rebellion"; and "impiety"; when one sins with a high hand and outstretched neck. Num. 15:22. Hence Rom. 6:13 "unrighteousness". Eph. 5:6 "disobedience", contumacy. 1 Tim. 1:9 "ungodliness", impiety. Heb. 12:3 "apostasy".

Mortal, as Thomas rightly says in 1a 2ae q. 88 art. 1, is said by the similitude of a disease, which is called mortal, because it induces an irreparable defect. But a twofold principle of life, corresponding to a twofold death, is to be considered; one legal, and thus every sin is in itself deadly, as Gerson says on the spiritual life, lecture 1, to the letter A. And this is life through Justification. The other is the principle of life through Sanctification; and thus there is a sin so slight, that it is not destructive and expulsive of the seed of God and new life. And in this sense, Augustine acknowledges venial sin, and we with him.

But the Question is, Whether there is any sin, under the New Covenant, venial by its own nature, and in relation to the Law of God, from which the formal nature of sin is to be taken, which from the cause or mode or slightness of matter is venial and worthy of pardon, and does not by the rigor of the Law meritoriously exclude from the kingdom of heaven, nor of itself merit eternal damnation? The Arminians and Papists affirm it. We deny it.

1. Gal. 3:10. Cursed is everyone who does not continue in all things which are written in the book of the Law. But he who admits the least sin, does not continue in all things which are written in the book of the law? and thus is subject to the curse of the Law, i.e., eternal death. Ezek. 18:4. The soul that sins, it shall die. Rom. 6:23. The wages of sin is death. James 2:10. Whoever offends in one point, he is guilty of all. For James argues, not from the magnitude of crimes, as the Jesuits want; but from the Authority of the Lawgiver v. 11. He who said, "Do not commit adultery", also said, "Do not murder". Hence the infinite authority of God is equal, forbidding either this sin or that, and prohibiting the theft of a penny and the theft of a thousand florins. Matt. 5:19. Whoever breaks one of the least of these commandments and teaches others to do the same will be called least in the kingdom of heaven. Matt. 12:36, 37. But I tell you that men will have to give account on the day of judgment for every careless word they have spoken. But with Purgatory extinguished then, and no place of temporary punishment remaining on the day of judgment, it is necessary that men pay eternal punishments for idle words, which nevertheless the Papists and Arminians attribute to venial sins on account of the slightness of the matter.

2. Every sin against the love of God is a violation of the Law, and merits eternal punishment; because it is repugnant to the greatest commandment of the Law, which is always violated insofar as we do not keep the commandments of God. John 14:14. Deut. 10:12. But venial sins are against the love of God.

3. Every sin, against the infinite Majesty, merits eternal punishment. But sin (as they call it) venial is such.

2. Because the same victim representing the one sacrifice of Christ, was offered in the Law for sins of ignorance (which they call venial) and for more grave crimes. Lev. 4-5. Heb. 10:4, 5.

It is Asked, Whether venial sin is not against the Law, but only besides the Law? The Adversaries say yes. We deny it.

1. Because venial sin is prohibited by the Law of God. For what prohibits the genus, also prohibits the species. As theft in general is against the eighth Commandment; Therefore, also the theft of a penny.

2. Venial sin is against right reason, namely, the Law inscribed on the heart. Rom. 2:15. What fights against whiteness insofar as it is a color, fights against every color. But the dictate of right reason is the divine Law, of which the law of nature is predicated, as a genus of a species. But venial sins are repugnant to right reason (such as to steal from a neighbor what is his, to idly waste speech), as Suarez, Azorius, Durandus concede, although Bellarmine denies it with no shame.

3. Because every sin is privatively opposed to a right moral act, as a jocose lie to the truth, which we ought to speak: and a word or deed besides the Law of God, but not against the Law of God, is the same as a certain blindness in an animal besides not against sight, and a certain death besides, not against life, as semi-blindness and semi-death, which are a mean by participation of both extremes. But venial sins (as they call them) are not semi-virtues and semi-vices; nor in moral actions is a mean given by participation of both extremes; as the theft of a penny and an idle word are not something intermediate, between a morally good act and conformed to God's Law, and an evil act and repugnant to God's Law.

Gal. 5:17.

For the flesh lusts against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary to one another, so that you do not do the things that you wish.

From which it necessarily follows, that the will and reason, in all the regenerate, are such principles of the most excellent actions, which since they are defiled with natural concupiscence, it is necessary that all our works, even the most perfect, are sprinkled with some stain of sin. Hence

It is Asked, Whether the most excellent Works of the regenerate are defiled with sins? The Jesuits and Arminians deny it, who teach that the blemishes and stains adhering to the works of the regenerate are not properly sins, or such as by the rigor of the divine Law proscribe men from the heavens, or make them liable to eternal condemnation. But that the state of the Question may be fixed, we teach:

1. The merits of Christ are of such value and power, that they can elevate the good works of the regenerate to absolute purity, through all things conformed to the Law of God; but that in fact the merits of Christ do this, we altogether deny. For the merits of Christ indeed take away all legal guilt from our good works, but not all physical stain; because although our Justification and Remission is consummated and perfect in this life, as to the removal of guilt; yet our Sanctification is not perfect as to the removal of physical stain.

2. It is most false, what the Adversaries say, Becanus, Gregory of Valentia, Bellarmine, Pererius, that we teach 1. Good works are mortal sins. 2. The good works of the regenerate are good simply and according to what, but are simply mortal sins. For we teach that the good works of the regenerate are good. 1. With respect to the substance of the act. 2. With respect to the formal object. 3. With respect to all four causes, efficient, material, formal, and final. Ps. 119:1 and 167. Gal. 5:22. Phil. 2:13. 1 Cor. 10:31.

3. We teach that the culpable stain adhering to our good works is indeed legally taken away through Christ, so that our works are pleasing to God, through and on account of Christ the Mediator; but that stain remains physically and really, culpably defiling our works.

4. So that the good works of the regenerate are indeed not formally and in the abstract mortal sins: Far be it. For the Adversaries falsely ascribe this to us through envy. Yet they are in the concrete and materially, defiled and sprinkled with the stain of sin; Or they are good with respect to the substance of the act and in their causes, and to omit them is sin; but they are in mode and degree and some circumstances, or rather degrees of circumstances, vitiated by culpable defect. And therefore these works are vitiated, not vices; sinful, not sins; culpable, not faults. And therefore the Lord eagerly exhorts to such works; and those who do not do such things, we pronounce to be cut off, as trees not bearing fruit from the vineyard of the Lord; indeed to be pleasing, praiseworthy, useful to God. Matt. 5:16. 1 Tim. 6:18. Matt. 26:10. 1 Pet. 2:5. Phil. 4:18. Heb. 13:6, 16.

But we teach that they are not so perfect, but that they are defiled with culpable blemishes and stains, so that they need remission in Christ.

1. Eccl. 7:20. For there is not a just man on earth who does good and does not sin. Job 9:3. If one wished to contend with Him, one could not answer Him one time out of a thousand. v. 28. I know that You will not hold me innocent. v. 30. If I wash myself with snow water, and cleanse my hands with soap, v. 31. Yet You will plunge me into the pit, and my own clothes will abhor me. Ps. 143:2. Do not enter into judgment with Your servant, for in Your sight no one living is righteous. Ps. 130:3. If You, LORD, should mark iniquities, O Lord, who could

stand? But certainly if the works of the regenerate were free from all sin and truly perfect, why would man not be righteous in the tremendous judgment of God, before God?

2. It would not be necessary for the most holy to pray, Forgive us our sins, if they could produce works so perfect, that they lacked all stain of sin.

3. The same is evident from the confession of the saints. Isa. 64:6. But we are all like an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are like filthy rags; we all fade as a leaf, and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away. And this confession of the Church and the pious from verse 15 of ch. 63 to ch. 64 v. 8. But now, O LORD, You are our Father, is not speaking of ceremonial righteousness, as the Adversaries want. 1. Because he says, all our righteousnesses are like filthy rags. 2. Because he adds v. 7. And there is no one who calls on Your name, who stirs himself up to take hold of You.

4. Because the flesh always strives against the spirit in the most holy. Rom. 7:18. Gal. 5:17. Concupiscence dwells in all. Heb. 12:1. 1 John 1:8. From which as a man, whose shin-bone has been dislocated, cannot walk upright but lamely; so it is impossible, that the regenerate, in whom is this principle of moral dislocation, should perform all works, from the most intense love of God, and with the greatest sincerity in the end of actions through all things, and with the fervor, required by the Law of God in every mode of acting.

5. Because men would be perfect in this life, and through all things conformed to the Law, if they could perform good works, defiled by no stain of sin: which the Apostle denies of himself. Phil. 3:18.

Rom. 7:18.

For to will is present with me, but how to perform what is good I do not find. Verse 23. But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.

Hence it is clear, that Paul asserts about himself, that in his most excellent actions, there is a vicious principle striving in the opposite direction, and retarding the fervor of action, namely, indwelling concupiscence:
Hence

It is Asked, Whether the struggle between the spirit and the flesh is perpetual in all the regenerate, as often as they perform good works; or whether in some, such as the perfect and consummately regenerate, this battle is absent? The Remonstrants in their Confession ch. 11 sect. 6 say that there are some perfectly regenerate, who give effort to holiness with pleasure, joy and a certain delight, and do justice and truth from the whole heart, and from the whole soul, and from all their strength. Not that they never sin, but that they have put off vicious habits; and if they ever sin, they offend by error, subreption, and clouding of the mind, but not from indwelling sin. And in their Apology ch. 11 fol. 128 they deny that in such, the struggle of the flesh and spirit is necessarily and always present, because they have a habit of grace, through which they easily and willingly want and do actions, which before were troublesome and burdensome.

We teach that through the infused habit of grace in the regeneration of man, the acquired habit of sinning is taken away, but the natural is subdued and tamed. Titus 3:3. Ezek. 36:26, 27. Hos. 14:8.

But it is false that the habitual propensity to sin, which retards and remits the supernatural fervor of actions, and inclines the agent in the opposite direction, is taken away; 1. Because in the regenerate Paul there is another Law warring against the Law of the mind, and leading him captive to the Law of sin. Rom. 7:23. Gal. 5:17. The flesh lusts against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are opposed to one another, so that you cannot do the things that you wish. 1 Pet. 2:11. Abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul.

But that this struggle on the part of the flesh is culpable, is evident
1. Because it is prohibited by the Spirit of God, as sin. Gal. 5:16. What the flesh desires, do not do. Therefore, it is sin, what the flesh desires.

2. It is opposed to the Spirit inclining to good, and that which is consonant with the Law of God.

3. Paul exclaims, that by reason of this struggle he is captive, enslaved and sold to sin, and miserable; and seeks deliverance in Christ. Rom. 7:14, 13, 24, 25.

2. It is sin in the seed, which is the principle of all moral actions, not a clouding of the mind. Because 1 John 1:8. If we say that we have no sin, and so are not affected by an internal habit of sin, we deceive ourselves; Therefore, there is in all an internal habit of sinning, from which they are denominated sinners. Prov. 20:9. Who can say, "I have made my heart clean"? Therefore, there is in every man a heart not purified. But this cannot not be a propensity striving against and resisting the propensity of grace and the Spirit in the

regenerate man. Therefore, there is always a habitual struggle and in the first act (as fire is contrary to water) in every regenerate person: and therefore no one is free from every natural habit of sinning.

3. James 1:14. But each one is tempted when he is drawn away by his own desires and enticed. Therefore, each one sinning has an internally enticing desire; and therefore does not sin by a mere clouding of the mind.

4. If there are some so perfectly regenerate, that they are free from every habit, i.e. concupiscence, and every acquired habit of sinning; then there are some who can say, we know that good dwells in us: we do not have sin: we have purified our souls: Nor is it necessary for them to say, Forgive us our sins. But this is exceedingly sacrilegious to Divine grace.

5. Also, then there are some, for whom it is not necessary to pray, Increase, Lord, grace in us: remove the heart of stone: subdue the desires of the flesh. Because such have entirely put off every habit of sinning, both innate and acquired: And they are in that state, in which are the good Angels and Adam in the state of innocence, in whom there is no habit of sinning, no concupiscence, no propensity to sin.

6. Indeed such could say, We do not now need Christ the Savior, nor an Advocate and intercessor for us with the Father, any more than the good Angels and Adam not yet fallen; indeed, we have now put off every habit and propensity of sinning.

7. It is not necessary, that such crucify the old man and carnal affections, or subdue desires warring against the soul.

Rom. 7:14.
We know that the law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin.

It is Asked, Whether the Apostle here speaks about the unregenerate man existing under the Law; or about the regenerate man under grace? Arminius in his exposition of chapter 7 of the epistle to the Romans, in order to overturn that struggle between the spirit and the flesh in the regenerate, says that Paul speaks in the person of the unregenerate, groaning under the law. So formerly the Pelagians, as Augustine says. So Erasmus, Castellio, Socinus. We, on the contrary, say that he speaks of the truly regenerate.

1. He always continues the discourse about himself. I am carnal, I acknowledge, I want, I do not want, not I, but the flesh in me, I give thanks to God.

2. It is false and repugnant to the word of God, that the unregenerate can be said to be dead to the Law, and married to another, namely, Christ. v. 3-4.

3. Paul expressly distinguishes in v. 5 between himself, of whom he speaks, and the unregenerate; or between himself while he was unregenerate, and himself now groaning under this struggle. For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. v. 6. But now we are delivered etc. Behold! a manifest change of state and person; and he expressly says, that he is delivered from the Law, and continues the discourse about himself delivered from the Law.

3. To consent to the Law, that it is good, and to delight in it with respect to the inner man, is proper only to the regenerate. Ps. 1:2. But his delight is in the law of the LORD. But of the man under the Law, and thus cursed, and a stranger to Christ, in whom all the nations of the earth are blessed, what blessedness?

4. Only the regenerate, not the unregenerate, have the inner man. Rom. 2:29. 2 Cor. 4:16. 1 Pet. 3:4.

5. Concerning the unregenerate, as a slave of sin, it cannot be said that he wants good, does not want evil, hates sin. But in the regenerate, God works a new heart. Ezek. 36:26. To will and to do, according to His good pleasure. Phil. 2:13. Indeed, in him all affections are renewed, as can be seen throughout Psalm 119 - delight, joy, fear, hope, trust etc. But in the unregenerate, the mind is darkened. Eph. 4:18. The conscience is defiled. Titus 1:15. Indeed the will, affections, senses, eyes, hands, ears, tongue, throat, feet, and all that is in them, are defiled. Rom. 2:10-20.

6. The unregenerate does not serve the Law of God with the mind; he cannot say, what Paul here says about himself v. 17. Not I, but sin that dwells in me: because he, as much as he is, is sin and enslaved to sin.

But it is wrongly denied, that the unregenerate man under the Law, who sins against the light of conscience, does not sin wholly, because by the natural light he sees and approves better things, and follows worse things; for if this reason were valid, thus could be excused the sin against the Holy Spirit (in which the one sinning is illuminated with the greatest supernatural illumination, as much as the slave of the Devil can receive) Not I with respect

to my illuminated mind, vomit blasphemies against God, but the sin which dwells in me. And thus all the sins of the unregenerate, in which the illuminated conscience strives against the inferior appetite of sin, would be sins of weakness, but not reigning; and to be excused for that reason, by which Paul in this chapter asserts that he and all the regenerate sin more lightly.

7. To the unregenerate sin is a delight not a burden. But here he exclaims that he is captivated, i.e. dragged as if unwilling to sin; that he is miserable and wretched in this body of sin, that he wants to be delivered, and gives thanks for deliverance in Christ. But these things do not square with the unregenerate.

Matt. 3:10.
Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire.

Hence the necessity of good works is asserted, if we want to be saved. But

It is Asked, Whether good works are necessary, as the cause of justification, and thus also of salvation? The Arminians say yes. We deny it. But for a clearer determination of the question, these three things must be distinguished. 1. The right to eternal life. 2. The particular application of that right to determinate and certain persons. 3. The actual possession of eternal life.

2. A distinction must be made between a cause without which not, or a cause, as Calvin calls it, inferior; and a superior cause.

Therefore we propose our opinion in these assertions.

Assertion 1. The right to righteousness and eternal life is owed to the merits of Christ alone; not to our works. 1. Because the blood of Christ is the ransom paid for us; not our works, not our sufferings. Rom. 3:24, 4:8, 4:12. Eph. 1:7. 1 Pet. 1:18, 19. Rev. 1:5. 2. Because no meritorious power inheres in our works. Rom. 8:18, 2 Cor. 4:17.

Assertion 2. Nor are our good works previous dispositions and causes to justification, under the promise of God, qualifying us. 1. Because justification is not by works, but by mere grace, as proved elsewhere. 2. Because there is no such promise in Scripture; He who will have performed such good works, he will be justified before the Tribunal of God.

Assertion 3. The cause applying the right, or meritorious title to righteousness and eternal life, is faith alone; because faith alone apprehends the righteousness of Christ, and His merits. But Christ is our righteousness, and eternal life has been obtained by His merits and blood alone.

Assertion 4. Nothing prevents us from calling good works an inferior cause of the actual possession of eternal life. So our Calvin Institutes book 4, chapter 14, section 21. Nothing hinders the Lord from embracing works as inferior causes. But whence is this? namely, those whom by His mercy He has destined to the inheritance of eternal life, by His ordinary dispensation, He leads into its possession through good works. What precedes in the order of dispensation, He names the cause of the latter. – Finally by these locutions, a series is noted rather than a cause: because God, accumulating graces upon graces, takes occasion from the former to add the latter. Hence that saying of Bernard, Good works are the way of the kingdom, not the cause of reigning: where he excludes them only as principal causes. Therefore Bucer in the Colloquy of Regensburg in the year 1547, ch. 6, calls them, causes in some way of the eternal reward. Zanchius on the nature of God, book 2, chapter 5, and part 2 on the predestination of the Saints, question 3. They are (he says) an instrumental cause rather than an efficient cause; and a cause, which they call, without which not.

Assertion 5. Good works are understood to have causative power of eternal life in three ways. 1. Condignly meritorious; which we reject as blasphemous, against the Papists; as we have proved elsewhere. 2. That they have an inferior power and instrumental causality, conferred on them by the grace of God: as Gisbertus Voetius says in Thersites Heautontimorumenos section 1, chapter 2, as running is the cause of the apprehended crown; struggle, of victory; diet, of health. Nor is it permitted here to distinguish accurately speaking between means and cause, or between way and cause: For since good works are means, not passive, but active, means here is an inferior cause: Hence our light afflictions, which are but for a moment, are working for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; as the Holy Spirit speaks 2 Cor. 4:17. Nor can we here distinguish between causes and signs; because mere signs have no causality; nor is the dawn in any way the cause of the day; nor is smoke the cause, or inferior cause of fire. But our running through good works, actively conduces to the actual possession of eternal life: But this causality 1. Is not principal. 2. Not meritorious. 3. Not from the works themselves, but from the grace of God. And therefore they are made causes, rather than innate; not by their own power, but from the dispensation of God. From which it follows, that in this question it is not necessary to have 1. The distinction of presence and causality; or presence and efficiency; nor 2. That distinction of cause and sign: nor 3. That of means or way, and cause: nor 4. That of passive and active means; unless they are prudently explained.

3. Good works are understood to have causative power of eternal life, principal, dominative and predeterminative, flowing from our Free Will, but not from the predetermining grace of God, as the Arminians dream: and in this way they want good works to be causes of eternal life; which we judge blasphemous.

1. Because to the one running and striving, who has not received strength from the Lord of the game, the praise and glory of the prize and victory would be owed, not to the Lord, who was a mere spectator; if it is absolutely in the power of Free Will to determine itself, and there is no determination of the free will from God and His grace: and thus good works will be principal causes of eternal life, not the grace of God.

2. The glory of good works and eternal life, would not be ascribed to God, not to the Lamb slain for our sins, not to divine grace (because with all these things posited, the free will can determine itself to good works or not determine itself) but the glory would have to be deferred to Free Will alone.

3. It will be absolutely in our power, not in the power of God and His grace, conversion and perseverance and eternal life, rather than non-conversion, apostasy, and eternal damnation.

4. Because Scripture everywhere denies that we are saved by works; but affirms that it happens by the grace and mercy of God. Eph. 2:8. For by grace you have been saved through faith (and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God), v. 9. not of works, lest anyone should boast. 2 Tim. 1:9. who has saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace which was given to us in Christ Jesus. Titus 3:5. not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit. Rom. 6:23. For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God (not wages) is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.

5. Because the Covenant of Works, or the Law, and the Covenant of Grace, or the Gospel, would be confounded, if salvation were by our works. Indeed, the same is the cause of eternal salvation, which is of our justification before the Tribunal of God. Indeed we do not want good works, legally perfect, to be necessarily required for the possession of eternal life; but Evangelically good works, and pleasing and acceptable to God through Christ the Mediator, suffice.

1 John. 1:7.
And the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanses us from all sin.

From which we have, that Justification is the plenary remission of absolutely all sins. Hence
It is Asked, Whether our justification is one, complete, continuous, and thus not to be repeated act; or whether Justification is interrupted and broken off, as often as the justified sin, and they are justified anew, as often as they believe and repent? That Justification is successive, interrupted and cut off, and advanced and perfected by its degrees, the Adversaries teach. Arminius, disputation 48, thesis 12. Episcopius, disputation 22, thesis 12. But we assert that Justification is a single indivisible act, the sense of which can be renewed daily; but that it is not itself perfected by any degrees, but the whole is posited in the indivisible.

1. Because those who are justified, all their sins are washed away by the blood of Christ. 1 John 1:7. Their sins, like a cloud, are blotted out. Isa. 44:23. All are cast into the depths of the sea. Mic. 7:19. So that if the iniquity of Israel is sought, it will not be found, and none exists. Jer. 50:20. Therefore, their sins once remitted are never so imputed anew, that a new Justification is necessary.

2. Whatever remission Christ obtained on the cross, He confers such to the believer in Justification. But He obtained the plenary remission of all and each sin on the cross. Therefore, etc. The reason for the major premise. Because it is unscriptural and absurd, that Jesus Christ made satisfaction for some of the sins of believers on the cross, but the believers themselves will expiate other and other sins in Gehenna; for Christ will thus be a semi-savior and imperfect Redeemer of such men. But Christ, Heb. 9:12 obtained eternal redemption. and Col. 1:20 made peace on the cross. Therefore He removed every war and cause of discord.

3. From this opinion it follows, that the special favor of God in Christ is cut off, and the decree of Election is retracted and changed and rescinded hourly; if as often as the elect believe and repent, they must be justified, and thus predestined. Rom. 8:30. And as often as they sin, so often justification is retracted, and the decree of Election is rescinded, and in its place succeeds the decree of Reprobation. For thus there would be almost infinite circumrotations and circumvolutions of the contrary decrees of God and immanent acts of loving and hating, imputing and not imputing sins, together with the mobile and inconstant acts of our inconstant Free Will.

4. The Covenant of Grace, Jer. 31, is called eternal; and the continuation and perseverance of those in Covenant is eternal. Jer. 32:40. Isa. 54:10, 11. Isa. 59 end. Therefore, it is not cut off and interrupted: Otherwise it would follow, that true believers fall away from this Covenant; nor are all those whom God predestines, calls, and justifies, to be glorified; which however the Apostle expressly says. Rom. 8:30.

5. It follows, that no one is completely justified, and no one has all their sins cast into the depths of the sea, until one completes the course in Faith and Repentance; which conflicts with innumerable places of Scripture.

6. Either the justified falls away from justification on account of any slight sin, from weakness, or (as the Sophists say) venial, or only on account of more atrocious offenses. If the first; then a hundred times each day, justification would have to be iterated and reiterated; which Sacred Scripture never implies. If on account of slighter sins the justified does not fall away from justification, for washing away those slighter sins there will be no need of remission in the blood of Christ: Therefore, they are not sins at all; and if they are sins, the justified does not fulfill the Law of God, and is not justified by good works. If he falls away from justification only on account of more atrocious sins; those more atrocious sins are either expiated by the blood of Christ, or not. If the first, then the satisfaction of Christ, and the remission obtained by Christ, is apprehended by the believer in parts, one part after another, a third after a second, a fourth after a third. If therefore someone dies before he is re-justified after being cut off from justification; he is justified in half, and for his sins satisfaction has been made, and plainly one part of his sins has been remitted; but the other part he must pay for forever in Gehenna; and he who once truly believes, is condemned forever; which is absurd. But if they are not expiated by the blood of Christ, they are simply irremissible, such as are the sins of Devils.

But the whole difficulty of this question seems to depend on this, that sins seem to be remitted before they are committed; since the regenerate must necessarily, after individual sins, at least more atrocious ones, apprehend anew and apply to himself the remission of sins in Christ. But the difficulty is easily removed. The saints indeed daily pray for the remission of sins; but once justified they pray for the sense and renewal of remission already once apprehended and applied. Nor is it absurd, indeed it is necessary, that all the sins of the regenerate, both those already committed, and those to be committed in the future, were expiated long ago by the one sacrifice of Christ, and in the mind and intention of God already blotted out; and that the sense of that expiation already made, is apprehended and applied again and again through new acts of believing. For this must be well held, that the remission of sins by no means effects that sins are not now sins, or that the sinner is not now a sinner, as far as pertains to the Physical and real inherence of sin in the subject; but only effects that sins are not imputed, i.e. that the

moral obligation to punishment, satisfactory to divine wrath, is taken away: not otherwise than the remission indulged by an earthly King, to a Traitor and one guilty of Treason against the Majesty, from the mere grace of the Prince, does not effect that he, to whom it is indulged, ceases to be a Traitor; but only that he ceases to be a Traitor to be punished by beheading, and freed from every legal obligation, by which before the remission was indulged he was bound to undergo the capital punishment of Treason. For royal remission does not retract by any Physical action, the acts of treason, which he committed, who would have been beheaded.

Hence sins are taken away in two ways. 1. Legally and in the fiction of law (as they say) by a wholly judicial and forensic removal. And in this way sins are taken away in Justification, not that they are not, but that they are not imputed, as Augustine says. And therefore justification infers in the justified, not some Physical change; but only a moral or legal change, by which a man is absolved from the obligation to punishment: but that absolution happens all at once in the mind of God, and is all at once apprehended by the believer, as soon as he is justified; and the sense of it is renewed and reiterated daily.

2. Sins are taken away really, and Physically, as to Physical inherence in the subject; and thus they are taken away in Sanctification, in this life indeed inchoately and imperfectly, just as our Sanctification in this life is imperfect and inchoate: And therefore it expels sin by Physical action only in parts and successively; as the morning light or first dawn expels the nocturnal darkness only successively and by degrees.

Acts. 13:43.
To him all the prophets witness, that through his name whoever believes in him will receive remission of sins.

From this place it is clear that faith is the only instrument of apprehending Christ. But about the nature of faith, there are grave questions between us and the Arminians.

It is Asked, Whether they rightly teach in their Apology chapter 10, section 1, that Faith, in the matter of justification, is considered no otherwise than insofar as by its natural property it includes obedience, i.e., conversion, repentance and observance of the commandments; but not correlatively, as it apprehends the righteousness of Christ? We deny it; and maintain that faith justifies only correlatively.

1. It is evident from this cited context, and Rom. 4:6. just as David also describes the blessedness of the man to whom God imputes righteousness apart from works.

2. If Faith essentially includes Works in this action, he will be just as blessed, to whom works are imputed apart from grace. Rom. 11:6. And if by grace, then it is no longer of works; otherwise grace is no longer grace. But if it is of works, it is no longer grace; otherwise work is no longer work.

3. Because if Faith is considered here, as it includes Repentance, Faith justifies, as it is Repentance; and thus Repentance itself justifies, which is absurd.

4. Because this is mere Socinianism. Socinus in Prelections ch. 17. Faith is not the apprehension of any satisfaction, but the obedience of Christ's precepts, under the hope of future immortality. And by this reason, if to repent and amend one's life, under the confidence of obtaining eternal life, is Faith; Therefore, to obey the Law under the confidence of obtaining eternal life, through the works of the Law, will be Legal justification: And thus in the Law, in this sense men would be justified by Faith, just as also in the Gospel.

1 Tim. 1:15.
This saying is trustworthy and deserving of full acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am the foremost.

We have here three things asserted by Paul concerning faith.

1. That its object is the Word of God, as true. Whence the Gospel Word is called a certain saying in relation to the Intellect, which ought to be certain of the truth of the Gospel Word.

2. That its object is good in relation to the heart, will and affections. Whence the Gospel is called a saying worthy of all acceptance; and this is the formal and specific object of saving faith, namely, Christ not only as narrating truth, which the intellect apprehends; but as promising good, namely, the remission of sins, righteousness and eternal life.

3. He puts the inseparable effect of faith in these words, of whom I am the foremost. Whence the one truly and savingly believing applies all the Gospel promises to himself by name. Hence

It is asked: Whether Faith is not a confidence of special mercy; but such a confidence (as the Remonstrants define, Confession ch. 11, sect. 2) by which I firmly establish that it cannot happen that I shall escape eternal death, and obtain eternal life, otherwise than through Jesus Christ, and by another way than that prescribed by Him? We deny.

1. Because the object of Faith in this way is not Christ and His mercy toward all believers; but the History of the Gospel, by which I firmly believe that, not except through Christ and His way prescribed in the Gospel, I shall escape hell and obtain eternal life. In this way the Jews trusted in Moses and Joshua on account of the promised land, namely, that by no other way than that which was prescribed by Moses and Joshua, they would escape from Egypt and attain the land of promise. To believe in Christ in this way is only to believe Christ narrating that through repentance and faith men obtain eternal life: But this is Historical faith, which is in Demons and many reprobates. For they can believe and firmly establish that it cannot happen that they shall escape eternal death and obtain eternal salvation otherwise than through Jesus Christ, and by another way than that prescribed by Him. For the object of this Faith is not Christ dead for sins, and made unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; but the bare way of arriving at eternal life prescribed by Christ, i.e., the mere letter of the Gospel, and Historical narration.

2. By the way prescribed by Christ, through which we may escape eternal death and obtain eternal life, they understand (as they themselves expound there, Confession ch. 11, sect. 4) the way of true obedience, or of good works (for so they define there their obsequious confidence). Whence this faith of the Arminians and Socinians is: I confidently lean and rest upon my good works, prescribed by Christ in the Gospel, by which I certainly trust that by them and not by another way I shall arrive at eternal salvation and escape eternal death. Whence they do not have a syllable about Christ dead and satisfying for our sins, in the object of their Faith. But our Theologians validly conclude that Christ is true God, consubstantial with the Father, because Christ is the object of Faith, and our Mediator and Sponsor, who, by His death and blood, most fully satisfied God the Father for our sins. But they want Christ to be the object of faith, insofar as He historically narrates and declares to us the true way and way of arriving at eternal salvation, in which way the Apostles, in their Canonical Writings also narrating to us the true way and way of arriving at eternal salvation, are the object of Faith. Whence it is sufficiently clear that they secretly deny that Christ is God consubstantial with the Father; then they define for us saving confidence and Faith to be mere confidence in our good works, prescribed by Christ. On

the contrary, Paul in Rom. 4 contends that Abraham's Justification by faith excludes all confidence and glorying in good works.

It is certain that the Gospel of Jesus Christ, which commands good works, as inferior causes of eternal life, is the object of Faith only quo [by which], and Christ the Mediator, dead for sins, is the object quod [which]. Whence they excellently define Faith as Confidence and trust in our good works, prescribed by Christ that we may obtain eternal life: For what hope, how evanescent a consolation here? how unstable a joy? how fallacious, futile and shadowy a peace of conscience does fiducial reliance on our good works bring in the day of temptation and the extreme point of life, who does not know? The wavering consciences of repenting Papists among us testify, who cast away confidence in their works and merits in the agony of death, hold it in distaste, and flee to the satisfaction alone rendered by Christ by His precious death and blood.

3. True Faith in the Scriptures is not only a firm assent to the way of worshiping God prescribed by Christ, which is the Historical and dogmatic faith of the Papists; but besides the assent of the mind it is defined through confidence of the heart in God through the Mediator, and fiducial reliance through the casting of the sinner into the bosom of Jehovah. Whence בָּטַח אֶל־יְהוָה [to believe in the Lord], Prov. 3:5, Believe in the Lord with all your heart, Isa. 50:10, Ps. 71:6, 125:1. Thus Isa. 48:2, They relied upon the God of Israel. From סָמַךְ [to lean], he leaned, he relied. Ps. 112:8, His heart is upheld. And the unused verb in Niphal to lean, to rest upon, which occurs Isa. 31:1, 2 Sam. 1:6, Saul was leaning on his spear, is also used here. Isa. 10:20, And those who have escaped of the house of Jacob will lean on the LORD, the Holy One of Israel. Whence also מִשְׁעֶנֶת [staff, support], 2 Sam. 22:19, Isa. 3:1, the staff of bread. Thus we lean on God in Christ, as a weary traveler on a staff or walking stick. Thus the Hebrews also express to trust by a verb which signifies to roll oneself upon God. Ps. 22:8, גֹּל אֶל־יְהוָה (properly, to roll to) the LORD. Thus Isa. 34:4, And the host of heaven will be rolled up like a scroll. Gen. 29:10, Jacob rolled the stone from the well's mouth. Ps. 37:5, Roll your way upon the LORD. Whence, he who believes rolls and turns himself and his burdens upon God; which is far more than to assent to God speaking truth. Thus ἔρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν Χριστόν [to come to Christ], John 6:37, Matt. 11:28-29, is to believe, John 6:46. Thus πιστεύειν εἰς or ἐπὶ τὸν [to believe in or upon], Rom. 10:11, John 14:1. Thus τὸν Χριστὸν λαμβάνειν [to receive Christ], John 1:12.

4. Faith and reliance on God is opposed to confidence in horses, chariots, flesh, and the arm of men, Isa. 31:1, Jer. 17:5. But to trust and rely on a horse is not to believe a horse speaking truth; but to rely and rest on the strength and speed of the horse with affection and confidence. Faith, therefore, is essentially confidence in the heart.

5. Fear is opposed to Faith. Matt. 8:26, Why are you afraid, O you of little faith? But fear is not in the mind, but in the heart and affections. But since contraries are in the same subject, it follows that faith also is not a bare assent in the mind, but confidence in the heart.

6. The object of justifying faith is the mercy of God in Christ, by which He justifies the ungodly. Rom. 4:5. But the object of such confidence of the Remonstrants, by which we establish that we shall be saved by no other way than that which is prescribed by Christ in the Gospel, is no more the mercy toward the elect and believers, than the Omnipotence, Veracity and justice of God, when we believe that eight souls were saved in the Ark of Noah, or that God was able to kill a thousand Philistines with the jawbone of an ass.

7. This faith of the Remonstrants is mere Socinianism. For Smalcius, the Socinian, in his Book on the divinity of Christ, ch. 14, defines faith, not only assent, but also confidence, by which we place hope and confidence in Christ, depend wholly on Him, with the firm hope of obtaining those things which He promised to those obeying Him, i.e., if we have corrected our life according to His prescription, etc.

It is asked: Whether the Word of God is the one and only instrument, both preparatory and consummatory of Faith to be engendered, so that the Remonstrants say truly in the Acts of the Synod of Dort, articles 3-4, pp. 62 and 128, that no immediate action of the Holy Spirit is required on the mind and will to produce faith; but the objective, moral, persuasive action of the Word alone suffices?

We acknowledge that faith is from hearing; but nevertheless we also at the same time believe that the Holy Spirit has certain immediate actions on the mind and will, and those not moral, but real and Physical, by which He creates in us by infusing supernatural power and habit.

1. Because by moral allurement alone, God does not draw men to Himself, nor are supernatural powers of believing infused merely by persuading: as an Orator by declaiming cannot restore to the lame the power of walking, to the blind the whole faculty of sight, raise the dead.

2. If the word is the one and only consummatory instrument of Faith, no nobler actions are required than those which can be accomplished by a Pastor; which is absurd.

3. Because God alone effects by efficacious grace to will and to work: But if there is no more eminent action here than the moral operation of the Word, God by His grace so

effects to will and to work, that it remains in the power of free will finally to will to resist God working, and pertinaciously to be unwilling.

4. The action of God of engendering faith is an act of omnipotence such as that by which God raised Christ from the dead. Eph. 1:19-20. And not inferior to the act of creating. 2 Cor. 4:6. And therefore irresistible. But if the whole matter is accomplished by the action of the Word only morally, and that both preparatory and consummatory, there will be no action of omnipotence here.

5. Nor do we here acknowledge anything Enthusiastic, although here is an action of omnipotence, to which the causation of moral Word cannot reach; Because: 1. Enthusiasm is when inspiration is expected apart from all action of the Word of God. Here we teach that the moral action of the Word is necessary; although we require a more eminent one, namely, real and Physical. 2. Enthusiasm is when something is expected to be done which is beside or against the Word of God. But we expect the same infusion of the spirit of regeneration, and conferral of a new heart, which God promised to us in the Gospel Covenant; but not another.

Chapter 13. On the Perseverance of the Saints.

John. 10:28.
I give them eternal life, and they shall never perish; no one will snatch them out of my hand. v. 29. My Father, who has given them to me, is greater than all.

From this context it is evident that Christ is arguing for the indeclinable and certain Perseverance of the Saints, by an argument taken from the omnipotence of His Father. He who is greater than all and more powerful cannot be despoiled of His sheep, and it is necessary that He be greater and stronger than all who attempt to snatch His sheep from His hands. But no one is greater than my Father, who gave the sheep to me, no one more powerful.

Today there are four more celebrated opinions about the Perseverance of the Saints.

The first is that of the more recent Jesuits, asserting that the elect and those congruously called according to the absolute decree of Election can never fall away totally and finally; yet many truly regenerate and justified can fall away finally and totally from grace.

The second Opinion is that of certain Pseudo-Lutherans, denying the final Apostasy of the Saints, but admitting a total one; that is, propounding a plenary intermission, impugning a final excision.

The third is that of the Papists and Arminians, whom we again divide into three classes.

1. The Papists commonly defend the Apostasy of the Saints, with their doctrine of the uncertainty of salvation.

2. Arminius himself and the Hague Collocutors, p. 401, say that they do not call into doubt the head of doctrine concerning the perseverance of the Saints, but only ask to be more fully instructed: yet they deny that the arguments of the Adversaries strongly conclude that the regenerate cannot fall from grace.

3. The disciples of James Arminius, the Remonstrants in the Synod of Dort; Corvinus against Molinaeus; Tilenus in his Animadversions on the Canons of the Synod of Dort, Peter Bertius on the Apostasy of the Saints, teach that the truly regenerate and justified can fall away finally and totally. And that: 1. That they may avoid the Stoicism of fatal (as they calumniate) and absolute Election. 2. That they may free God from the causality of sin (as it seemed to them). 3. That they may elevate human liberty, the proud Mistress, and independent artificer of Election and Reprobation, Salvation and Damnation, to the throne of God, grace having been trampled under foot.

The fourth and true Opinion is that the truly regenerate and justified can fall away from the state of grace neither finally nor totally, nor defect from God, or perish forever.

But first certain calumnies of the Adversaries are to be wiped away, before we fix the State of the Question.

1. Bellarmine, Suarez, Gregory of Valencia, all shame having been shaken off, impute the heresy of Jovinian and the Beghards to Wycliffe, Calvin, Luther, namely, that some are rendered truly impeccable by the grace of God; which we deny; And we teach that the truly regenerate can fall into horrible and grave sins, and oftentimes incur damnable guilt. Indeed this very calumny touches them (not us), who propound the article concerning the possibility of fulfilling the Law by the grace of God.

2. The Arminians calumniate that we teach that the truly faithful, whatever they sin, are nevertheless obliged to believe with absolute persuasion that they are certain of their final perseverance. We teach the certainty of persuasion concerning the final Perseverance of any faithful person; but we do not teach it to be so absolute, and free from all condition of pious solicitude: Indeed we want the certainty here to be not so absolute, by which one believes that he will persevere, whether he fears or not; but hypothetical, which is conjoined with the assiduous exercises of holy fear, sedulous faith, and efficacious charity.

3. They impute to us the impossibility of the Apostasy of the Saints, such as is the impossibility of the mutation of God, and of the divine decrees. But we here teach the impossibility of Apostasy hypothetical from the hypothesis of the decree of Election and true Regeneration; and limited and secundum quid [in a certain respect], extrinsic and modal, not intrinsic and pure: indeed as to us, account being had of our lability, the grace of God being set aside, we can defect and perish.

4. They invidiously feign for us inevitable Perseverance; as if it were necessary that we persevere, even though we be unwilling and resisting, pressed and drawn by so fatal a fortitude and power of God, according to the immutable decree of God; and therefore

however carnally secure we be, that we shall nevertheless persevere, by whatever force and whatever injury. We plainly reject that.

Indeed we teach:

1. That the baptized can utterly fall away.

2. Indeed we think a distinction is to be made between the essence of the special grace of the Elect, and many things which are in it, or accompany it: which we reduce to these six. 1. Habits. 2. Acts. 3. The ease of working, facilitating the worker in his actions. 4. The sense of grace. 5. Solid certainty concerning one's state. 6. The peace and joy of conscience. Thence we teach:

1. That the habit of grace can be remitted and diminished, by more grave sins.
2. That gracious acts can be intermitted.
3. That the sweet facility of working piously can be lost.
4. That the sense of special favor and mercy can be lost, and all but perish.
5. That solid and firm certainty concerning one's final Perseverance can be dashed and enervated.
6. That the consolation and peace of conscience, together with pious security and ἀπονία [freedom from pain], can languish and wither for a time, we teach.

The Question, therefore, is: 1. Not concerning infants, but adults. 2. Not concerning those who are temporary, whom they call πρόσκαιροι [temporary], but concerning the truly regenerate and justified. Nor 3. Is it asked, whether it is absolutely impossible that the faithful should fall away? for if they are considered by reason of their innate corruption, they can finally fall away.

Hence it is Asked: Whether 1. Adults, 2. Truly regenerate and justified, 3. Not by reason of their infirmity and corruption, but 4. The intercession of Christ, the vital principle of Faith, the immutable Covenant of God, Election, custody and power of God notwithstanding, can so fall away, that not only by reason of the event they sin grievously; But 1. They lose all right to the kingdom of God, which they once had in Christ. 2. They fall from the favor and gratuitous grace of Election. 3. They are totally and finally removed and depart from the state of the sons of God? The Papists, Jesuits, Pseudo-Lutherans, Arminians, Socinians affirm. We deny.

The first Argument is from the Immutability of God. If Rom. 8:30, whom God foreknew, He also predestined; whom He predestined, He also called; whom He calls, He justifies; whom He justifies, He glorifies: If Rom. 11:29 the χαρίσματα [gifts] and calling of God are without

repentance: If Rom. 11:7, Israel has not obtained, but the elect have obtained: If John 13:1, those whom Christ loves, He loves to the end: If the purpose of God according to Election stands firm, Rom. 9:11, If the foundation of God stands sure, having this seal, The Lord knows those who are His, 2 Tim. 2:19, If it is impossible for the elect to be deceived, Matt. 24:24, Then the truly believing and justified cannot totally and finally fall from grace. But the former is true. Therefore the latter.

Argument 2 is from the Veracity of God. What God, who cannot lie, has promised in His word, He most certainly and infallibly performs. But God, who cannot lie, has promised in the Word to the faithful ingrafted into Christ total and final perseverance. Therefore, God will bring it about that they most certainly and infallibly persevere. The Major is not denied by the Adversaries, except that they take refuge in the conditional promise of Perseverance, If (they say) the faithful themselves do not fail, if they pray, if they use the grace which God supplies to them carefully and with the fear of the Lord. But indeed the grace by which they do not fail, nor want to fail, the grace by which they pray and fear God, is also part of the Perseverance promised by God. Jer. 31:40, Zech. 12:10. It is not, therefore, a condition of Perseverance: For thus God would promise that the Saints would infallibly persevere, if they were going to persevere. The Minor is evident from Jer. 32:38, 40, Isa. 54:10, Matt. 16:18. Thus Augustine, On the Gift of Perseverance, ch. 2.

Arg. 3. From the perpetuity and Stability of the covenant of grace. Because the permanence of the faithful in the state of grace is more stable than the natural Covenant of God with the revolutions of the Sun and Moon, and the most firm law with day and night, Jer. 31:35-37, than the mountains and hills, which cannot be removed from their place, Isa. 54:10, than the Covenant with Noah, that the world would not again be overwhelmed by waters, which God swore would never be. Ibid. And as ratified and certain as that which God bound Himself to do not only by promise, but also by the sacrament of an oath interposed. Heb. 6:17-18, Ps. 89:30-35, etc.

Arg. 4. From the custody and protection of God. Those who are kept by the power and protection of God to eternal life cannot finally and totally fall from grace. But all the truly regenerate are thus kept. 1 Pet. 1:5, 1 Cor. 1:8, 10, Phil. 1:6, 1 Thess. 3:3.

Arg. 5. From the omnipotence of God. If he who would snatch the sheep of Christ from the hand of God the Father and Christ must be greater than the Father and stronger, John 10:28-29, And if such a one is greater and stronger than any creature, Rom. 8:35, 37-39, If God is able to keep His own, Jude v. 24, And if God employs His omnipotence to present the faithful holy and blameless before the presence of His glory; Then the regenerate cannot fall from the state of grace. But the former is true, as proven from the cited places.

Arg. 6. From the intercession of Christ. If Christ lives for His own, and acts as Advocate for them, when they sin. 1 John 2:1, and intercedes for them. Heb. 9:24-26, If He prays for all, not only the Apostles, but those who will believe in Him to the end of the world. John 17:20-24, that they may persevere and be kept to the end, and obtain eternal life. And that their faith may not fail. Luke 22:32. Then the truly regenerate cannot fail to persevere to the end. For the Father always hears the Son praying. John 18:42, John 6:37-38.

Arg. 7. From the nature of divine grace, not simply habitual, but habitual and actual alike. Those who are born of incorruptible seed; who cannot make a practice of sinning, nor sin (unto death, and with all the effort and powers of the will), because the seed of God remains in them; in whom is the fountain of water springing up into everlasting life; and who are planted by the rivers of waters, so that they cannot wither; they cannot finally and totally fall from grace. But such are all the regenerate. 1 Pet. 1:23, 1 John 3:9, Ps. 1:3, John 4:14 and 7:38, Matt. 7:24, Luke 8:15.

Arg. 8. From the Covenant between God the Father and Christ. Because the ends of the earth are promised to Christ by God the Father, Ps. 2:7-8. And seed and children given by God, if He lays down His life for His own. Isa. 53:10. And a willing people. Ps. 110:3. And Dominion from sea to sea. Ps. 72:8.

But if the Saints can fall away, these promises will be void, nor will God the Father keep this Covenant with His Son, which is blasphemous.

Arg. 9. From the sealing of the Spirit. Those who are sealed unto the day of redemption. 2 Cor. 1:21, Eph. 1:23 and 4:30. Who have received the first fruits of the Spirit and the earnest, and are already saved in hope, and already sit with Christ at the right hand of the Father; They cannot utterly fall away. But the faithful are such. The Reason of the Major. Because hope does not make ashamed, does not deceive, Rom. 5:5. Nor is the seal of the Holy Spirit fallacious, nor does it seal an uncertain thing. For what consolation? what peace? what joy would arise from it? if hope were fallacious and made those hoping ashamed. Rom. 14:17. The Minor is evident. Rom. 8:23-37. Nor is there need of a seal in the heart to confirm general truths in the N.T. as he who believes will be saved: For they are sufficiently confirmed to all by the testimony of God and the Word. And the Devils, and many hypocrites do not deny them and the faithful more rarely and less doubt concerning them. And this seal does not seal to Peter that his salvation is sure, if he freely perseveres, any more than to Judas the betrayer.

Arg. 10. From the dominion and victory of the Saints. Those who are so dead to sin, that it no longer has dominion over them, that they cannot make a practice of sinning; who through faith so obtain victory, that they cannot be conquered; They cannot fall away. But

sin no longer has dominion over the regenerate. Rom. 6:8-9, they cannot make a practice of sinning. 1 John 3:9 and 5:4. Because they are born of God, they overcome the world. 1 John 5:18, they keep themselves, so that the evil one does not touch them. 1 John 5:18, Rev. 20:6, Rom. 8:35-37.

Arg. 11. From the difference of the temporary and the truly believing. If some therefore fall away from the Faith, which they professed for a time, because they were never truly faithful; then the truly faithful cannot fall away. But the former is true. Therefore, the latter. The reason of the major. Because to have true and saving faith is the adequate cause why some persevere, and one therefore falls away, because he is destitute of this faith. As if life is the cause of motion and senses, and one therefore neither moves nor senses, because he does not live; Therefore, those having life can necessarily move and sense. The minor is proven. 1 John 2:19, They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us. Thus Luke 8:18, John 2:23-24, Matt. 13:21, John 17:9, Isa. 40:24, 30-31.

Arg. 12. From the relation between the faithful and Christ. Because if the faithful can finally and totally fall away from faith, Christ would not certainly be the head of the Church, as He could lack Members; not the Bridegroom, who would have no Bride, not the King, who would have no subjects; not the Savior and Redeemer, who would have none Saved and Redeemed; not the God of the eternal Covenant, who would have none in Covenant with Him; not made Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, Redemption by God; indeed, there could be none capable of His Righteousness, Wisdom, Sanctification, and Redemption, since all would be Apostates. Faith would fail concerning the Catholic Church; the praises and victory of the Lamb could fail; and the Devil would be the victor; Christ, the vanquished. For it is vain, what the Arminians retort, that Christ is King in this, that He has right and dominion over all mortals, even though there should actually be no one who would acknowledge Him as King: Because He rules in the midst of His enemies, Ps. 110:2. Because Christ is King in the actual preservation of His subjects to eternal life; and head in the actual inflowing into His Members; and Bridegroom in that eternal Marriage contracted with the Bride in this life, and to be celebrated in the heavens forever; as is expressly taught in innumerable places of Scripture; but especially Ps. 45 and 110, Col. 1, Jer. 31, and throughout the Song of Solomon.

Arg. 13. From the invincible dominion of divine grace. For if from Free Will, indifferent to persevering or not persevering, and all actions of grace whatsoever being posited, all could finally fall away; then Christ would be a weak King, who could not preserve His own, His kingdom to be ended, not eternal, contrary to what is asserted. Dan. 2:44, Luke 1:33, Ps. 145:13, Isa. 9:7, Mic. 4:7, Rev. 11:15.

Arg. 14. From the prayers of the Saints. We cannot in faith and certain confidence pray for the perseverance of the Saints; contrary to John 14:13-14. Nor pray that God's name be hallowed; God's kingdom come; God's will be done; that we be not led into temptation; because it is not in God's power to satisfy these prayers, if it is in the power of Free Will to defect totally and finally from God.

15. From the confidence of the Saints, and from the thanks which the persevering owe to God. For I cannot believe and hope that I will be saved by God's grace, nor would it be lawful to give thanks to God for Perseverance, if it is in the power of man's will to finally fall away from God.

16. From the hope, joy of the Holy Spirit and consolation. These would totter, if the Perseverance of the Saints were not infallible and necessary; because the hope, consolation and joy under the hope of glory, which the Remonstrants supply to the believing elect, according to the doctrine of the Apostasy of the Saints no more belong to them, than to the reprobate and hypocrites; namely, because I am a man outwardly called, from this there is to me firm consolation that I will be glorified, if through Free Will I will not be wanting to the grace of God and His protection. But the most bitter Apostate, before he falls away, can seize this joy and this consolation, with equal right with the faithful; and afterwards if he repents, he will fail again.

17. From the end of Creation. Because He would have created all the sons of men in vain, contrary to that Ps. 87:47. Nor would God have formed His elect people for Himself and for His glory, contrary to Isa. 43:21, My people whom I formed for myself, they will declare my praise. The doctrine of the gracious and supernatural providence of God concerning His own would also collapse, contrary to that Isa. 46:3, Listen to me, you descendants of Jacob, all the remnant of the people of Israel, you whom I have upheld since your birth, and have carried since you were born. Even to your old age and gray hairs I am he, I am he who will sustain you. I have made you and I will carry you; I will sustain you and I will rescue you.

18. From the doctrine of Faith. All the articles of faith would be utterly overturned, if the truly elect and regenerate could perish forever. For the doctrine of the conception and incarnation of Christ to save His own would be null and void: The article of the death of Christ and its efficacy, of the resurrection, of the triumph of Christ over death, the Devil and hell, would be vain, if these enemies could triumph over all the truly believing and elect forever. Why the doctrine of the descent of Christ into hell, and the suffering of infernal torments, which it would have been fitting for us to suffer in the order of justice? Why the doctrine of the ascension of Christ into heaven to make a new way for us through the veil of His flesh, of His advocacy and intercession at the right hand of God the Father;

of the preparation of heavenly mansions? if indeed it could happen that no one of mortals would ascend into heaven. The doctrine of the sending of the Holy Spirit, who would lead us into all truth, and of the remaining and indwelling of Christ with us, to the consummation of the age, would also be vain, if indeed it could happen that the Holy Spirit would forsake His own. The doctrine of the Catholic Church of Christ would also be null and void, if it could happen that it would become the Synagogue of Satan: All its privileges would be void, namely, that it is one by the unity of Faith and Spirit, that it is holy, that it is Catholic, that it is the Sister and Bride of the glorious Brother and Husband Christ, if it could happen that there would be no such assembly in the world. What would be the communion of the Saints? what the mutual love of the members of Christ among themselves? what gratuitous Justification and Remission of sins? what the glorious resurrection of the just? if it could happen that all the truly regenerate would utterly fall from grace, and perish forever. What finally the hope of eternal life, and of the glorious marriage to be celebrated forever between the Lamb and His Bride, if it could happen that all mortals would become inhabitants of Gehenna and black Apostates? For all these goods, comprehended in the Apostolic Symbol, would be only offered, either never conferred, or utterly taken away.

19. This doctrine fights diametrically with the Law and Gospel. For the regenerate performing good works in their whole life; in the extreme hour of death according to it they can fall from the crown: and it can happen that through the Gospel and faith in Christ, no less than through the Law and legal Justice, there is no eternal salvation; if indeed the regenerate and truly believing can fall away from saving faith and the grace of Christ.

20. Finally, the glory of God to be declared by the glorified, the glory of Redemption, our salvation, and all things by which the saints are distinguished from hypocrites, would depend on mere contingency, or fortune, not on the determining Dominion of gracious Providence: Nor would God have a determined number of elect and reprobate, because this number depending entirely on the free will of those persevering or falling away would be plainly uncertain. For if future contingencies cannot be known by God, God does not know who will persevere, who will not. And thus the Perseverance or Apostasy of the Saints escapes and passes by all the knowledge of God and all the acts of Providence.

Matt. 13:20.
But he who receives the seed in stony places, is he who hears the Word, and immediately receives it with joy. v. 21. But he has no root in himself, but is temporary, etc.

Hence it is Asked: Whether temporary and πρόσκαιρος [temporary] Faith, is essentially saving Faith, not differing in species and nature, but only by accident, namely, in duration from the saving faith of those who receive the Word in good soil: just as seed growing in stony ground and in good soil, are crops of the same species? The Remonstrants in Synodical Writings, pp. 129-130, so teach, because Luke ch. 8 says concerning them, 1. For a time they believe. 2. They receive the word with joy, which is an indication of a teachable and upright mind. We deny that it is truly saving faith, indeed we contend that it differs in nature and species from saving faith.

1. Because the specific difference of faith is taken from the formal object of faith. But the object of temporary faith is not Christ, as Christ, and the promises of the Gospel, as such (because that object endures in time of persecution, but the object here fails, persecution having arisen) but something of the Gospel and something of Christ; namely, external prosperity; or the Gospel, insofar as it is clothed with earthly prosperity: Therefore with the prosperous success of the Gospel ceasing, faith fails; as with the cause being removed, the effect is removed.

Objection: But there is no reason of truth in external prosperity; Therefore, this object is not formal, because it does not pertain to the object of the Intellect.

Resp. External prosperity is the motive, not the formal reason; nor do they believe the Gospel, as it is a supernatural good. But the object of temporary faith is the truth of the Gospel promises, as pleasant, or as good in the genus of the pleasant good and the useful good having promises of the present and future life; not of the honest good, or in the genus of honest goods:

So that the object of temporary faith is as it were a Physical good naturally moving and thoroughly moving the appetite: And the object of Saving Faith is a moral and morally honest good.

2. Because in the definition of an accident and adjunct of something by addition, the subject, or rather the σχέσις [relation] and habitude between the subject and the accident

is taken in the definition; as man in the definition of risibility; nose in the definition of snub; horse in the definition of neighing: And the σχέσις of man to risibility essentially distinguishes risibility from all other qualities of that genus. Because therefore the subject of saving faith is an honest and good heart, καρδία καλὴ καὶ ἀγαθὴ [a good and honest heart], Luke 8:15, But the subject of temporary Faith is a stony and hard heart, and stony and made of stone, which is proper to unregenerate man. Ezek. 36:26 and Ezek. 11:19, and of a man ῥίζαν οὐκ ἔχοντος [not having a root], i.e., not rooted and established in Christ through true faith. Col. 2:7, ἐν Χριστῷ κεχαρριζωμένον [rooted in Christ], not ingrafted into Him nor planted in Christ, as in moist soil. Therefore this temporary Faith differs in species from that which is in those who are rooted in Christ, and have an honest and good heart. And just as an honest and good man and rooted in Christ differs in theological species and essence (according to moral being, so to speak) from a dishonest and wicked man, who is not rooted in Christ, and is destitute of the vital sap of saving grace (as stony and rocky soil is destitute of all sap), so the faith of the latter differs from the faith of the former in species, and not only in duration, or in firmer or less firm rooting in the subject, as less and more white differ.

3. Therefore and for this reason alone the temporary fail, Matt. 13:6, Διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν ἐξηράνθη [Because they had no root they withered away]: Because they do not have a root, therefore they wither: And Mark 4:7, Διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἰκμάδα [Because they had no moisture], Because they did not have moisture, that is, because they lacked the Spirit of sanctifying grace, who alone makes men fruitful by nature dry. And this is a sign that dry and stony men and those with a stony heart cannot fail to wither and fail when the Sun of Persecution arises. But that men having true faith necessarily fail in time of persecution, is neither true, nor do the Arminians dare to assert it.

4. Saving faith necessarily produces good fruits from a vital and supernatural principle, as do all the truly faithful. Ps. 1:5, Matt. 7:7, Jer. 2:17, 20, John 15:5, He who abides in me, and I in him, he bears much fruit. Faith, therefore, which is temporary, which does not produce fruits (which every temporary one does, whose faith is a seed never growing into an ear) is a dead faith, and is no more truly and essentially faith, than the faith of Demons, James 2:19, or than an inanimate corpse is living. Nor is there anything to be answered that the temporary is alive; for this is to beg the question.

5. The scope of this Parable is (because many frequently ran together to hear Christ Himself, who nevertheless afterwards withdrew and fell away from Him) to show who are the good and honest hearers, who the temporary and by no means sincere, and have only a faith glorious before the world, not true and saving.

6. If therefore temporary faith is true faith, because in the text it is called faith; then those have true faith, to whom Christ was unwilling to commit Himself, John 2:24. Or if therefore it is true and saving faith, because the temporary grow for a time; by equal reason, those who serve riches and pleasures, and therefore cannot serve Christ the other Lord, in whom the seed of the Word is choked by the cares of riches and pleasures, would have true and saving faith; because Luke 8:7, Καὶ συμφυεῖσαι αἱ ἄκανθαι ἀπέπνιξαν αὐτό [And the thorns sprang up with it and choked it]. But those who are enslaved to Mammon cannot believe savingly, even the Adversaries confessing. But if therefore they are said to believe savingly, 1. Because they assent to the Gospel. 2. They hear the Word with joy. 3. They profess faith: Then Herod who heard John, Mark 6:20, ἡδέως [gladly] and with pleasure, and Simon Magus who πιστεύων [believing] believed, Acts 8:13, would have saving Faith. For assent, joy and profession were not lacking to them; yet essentially required was lacking, namely, an honest and good heart and vital sap. Finally, what the Adversaries lightly say, that it is not denied that they have a root; but only that they do not have a root in themselves; because the root ought to be in that alone which has the root: otherwise the temporary have from themselves the principle from which flows their vain and fallacious faith, namely, a stony heart. Nor is to grow in this Parable anything other than to spring up before the world, as seed with fallacious hope of harvest, and to promise an empty hope of harvest, where nevertheless there is no true root; although the word to grow when it is attributed to seed sown in good soil, is the same as to vegetate from a true root: nor is it absurd for the same word to signify in different ways, when it is applied to different subjects.

It is asked: Whether temporary faith is hypocritical, and therefore the temporary cannot be said to fall away, when they abdicate temporary faith, because no one falls away from Christ, because he deserts hypocrisy? The Remonstrants affirm. We deny.

1. Because hypocritical faith is taken in two ways.
1. That faith which puts on the appearance of true and saving faith; yet is not true and saving faith; as that which puts on the appearance of metal entirely, but is colored wood. And in this way temporary faith is rightly called hypocritical, because it is saving faith apparently only, not truly; κατ' ἔμφασιν [in appearance], not in fact.

2. Hypocritical faith is said to be that which is opposed to false and plainly fictitious faith and which has nothing at all of faith. In this sense temporary faith is not hypocritical, but is true in its degree, although not saving: as brass referring to gold by a golden color is not hypocritical metal; for it is true metal; yet hypocritical gold. Thus a painted man is not a purely fictitious being, nor something figuratively fictitious and false; but is truly a being and truly something figured, yet not truly a man. For common essential attributes in the same category can be said of many, and more special ones denied; as this is substance, is

essentially body, yet not living, not animate. Thus temporary faith in the genus of saving faith, is hypocritical and only apparently faith; but indeed is not fictitious and hypocritical as to all degrees. And temporary faith is rightly said to be a degree to the thing, or the material beginning; not a degree in the thing, or in species, or the formal beginning of justifying faith; as yellowness is a degree to the thing with respect to whiteness, having something of the essence of color; yet it is not essentially whiteness, but is distinct from it in Species; and therefore is only a degree to the species: But indeed white as two, is a degree to whiteness as four or five, and indeed a degree in the thing and a formal beginning, and differs from whiteness as four, in degree not in species and nature. Thus an embryo is a degree to the thing with respect to a living and animate man, and yet is distinguished in species from man; but an infant animate in the womb and actuated by a rational soul is a degree to a man of perfect adult stature, and indeed a degree in the thing, distinguished from an adult man by degree, not by species and nature. Therefore, just as in order for an embryo to become an animate man, it is necessary that it cast off the essential form of an embryo; yet not the whole essence, because it retains the seminal mass; so in order for temporary faith to become saving and justifying, it is necessary that it put off the specific form of temporary faith, yet it is not necessary that it put off all that which is of the essence of faith; because assent given to all the Word of God ought to remain. Therefore it is necessary that the temporary cast off that which is fictitious and false in temporary faith, if he wishes to desert hypocrisy, and he who does this to that extent does not fall away from Christ, if only he retains that which is material in temporary faith, namely, to assent to the Word of God as true; but he who abdicates these, to that extent falls away from Christ.

Heb. 6:4.

For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, v. 5. And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, v. 6. If they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance.

From this place the Adversaries endeavor to prove that the truly regenerate and justified can totally and finally fall from grace. Synodical Writings, article 5, p. 237.

We deny that such, of whom the Apostle speaks, were truly regenerated.

1. Because this place, as our men rightly note after Athanasius, is to be understood of the sin against the Holy Spirit; this is not a simple sin, but παραπίπτειν [to fall away] is to fall by total apostasy: which sin cannot fall on the truly elect and justified, innumerable places of Scripture prove, as seen above; which Pareus notes, commentary ibid.

2. Because such, of whom he here speaks, did not have ears prepared, and senses to the discretion of good and evil, nor were they capable of solid food; indeed such were they to whom alphabetical instruction was necessary in the first elements of Christianity, as is to be seen, ch. 5:12-14. But indeed the Apostle says concerning the elect and truly believing, to whom he writes, v. 9 and 10 of this chapter, that he is persuaded of better things and things accompanying salvation, of their laborious charity, by which they ministered to the saints.

3. Because the whole argument is from both affirming in the second figure.

The regenerate were enlightened, have tasted of the heavenly gift, were made partakers of the Holy Spirit.

But these justified and regenerated to whom the Apostle writes, are enlightened, have tasted of the heavenly gift, etc.
Therefore, etc.

Otherwise the major proposition converted is openly false, and that which is in question.

4. Because since the Apostle does not here deal with the more crass hypocrites, but with professors a little more enlightened; it is not rare that those who were never regenerated taste the sweetness of the word and the happiness of the future age with the edges of the lips. For to taste in the word is opposed to the internal thing and impression rooted in the heart, affections and powers of the soul: Whence to taste death, Matt. 16:28. And Christ is said to have tasted death, and yet we know that He was not plainly subjected to the power of death. And 1 Pet. 2:3 signifies the initial perception of grace, which precedes the first birth and begetting of an infant. To taste death is attributed to believers, of whom it is denied that they shall die. John 11:26. Therefore, to taste the powers of the world to come, does not necessarily so sound, to be made a partaker of eternal life, as those who have the first fruits; but as those who are not partakers. But although the material object of this tasting is the good word of God and the powers of the world to come; yet it is not the formal object: for to love a wife as a harlot, with meretricious love, and to love her as a wife, with conjugal love, differ much: In the same way a heavenly and spiritual thing often affects Herod or the temporary with joy, as a pleasant good, and the truly believing, as an

honest good; but not under the same formal reason. For just as the spiritual man has spiritual joy in God concerning temporal goods; so the unregenerate man can conceive natural joy concerning a supernatural object. For the affections and motions of the will and heart do not take their specification from the material object.

5. Partaking of the Holy Spirit is the communication of the common gifts of the Holy Spirit in the Sacraments and Evangelical promises. But although these excellent gifts are attributed to these temporary ones, there is nevertheless deep silence concerning the remission of sins, concerning justification, concerning the sealing of the Spirit, concerning the first fruits of the future life, concerning gratuitous election to salvation; which essentially distinguish the believer from the unbeliever.

6. The impossibility of renewal can be attributed to no truly elect and believing according to the dogmas of the Adversaries, who maintain that universal and sufficient grace is at hand for all in this life. For what they dream here ἀδύνατον [impossible] for difficult, so that sufficient grace is at hand for such, makes a light commination denounced on a sin by far most atrocious; for such is the punishment of a lighter sin.

7. To crucify the Son of God afresh does not signify more that the Son of God was once crucified for them, than those unworthily communicating and partaking of the Lord's Supper, who are said to be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, to be such for whom the body of the Lord is said to be broken and the blood shed on the cross; as Ames observes in his Anti-Synodalia. But here the Apostle alludes to the perverse Jews; who crucified Christ anew, as their fathers once crucified Him under Pontius Pilate; because they gave assent to His ignominious death by malicious opposition to the Gospel and persecution of all believing in Christ.

8. That sanctification which is attributed to them is 1. Sacramental. 2. Internal indeed, but common. 3. External by profession of the Gospel.

9. It is false that the truly regenerate are called, v. 8, earth accursed and near to cursing, whose end tends to burning, because it bears thorns and thistles; since all who are in Christ by faith, in whom all the nations of the earth are blessed, are blessed with Abraham. Gal. 3:14.

10. The Adversaries here especially intend that this commination is vain to the elect, if Apostasy is impossible for them; which nevertheless is a slippery and weak basis of the argument: because the flight of Joseph and Mary into Egypt with Christ still an infant, lest the child be killed by Herod, is not vain; although the killing of Christ in infancy was equally impossible from the absolute decree of God as the apostasy of the elect.

2 Pet. 2:20.

For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning.

Whence it is Asked: Whether these were truly regenerated? The Remonstrants affirm. We deny.

1. Because, as Pareus observes, Commentary ibid., only historical knowledge is always attributed to them. 1. They escaped the defilements of the world through the knowledge of the true doctrine and the rejection of errors. v. 20, in the knowledge of the Lord they escaped. And v. 21, it would have been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness.

2. Because Judas, Herod, Ahab for a time escaped many defilements of the world; but the Devil returned with seven worse spirits. There is here no fiducial reliance on Christ, nothing of Justification, Redemption, Adoption, and their eternal Election in Christ is in the text.

3. Although they are said ὄντως [really] to have escaped, yet as Beza and Ames observe, ὄντως is not in the Codices Regius, Complutensis, Plantinianus. Erasmus and Vatablus read ὀλίγως [scarcely]: other codices ὀλίγον [a little].

4. The whole series of the context cries the contrary. For Peter calls such, who escaped these defilements of the world, ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους [unstable souls], swine v. 12, ζῶα ἄλογα [irrational animals] v. 13, who are to receive the reward of unrighteousness; he calls them spots in their feasts, having eyes full of adultery; beguiling; having a heart exercised in covetousness. v. 15. Therefore, they only externally professed Christ, and ἀγάπαις [in love-feasts] joined themselves with the saints, when nevertheless they had nothing of true holiness in themselves. v. 13, Jude v. 12.

1 Tim. 1:19.
Which some having put away concerning faith have made shipwreck: v. 20. Of whom is Hymenaeus and Alexander.

It is asked: Whether Hymenaeus, Philetus, Alexander, Demas, David, Solomon, were truly regenerated, and yet in the end Apostates? The Remonstrants affirm. We deny.

1. Because Hymenaeus and Alexander are said to have erred concerning the faith as concerning the target, i.e., from the sound doctrine of faith, indeed, denying the principal article of faith, the resurrection of the dead. For faith here is taken for the object of faith, or the faith which is believed; not for the habit of saving faith, or for the faith by which it is believed to salvation. For sound faith concerning the Resurrection of the dead does not validly argue regeneration.

2. Many put away a good conscience, who do not have it. For they put away a good conscience not formally, as if they had it, but in its cause, namely, sound doctrine interpretively; because they did not want to have it. Therefore a special exception is posited by Paul, and in what their defection was, he expounds, περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐναυάγησαν [they made shipwreck concerning the faith].

3. We do not deny that they rejected the same faith objectively, which was in Timothy, namely, sound doctrine, which Timothy savingly embraced; but they held it Theoretically, and soundly, as those who have an acquired habit of sound Theology, until they denied the Resurrection. But it was not the same Faith in species and nature; indeed they differ, as the habit of Faith or Theology supernaturally infused, which is in the truly regenerate, and the habit of Faith or Theology, acquired by study and exercise; which even the unregenerate can have, as impious Prophets and Ecclesiastes. Matt. 7:22-23.

4. Because Demas loved the world more than befitted a faithful pastor, and indeed in the time of most grievous persecution, and deserted another faithful Pastor, it does not follow that he was an Apostate.

5. Nor do they rightly conclude that Demas was inscribed in the book of life and elect, from Col. 4:14. Because he salutes the saints, and was Paul's helper; unless it should be said, Phil. 4:3, that the names of all his co-workers, without exception, were inscribed in the book of life, which is by no means said: Although Paul according to charity could then judge so concerning each one.

6. Grave Theologians think that Alexander, who cast himself with Paul into the danger of death for the Gospel, 4:19, was that coppersmith, at length Paul's most hostile enemy. 2 Tim. 4:14. Nor are all who suffer for the truth immediately truly regenerate; for it is known that Socrates drank hemlock, because he denied the multitude of Gods.

7. We deny that David was an Apostate, because he did not walk in the works of the flesh: nor does one or another work of the flesh exclude from the kingdom of heaven, except meritoriously; because it differs far, for David to be a man of death meritoriously, and to be excluded from the kingdom of heaven meritoriously (which we acknowledge concerning David) and to be a man of death formally and in act (which we deny concerning David). Nor is it much, what the Adversaries say, that David was an Apostate, because he despised the word of Jehovah, and made the enemies blaspheme. 2 Sam. 12. and he had no good works, declarative of faith, at that point of time: because thus all the saints sinning and sleeping would fall from grace; when nevertheless it is certain. 1. That he performed the excellent parts of a Judge at that time, and pronounced a sentence worthy of a good King on the one who snatched away the little ewe. 2. That God made an eternal Covenant with David. 3. David prayed that God would not take away from him the Spirit of grace: he had, therefore, the spirit of Adoption. 4. The Arminians will not say congruently with their principles that a supernatural habit and power of believing, praying, repenting was infused by the first sermon of Nathan the Prophet; because they deny all infusion of a supernatural habit: And they also deny that by Prophetic sermons, which operate only persuasively and morally, supernatural powers are infused: indeed they want all supernatural power of believing and repenting, and habit, to be acquired only by frequent actions, and frequent exercise and industry. But it is evident from the History that David seriously repented, believed, and conceived the truly penitential Psalm 51 at the first sermon of Nathan; and therefore the seed of God, i.e., the habit of saving grace, lay hidden in David under that horrible lapse.

Finally, concerning Solomon we say that he was by no means an Apostate. 1. Because Scripture asserts that God loved him: Therefore, He loved him to the end. John 13:1. and he in turn loved God.

2. God promised that He would never desert Solomon, as He had deserted Saul the Apostate.

3. Although he gravely sinned, it cannot be proven from Sacred Scripture that he placed confidence in Idols, nor that he attributed divinity to them, as the Heathen do. Although, by an example sad enough, he committed the external acts of idolatry; yet he did not incite the people to Idolatry, as Aaron did; he did not compel them, as Jeroboam did; he did not adore them in his own person, he did not place them in the Temple.

Phil. 2:12.
Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.

It is asked: Whether because exhortations by their nature serve to engender fear, therefore the reason of the promise perishes, by which God absolutely promises Perseverance? The Remonstrants affirm. Synodical Writings, p. 278. We deny.

1. Because to a Physical and brutish Perseverance, and void of all knowledge, moral exhortations and persuasions, compared to engendering fear of non-perseverance, would be ridiculous: as if God should exhort heaven and earth to persevere in their being, which nevertheless are going to persevere by Physical necessity. Ps. 119:90, They continue this day according to thine ordinances. But indeed moral exhortations, compared to engendering fear, are most apt means for those who morally, ethically, and from sure knowledge are going to persevere absolutely from the divine promise.

2. The reason of the promise of absolute Perseverance is not taken away, when the saint piously fears lest he fall away; because the fear lest I fall away, as a means of not-falling away, is also absolutely promised. Jer. 32:40-41.

3. Because the fear lest I fall away does not fight with the promise, by which it is promised that it will be that I shall never fall away; no more than the faith of David, by which he believed that he would be King of Israel, fought with the pious caution, by which he fled the anger and hands of Saul about to kill him. Thus the faith of Joseph and Mary (by which they believed that God by His irresistible power would preserve the infant Christ alive, until having become an adult of more advanced age, He would offer Himself to God as a victim for the sins of the world on the wood of the cross) by no means fought with the pious caution, by which Joseph and Mary fled into Egypt with the child, and that from the special command of God, lest Herod should kill the infant Christ with the rest of the infants. For the faith by which I believe that it will be that I shall absolutely persevere, and the fear by which I fear lest I not persevere, do not have objects contradictorily opposed; and the contradiction is not to the same thing: Because the object of Faith is God by His irresistible grace working in me caution, lest I fall away; and the object of fear is falling away, from the hypothesis that I culpably negligent, and less cautious, shall be in persevering. The object of Faith here is the promised irresistible action of God: for my action of persevering is not properly the object of faith. The object of Fear is my culpable negligence and lack of pious fear.

You will say, it is not necessary that you fear lest you fall away; because God will irresistibly effect that you do not fall away.

Resp. 1. He effects that I fear lest I fall away, so that that Fear is a means to procure not-falling away. 2. God's non-effecting of pious fear in me is not the object of pious fear; indeed it is a sin to fear that which is to be believed by divine faith will be: But the object of fear formally is my natural negligence and security, but not my Apostasy. And so proper fear concerning the event does not have place here, but only caution and pious care of means. 3. Fear is twofold; one concerning the end, namely, eternal death. The other concerning the means tending to that end, namely, my sins. Fear concerning the end is twofold; one absolute, the other conditional. Absolute fear concerning the end is when one fears concerning eternal death to be inflicted as to the event. This fear is not commanded in the regenerate in exhortations or comminations; for it is the fear of desperation, to which God exhorts none; and it is formally the fault of infidelity, to fear lest that event happen, the turning away of which is in the power of God alone, according to that common saying; It is ours to take care of duties, but God's to take care of events: Because fear properly so called obliges us to believe that God is true in comminations; and so actually to inflict the evil which He threatens. But to believe that God will actually inflict eternal death fights diametrically with the faith by which the elect is bound to believe final perseverance and eternal life.

But the other is conditional fear; and it is the horror and fear of eternal death to be inflicted on me, not simply, but on me voluntarily neglecting the day of salvation, or if I shall neglect the day of salvation. This fear cannot fail to be in him who believes by legal faith the comminations of God both Legal and Evangelical. The former fear, which is called of desperation, because it formally includes sin, cannot be commanded to the justified. But the fear of horror, which is called conditional, can very well be in him who is certainly persuaded that he will escape the evil to be inflicted as to the event. For who does not shudder and fear, who sees the head of another cut off by the sword, even if he is persuaded that he will evade that death? Who standing on the bank, next to the imminent gulf of a most deep river, would not shudder, even if he certainly knows that he will never be submerged there? according to that, 2 Cor. 5:11, Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men, etc. Paul had it most persuaded that he could not be separated by any devices of the world, flesh or Devil from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus. Rom. 8:35-39. Yet experimental horror and trembling of the last judgment was not lacking to Paul.

There is also another fear concerning means; and this is also twofold: one conditional, the other absolute. Conditional is when the regenerate, from the hypothesis that he is

deserted, even for a time doubts and fears concerning the favor of God and his own perseverance; and that doubt standing, not to fear but to be secure is evil and sin, although simply he is bound to lay aside the doubting conscience and fear. Whence that fear is rational χρῆμα from that hypothesis. The other is absolute Fear concerning means, when some regenerate person fears lest he indulge his own sloth, and pay the penalties of his yawning and supine negligence. And this Fear (when its Object is final yawning and carelessness with impenitence) is the same as desperation concerning his own perseverance, and is damnable; because he who so fears doubts concerning the event, which is proper to God; and doubts whether God will fulfill His promises concerning putting pious fear in the heart, Jer. 32:40. But when the Object of this fear is the native inclination to defection, and is nothing other than the care of doing what God commands, and the caution and flight of sloth, yawning, rebellion; then it is pious fear, and the genuine effect of exhortations and comminations.

Hence it is easy to respond to that of the Synodists, article 5, p. 292: What can in no way effect that to the effecting of which they are by their nature compared, those are employed in vain to the effecting of that, as means. But the comminations of eternal death made to the faithful, if they cannot fall away, can in no way effect that to the effecting of which they are by their nature compared. Therefore, etc. The Minor is proven. Because the comminations are compared to engendering the fear of evil, namely, of eternal death. But in the faithful persuaded that they will never fall away, the fear of eternal death cannot be engendered: For they have a certain confidence that God neither wills nor can inflict on them that evil of eternal death, on account of the absolute decree of Election made.

Resp. The comminations of eternal death, with respect to the truly regenerate, are improper comminations; for they have something peculiar, which is not in human comminations; just as also the promises with respect to the reprobate non-believing. For with respect to the regenerate, and insofar as they are made to them, they are not properly so-called comminations; because this commination (I will to inflict eternal death on Peter, if indeed he shall be impenitent) is equivalent to this (I will to inflict eternal death on Peter, if indeed I shall deny to him efficacious grace of believing and repenting): And this again is equivalent to this (I will that Peter die eternally, if indeed I reprobated him from eternity). But this supposition posits nothing at all, because the condition posits nothing when the thing conditioned is a non-being and nothing: But Peter is not reprobated from eternity; And therefore the minor is false, and its probation false; because God does not will that Peter believing fear eternal death. Nor are the comminations compared to engendering the fear of eternal death; but they are compared to caution and the anxious use of means, in the manner of a man fearing eternal death. For this commination (If David shall not flee from Keilah, Saul will kill him) is not compared to engendering in David the fear lest he ever be King of Israel, and to distrusting God, who

said through the prophet that he would be King of Israel. If God says to Christ (flee the people trying to stone you) it is not lawful to infer from this (Therefore, fear lest you ever redeem the world through the death of the cross). What is said elsewhere concerning the Evangelical promises preached to all and each one in the Visible Church, but in reality looking to the sons of the promise alone, as Paul speaks, Rom. 9; the same is to be said here concerning the Evangelical comminations preached in the promiscuous crowd, but in the intention of God looking to the reprobate and unregenerate alone.

It is asked: Whether the Remonstrants rightly thus rhetorically inveigh against the necessary Perseverance of the faithful according to us? Article 5, pp. 276-277: You as many as believe in my Son (they say) and therefore by the undoubted certainty of faith, I so willing and commanding, indeed sealing your minds to this very thing, are persuaded that you cannot by any, even most grave crimes, totally and finally fall away from faith, and that I by my irresistible grace will effect perseverance in you, nothing is required of you besides the giving of thanks: I nevertheless admonish, adjure, beseech you, that you persevere in faith, lest there ever be in you an evil and unfaithful heart to fall away from the living God; if you shall fall away you will die eternally; if you shall persevere, you will be saved.

Resp. There is nothing here besides mere empty rhetorical flourish.

1. Throughout this ridiculous speech, God the Father could thus address His Son. Persuade yourself, my Son, that it cannot happen but that after 33 years or thereabouts, and after the preaching of the Gospel, and the glorious miracles done by you, at the hour appointed and fixed by my eternal decree, you shall undergo the ignominious death of the cross for the salvation of the human race; and this is as necessary as it is certain that my decree cannot be rescinded and my knowledge deceived in the least. Yet, my Son, meanwhile cause that you flee the violent hands of the Jews, trying to stone you, and to throw you headlong from the mountain; lest perhaps you be not crucified at that appointed hour, but before that time perish overwhelmed by stones. For just as an absolute decree and sure knowledge concerning such a future event can consist with cautious fear, lawful care and caution lest that event by no means happen; So God can threaten punishment to those not persevering who are preordained by God, through His irresistible grace, to persevere: Just as the cautious flight of Christ, and the avoiding of the violent hands of the Jews trying to overwhelm Him with stones, consisted very well with the certainty of faith in Christ, by which He knew that He would not be killed before the hour appointed by God the Father; as these places prove. John 11:53-54, Luke 4:29-30, John 10:39-40, Mark 1:45, compared with John 7:30 and 8:20 and 13:1, Matt. 26:45, Mark 14:41.

2. We teach nothing such, namely, that God instills in us the persuasion that by no crimes can we totally and finally fall away from faith; because to have faith and to commit most atrocious crimes with the whole effort and endeavor of the will (which the Remonstrants want to be able to fall on the truly believing) are truly ἀσύστατα [incompatible] and repugnant.

3. The force of this argument is situated in this, that there is no force and no efficacy of the commination which threatens such an evil, which we are persuaded with the certainty of faith is never actually to be inflicted on us; which is a weak argument.
1. Because the regenerate are not always actually and fully persuaded, without any intervening doubt of conscience, that this evil is never actually to be inflicted on them: in which case the commination is useful to deter them from sin, procuring that evil meritoriously.
2. Indeed there would be no force of the commination of eternal death to those who are persuaded with the certainty of faith that they will escape eternal death, unless God had willed the fear or rather the horror of eternal death to be a means of avoiding sin, which brings eternal death.

4. They place the useless force of the command in this that God commands that as free obedience (namely, Perseverance), which nevertheless He by irresistible force effects in us: Which was once objected by the Pelagians, who did not bear that of Augustine, Give what you command, and command what you will. Meanwhile, they cannot deny that God commands the internal illumination of the mind, from Ps. 32:9, Be ye not as the horse, or as the mule, which have no understanding; and at the same time it is their doctrine that God irresistibly illuminates the mind. This same thing was once objected by the carnal Jews, Rom. 3, That it is impossible for men to be justified by the obedience of the Law: yet Paul exhorts men to the perfect obedience of the Law under the penalty of eternal death; and meanwhile denies that he makes void the Law, but establishes it.

5. That nothing is required of us, from our doctrine, besides the giving of thanks, is a diabolical calumny; indeed, we teach that universal obedience to all the commands of God, without exception, is required from those persevering; not indeed by the title and name of legal obedience, but of Evangelical gratitude towards our Redeemer.

6. When they deny that the command or comminations are means and instruments of our perseverance, unless God were to operate perseverance in a merely persuasive and plainly resistible mode, through the merely persuasive, contingent, movable and uncertain action of the Word; it is the same as if they should deny that the pen is the instrument of skillful writing, because the pen of itself is endowed with no art: But certainly the pen of itself does not artificially paint the characters, yet it does so well as the pen is elevated above

itself by the hand of a skilled writer. Thus the action of the Word as a means and instrument, although it is only persuasive and resistible; yet as it is elevated by the Holy Spirit, it has an action more than persuasive, indeed a necessary and irresistible action.

Vain, therefore, is what the Remonstrant Synodists say, article 5, p. 279: If through exhortations God irresistibly operates perseverance, then the exhortations are not means of perseverance, but a certain irresistible force effected through the exhortations will be the means: Because this is the same as if they should say, If the writer through the brute pen and void of knowledge artificially writes, then the pen is not the medium or instrument of artificially writing, but a certain artificial force effected through the pen. Because that God operates Perseverance irresistibly through the Word, and the Word, of itself and without the elevation of the Holy Spirit, operates Perseverance only resistibly, do not fight any more than that the pen of itself writes neither necessarily nor artificially, and the pen in the hand of a skilled writer writes both necessarily and artificially. Because it is known that the instrumental cause communicates with the principal cause in the more eminent and noble action, while it is elevated in exercise by the principal agent, which it cannot perform through itself and not elevated. The Word of God of itself indeed is a dead letter, operating only persuasively and resistibly, nor can it of itself illuminate the blind and convert the soul: But the Word through God, i.e., elevated above itself by the Spirit of God, is valid to demolish fortifications in the soul. 2 Cor. 10:4. And the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. Rom. 1:16. It is not called power simply, but the power of God using it.

It is also false what they say, that the Word of itself has no efficiency in order to Perseverance, if God irresistibly operates Perseverance; because of itself it has moral efficiency to produce Perseverance, and elevated by God more than moral: Of itself it has movable, contingent, uncertain efficiency; but elevated by God, and animated by the grace of the Holy Spirit, it has immovable, necessary and certain efficiency: Otherwise it is necessary that here the Remonstrants acknowledge no more noble action of God to procure Perseverance than moral, i.e., teach with the Pelagians that the whole grace required for the Perseverance of the Saints is the letter of the Law and Gospel, which grace can be performed by a pastor alone and a mere man.

7. Although no one is certain with the certainty of Faith that he will persevere, unless he obeys the exhortations, and to obey in himself is a contingent and movable condition; yet to obey the exhortations, as it is subject to the decree of God's Election and predetermining grace, is not that movable and contingent condition of the jurists, which is indifferently related to being or not being, as if the pure Pelagian cause, i.e., the bare free will were operating here. But the obedience given to the exhortations is itself

Perseverance immovably effected by God through grace, and believed with the certainty of Faith, and at the same time commanded by God. For these do not fight among themselves.

It is asked: Whether those who are certain of eternal life as their own cannot be moved to obedience by the promise of eternal life? The Remonstrants deny that those who already have that good can be moved by the promise. article 5, p. 297. We affirm.

1. Because he who certainly knows that he will snatch the palm before all his competitors, is moved to run more swiftly, because he knows that he will not obtain the palm except by running. Thus one persuaded of eternal life is moved to run, because essentially included in that persuasion is the knowledge of obtaining eternal life, not otherwise than by running. But if anyone were certain that he would obtain eternal life, whether he obeys or not, whether he runs or not, he could not be morally moved to obey, to run, to persevere by the promise of eternal life. But the faithful are not so taught by Christ: and the Arminians in vain ascribe to us such an absolute certainty, ridiculous and empty.

2. Because Christ was certain of His future glory, and yet for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame. Heb. 12:2, Ps. 16:9-11. Christ says, John 15, I have chosen you; and yet in the same place He says, bear fruit and abide in me. Because David knew that he would be king of Israel, could he not from the promise of the kingdom and the hope of it accept the throne offered to him by the tribes of Israel? This would be strange.

3. Nor do the Elect have eternal life in act and possession, but we are saved by hope: which hope is gathered to be vain from this, if it does not lean on sincere obedience, as a secondary prop. 1 John 3:3, 2 Cor. 5:7. Indeed this hope begets fear by religious caution, by which we avoid sins (although not the fear of desperation concerning the event) and the fear of filial reverence, whose object is the Goodness of God. Hos. 3:5, Ps. 130:4, by which we do not fear something as an evil of punishment. 2 Cor. 7:15, but not the terror and trembling of servile fear.

It is asked: Whether because the faithful so sin that they are men of death, 2 Sam. 12:7, and incur the guilt of eternal death, unless they repent, they therefore totally fall from the grace of God? The Arminians affirm. article 5, p. 303. We deny.

1. Because the Lord has promised that He will raise up the just, as often as he falls. Ps. 37:24.

2. Because not only on account of atrocious sins, but also on account of lighter ones, even an idle word, they meritoriously incur the guilt of eternal death, if indeed God should will

to enter into judgment with His servants. But the Adversaries will not say that on account of the lightest sins men totally and finally fall from grace.

3. Because God is angry at the sins of believers, but not at their persons. Ps. 89:30-34. Nor do the more atrocious sins of the regenerate change God, with whom there is no variation or shadow of turning, James 1:17, from electing to eternal life into reprobating.

Matt. 16:18.
Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

In these words we have the promise of Christ concerning the indeclinable Perseverance of the Saints, so that those built upon the Rock, i.e., Christ, or the confession of Peter, cannot perish. Whence

It is asked: Whether God promises Perseverance to believers, not indeed absolutely, but conditionally, if only the believers themselves watch, pray, and do their duty? The Remonstrants affirm, article 5, p. 293. We deny.

Meanwhile we advise that the promise of Perseverance, according to the state and condition of those apprehending it, can be called one dissolved, the other absolute. Dissolved is that of carnal men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness; such as the Adversaries falsely feign to us, as if God promised Perseverance to the torpid, indeed to the one walking according to the flesh; such a promise is not acknowledged by us. The other is absolute as it is contradistinguished from conditional. For although everyone in whom God fulfills the promise of Perseverance necessarily watches, prays, does his duty; but to watch, to pray, and to do duty, is not a condition qualifying the person in whom the promise of Perseverance is fulfilled, but is the thing itself promised.

Likewise, one is the condition of the person, or the condition of the subject, or the passive condition, namely, if he is elect in the intention of God, the promises of Perseverance are made to him absolutely. The other is the condition of duty, or the active condition; and so to the negligent and torpid in duty, the promise of Perseverance is not made absolutely and indifferently.

We defend with the Scriptures, against the Remonstrants, that the promise of Perseverance is not conditional, but absolute.

1. Because if God promises Perseverance in faith, if only they pray and if only they watch and do their duty; then God promises Perseverance if only they persevere: because we are commanded to persevere in praying, in watching and doing our duty, 1 Thess. 5:17, Matt. 26:41, Eph. 6:18, Gal. 6:9. Indeed in this way God promises Perseverance in faith even to the Devils and those fallen into the sin against the Holy Spirit; which is absurd. Or God promises only the power of persevering, not actual Perseverance; contrary to the Scriptures. Jer. 32:40 and 33:35-37, Isa. 54:10-12 and 59:21-22. This also fights with the prayers of the Saints who pray to God for actual, not potential Perseverance; because potential Perseverance is non-perseverance, and such prayers of the Saints would be heard, even if all believers became the most abandoned Apostates. Matt. 6:13, Ps. 71:9. It is also against the prayers of Christ. Luke 12:31, John 17:15, 20, Rom. 8:38. Finally, the power of persevering is only the free faculty of persevering or finally falling away, which cannot be promised by God, unless He would delude us.

2. Because the question will return, whether God promising Perseverance to us, by this very thing also promises the grace of persevering in praying, watching, and doing duty? (since to do duty is the very Perseverance itself) If He promises the grace of watching and doing duty, then He promises it either conditionally or absolutely. If the former, there will be progress into infinity. If the latter, we have our position. If He does not promise the grace of persevering in doing duty, then that perseverance happens without any grace of God promised to us, and is a matter of pure Free Will.

3. It is pure Pelagianism to suspend actual Perseverance from the acts of our Free Will; because thus our free will is established as the efficacious cause, the independent mistress and artificer of Election and Reprobation, Salvation and Damnation.

It is asked: Whether Christ chose no one to persevere, and graciously predestined from eternity? The Remonstrants affirm, so that no one may be said to be peremptorily and irrevocably elected to glory, except he who finally perseveres, and expires in true faith; that Perseverance also may be said to depend, not on the gracious predestination of God, but to be suspended from the nod of the slippery, inconstant, and changeable Free Will. We teach the contrary, namely, that Perseverance is the effect of gratuitous election to glory.

1. Because Eph. 1:3-6, He chose us before the foundation of the world to live blamelessly, to the praise of His grace. Therefore, also to final holiness.

2. Because the intention and counsel of Christ dying and giving Himself for His Church is, Eph. 5:27, that in the last judgment He might present the Church glorious, not having spot

or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and blameless. Therefore, to this perfection and consummated holiness, He destined it from eternity.

3. Because God predestined us through sanctification of the Spirit to obedience. 1 Pet. 1:2, and v. 3-4, regenerated us to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, reserved in heaven for us.

4. Because 1 Thess. 5:9, God has not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, He predestined us to the necessary means of that salvation: but this is Perseverance in faith.

5. Because God works in us to will and to do, according to His gracious good pleasure. Phil. 2:13. Therefore, according to that gracious good pleasure, He decreed from eternity to work that willing and doing constantly in us to the end.

6. Because if Perseverance depended on Free Will, not on the grace of Election; then salvation would be of works, and of us, and of our Free Will.

7. Because we are His workmanship created for good works, for which He prepared us. Eph. 2:10. Therefore, for continued good works, and final Perseverance.

8. That faith which is called of the elect is so called because it is given to the elect alone from this fountain alone, because they are elect.

9. If from that golden chain, Rom. 8:30, God glorifies us because He predestined us from eternity; Therefore He also continues our calling efficacious to the end, because He predestined us.

It is asked: Whether Christ by the merit of His death acquired Perseverance for the elect? The Remonstrants deny, lest they be forced to say that the elect, who cannot be defrauded of the benefits obtained by the death of Christ, cannot fail to persevere. We teach the contrary.

1. Because God blessed the elect with every spiritual blessing in Christ. Eph. 1:3. Therefore, also with Perseverance in Christ.

2. Because Christ gave Himself to death for His Church for this reason, that He might at length present it glorious and blameless to God the Father, Eph. 5:27. Therefore, by that death of His He merited that we should be finally and consummately sanctified. Because

He died that we might have remission of sins in His blood; it is well concluded, Therefore, remission was obtained for us by the merits of the death of Christ.

3. Because 1 Pet. 2:24, Christ bore our sins in His body on the tree, that we being dead to sins should live to righteousness.

4. Because Rom. 5:2, Through Jesus Christ, by faith we have access into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

5. Because God cannot fail to give us all things with Christ, delivered to death for us. Rom. 8:32. Therefore also Perseverance.

6. Because we are more than conquerors in all these things, and so in overcoming sin, through Him who loved us. Rom. 8:37.

Acts. 2:21.
And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved.

It is asked: Whether the promise of salvation adheres immediately to final Perseverance alone, and to faith only total, i.e., as it lasts to the end; so that faith not as it is essentially living and true faith, but as lasting to the end, is that which is graciously deemed worthy of the reward of eternal life? The Remonstrants affirm, article 5, p. 189. We deny.

1. Because to the truly faithful in the extreme period of life, even in the twelfth hour, i.e., the last, and to the thief believing later, eternal life is promised, although he has faith only for a day or a few hours; according to that, He who believes has eternal life.

2. Partial faith, i.e., which lasts for a short time, as it is distinguished from the Arminian total faith, which lasts to the end, does not differ in essence and species from total faith, as the Adversaries teach. If, therefore, anyone should expire in that faith which lasts for a short time, either he would be saved (according to that, He who believes will be saved) and thus we have our position: Or he would perish eternally; and thus someone savingly believing in Christ would perish: which is against the whole Gospel.

3. From this doctrine it follows that the promise of eternal life is not made to faith from grace and by means of the gracious good pleasure of God; but on account of the

meritorious duration and rooting of faith in the subject: And that faith lasting for a shorter time is by no means sufficient to obtain the reward of eternal life; and that only total faith is graciously deemed worthy of the reward of eternal life: which is also repugnant to their doctrine, who in their Apology, ch. 18, fol. 182, teach that the temporary are revocably elected, most properly and in reality to partake of the life promised in the Gospel, for that time in which they believe. They have, therefore, by virtue of the divine promise and the merits of Christ, for that time, a right to eternal life.

4. According to this assertion, if to someone truly believing in Christ, for 70 or 80 years, sudden death creeps up, through a fortuitous contingency antecedent to the decree of God, and in that hour in which he does not believe, it is necessary that he pay eternal punishments in hell for hourly infidelity; and be defrauded of the reward of saving faith, which he had throughout his whole life. And he who does not believe, but lived in infidelity for 70 or 80 years, if however for the short space of an hour before death he believes, his hourly faith will be crowned with the reward of eternal life. Meanwhile this whole dispensation happens, according to the created free will, determined by God to believe neither from eternity nor in time; but operating fortuitously and contingently, changeable, slippery, and more versatile than the wheels of chariots and the turning hinge. Thence necessarily flows that no one will be certain of the plenary remission of his sins, of eternal glory: no one truly justified, no one covered with the Righteousness of Christ, no one truly elected to glory will be in this life: which certainly will torture the pious souls of believers with perpetual fluctuation; will deprive them of all living hope, sure confidence, solid peace of conscience, stable joy of the Holy Spirit, pure and vivid consolation.

Although the Remonstrants think that they must fight for the Apostasy of the Saints as for altars and hearths; yet they leave this as a problem disputable on both sides, in Synodical Writings, pp. 186-187. Whether God sometimes, by His absolute right, by some extraordinary reason, remunerates certain faithful, long and much exercised in the study of piety, and proven by temptations as by fire, with the gift of indefectible Perseverance? Yet we believe that this is by no means disputable.

1. Because God graciously bestows the grace of indefectible Perseverance on all the regenerate.

2. Scripture does not acknowledge any gift which is not obtained by the merits of Christ, who establishes and confirms all His own to the day of His glorious advent. Eph. 1:3. Therefore, here there is no such absolute right with respect to certain singular faithful.

3. The remuneration of those who have been long exercised in the study of piety and proven by temptations, and their remuneration by absolute right, fight with each other.

Because all remuneration of obedience to them is from strict Justice: But strict Justice, and absolute right fight with each other. Otherwise God could remunerate infants newly regenerated, by His absolute right, with indefectible Perseverance, which the Arminians would not concede. Indeed the Apologists acknowledge it as a Problem, ch. 17, fol. 195, that God reserves to Himself the whole right of gifting certain ones, whose work He wills to use for the conversion of other men, with an extraordinary and irresistible calling. Whence to the Arminians it is a disputable problem, indeed a very probable opinion of Calvin and the Reformed Churches.

1. That with indefectible and absolute Perseverance standing, and so with absolute Election to glory, it is very probable that the Reformed Churches rightly and soundly teach.

2. That Evangelical exhortations, commands, threatenings, promises can rightly be set forth to Prophets, Apostles, and others long and much exercised in the study of piety. And so God can rightly threaten with eternal death those whom He has determined to preserve to eternal life by the gift of indefectible Perseverance and the operation of irresistible grace (which nevertheless they condemn in our doctrine). And that God can morally allure with the hope of eternal life, as an argument, those who nevertheless are confirmed by the gift of indefectible Perseverance; and that God can command that they persevere, who nevertheless cannot fail to persevere, on account of the force of the irresistible operation of grace; which they also condemn in ours.

3. That it is a very probable doctrine, that the Prophets, Apostles, and others indefectibly persevering, both most freely sin and most freely persevere; and yet persevere and obey by the irresistible and indefectible action of grace.

4. That the Christian Religion remains safe, even if men are said to sin freely, and also by the necessity of the decree of God cannot fail to sin; and to obey freely, and yet by the necessity of the decree and of the saving grace of regeneration operating irresistibly, cannot fail to obey.

5. That the opinion is probable concerning absolute Election, apart from the foresight of faith and merits; and absolute Reprobation from the pure good pleasure of God.

4. It follows, according to the doctrine of the Arminians, that those Apostles and others who are endowed with infallible Perseverance: 1. Cannot lie, steal, perjure, act unjustly, or fall into sins that lay waste to the conscience. 2. It follows that such persons are not subject to any Law, any commandment, any promises or threats of the Law or Gospel. 3. It is not necessary for them to fear God, to guard themselves against sins and the snares of

temptations from the world, the flesh, and the devil; but they can securely sleep on both ears, neglect prayer, industry, the solicitude of perfecting salvation in fear and trembling. 4. To confess sins, to complain and grieve with Paul about indwelling sin in Romans 7, to seek forgiveness of sins, to hope for eternal life, only to persevere to the end, to pray for the grace of Christ by which they may persevere, is useless and ridiculous for such persons. Yet they object to all these consequences and many others against our doctrine of the absolute Perseverance of the Saints.

It is asked, does one, in the divine judgment, persevere in the faith who 1. Does not sin against the clear and open dictate of both natural reason and supernatural revelation. 2. Who applies moderate diligence to correct and amend his infirmities, to which all and each one, in proportion to their temperament, age, places, and other circumstances, are more or less liable? The Remonstrants affirm this in these words, article 5, p. 189. We deny it.

1. Because they suppose that every sin against the clear light of conscience, together with the sin of infirmity which one does not oppose, makes one an Apostate: Since thus those who speak idle words, who jokingly lie, who provoke a brother with reproach, without a bite of conscience for such sins, would be Apostates by divine judgment: Indeed, a thousand times in a year, in a month, one and the same man, who salvifically believes, would be an Apostate.

2. Neither Idolatry in the Indies, nor Adultery in those Nations which have promiscuous wives and believe such marriages to be lawful, would be sins laying waste to the conscience and casting out salvific faith: because in such cases neither the dictate of natural reason, nor of supernatural revelation, is clear and open; but their mind and conscience is defiled. Titus 1:15. And those who kill the Apostles and most faithful Pastors of Jesus Christ think that in this they are serving God. John 16:1,2. And they perpetrate such sins with no dictate of conscience crying out against it: Yet such sins, if they were in the regenerate, would truly make them Apostates. Therefore, one can be an Apostate who does not sin against the clear and open light of conscience.

3. Because in the reborn they acknowledge no principle of sin, except temperament, age, place, and other circumstances; although there is indwelling sin in all, the old man, the flesh and concupiscence perpetually rising up against the Spirit of God.

4. Because Pagans can for a time, according to our Adversaries, neither sin against conscience, nor against supernatural revelation; and Cicero, Seneca, Aristides etc. did this in their moral virtues, as they teach; and they were also able, according to them, to apply

moderate diligence in amending the infirmities of temperament, age and place. Therefore, Pagans, in the divine judgment, persevere for a time in true faith.

Rom. 7:17.
So then it is no longer I that do it, but sin which dwells in me.

From which the Apostle concludes from the struggle between the flesh and the spirit, that he does not sin at all with the full consent and effort of the will, when he says, it is not I that do it, that is, not I insofar as I am reborn, and insofar as the Holy Spirit dwells in my will, mind, and affections, who makes the acts of sin remiss and less intense. From which

It is asked, Are all the sins of the regenerate only sins of infirmity, from our Theologians? The Remonstrants affirm this. Synod. Script. art. 5. p. 211.

We respond by distinguishing. Sin of infirmity is taken in two ways. 1. As it is opposed to sin which is perpetrated from the dominion of reigning and prevailing concupiscence. And thus our Theologians, Calvin, Beza, Zanchi, as they are cited in Coll. Hag. art. 5. p. 31. rightly teach that all the sins of the regenerate are of infirmity, because they always sin with reluctance made by the Spirit. 2. Those sins are called of infirmity, which are of daily incursion; namely, natural lapses, and blemishes adhering to our best works; And thus it is false that Ours teach that all the sins of the regenerate are of infirmity.

1. Because David's Adultery, Solomon's Idolatry, Asa's injustice and violence in imprisoning the Prophet of God, were atrocious sins.

2. Because the saints for a time indulge in carnal security, not without grave contempt for the calling of Christ. Song of Sol. 5:2, 3, 4.

3. Because God sometimes forsakes the regenerate for their greater humility, so that having lapsed into graver sins, they may perceive how little they are when forsaken by God, and what thanks they owe to God, through Christ the Mediator, in the name of strengthening grace.

It is asked, do the Remonstrants rightly condemn ours, because we teach that the truly regenerate cannot sin by deliberate counsel, with the whole effort of the will, with full consent, and with utter malice? They do this in the name of Synod. Script. art. 5 p. 211.

We answer that sin from deliberate counsel happens in two ways.

1. Sin is committed by deliberate counsel, when sin is perpetrated from knowledge and προαιρέσει [choice], having compared the reasons on both sides, having weighed the advantages and disadvantages that will follow from the sin, having also considered the magnitude and infinity of the divine Majesty, and the wrath of the offended Deity. And in this sense it has never been denied by Ours that the regenerate sin all too frequently by deliberate counsel.

2. Sin is committed by deliberate counsel, when it is sinned with a full, and most composed and most free deliberate act, and with the whole effort, exertion and impulse of the will, without any act of the spirit of grace striving against it, or as it were protesting and struggling in the opposite direction. Which counter-striving is either a habitual or actual insurrection of the Spirit of grace against the flesh, dragging the man captive to sin. In this way we teach that the truly regenerate never sin.

1. Because sin does not reign in them, does not have dominion. Rom. 6:4, 5, 6, 11, 14. But the dominion of sin is in the full consent of the will to sinning with greed. Eph. 4:19.

2. Because the regenerate are not servants of sin, nor enslaved to the lust of desires, since their old man is crucified. Rom. 6:16-21. Rom. 8:9, 10, 11. Eph. 5:5. Col. 3:1, 2, 3.

3. Because in the regenerate the Spirit and the Law of the mind, i.e. the soul, mind, conscience, will and affections, insofar as they are renewed, struggle against the flesh in all their sins. From which the consent to sinning is diminished, and the intense endeavor and exertion of the will, which was formerly most intense while living in the flesh and its lusts, is remitted and washed; so much so that the regenerate sin not with the whole heart, but with the renewed part reluctant: as is clear from Rom. 7:17 and 23, where just as a captive obeys the Lord or Tyrant by whom he is detained with a half-will, or with a consent of the will that is by no means full; so the regenerate sins with a half-full consent of the will. And Gal. 5:17, as if two men, two leaders, conflicting with each other with opposing faces, are in any regenerate person - the Spirit and the Flesh.

4. Because 1 John 3:9, the regenerate cannot sin, (i.e. with full consent, from utter malice and depraved habit; otherwise there is no one who cannot sin) (1 John 1:8) and it is explained there, ἁμαρτίαν οὐ δύναται [he cannot sin], because his seed remains in him; and the anointing teaching all things remains in him. 1 John 2:27. He has received the spirit of adoption. Rom. 8:15. He has received the Spirit who is from God. 1 Cor. 2:12. The Father and the Son make their dwelling with him. John 14:23. Christ dwells in the heart through faith. Eph. 3:17. He has the Spirit of God. Rom. 8:9. He has in himself a fountain of living water,

gushing up into eternal life. John 4:14, i.e. the Spirit of God. John 7:38, 39. From which it is plain that habitual grace remains in him, i.e. the Spirit of God, once promised. Isa. 44:3, 5 and 54:11, 12. Ezek. 36:26, 27. Zech. 12:10. Joel 2:28, 29. John 6:45. Through which grace it cannot happen that the whole heart and the whole will exert full consent and entire and total and most intense powers into sin; but only blunted, remitted and subdued by the grace of God; just as an agent whose powers have been broken and weakened and subdued produces actions conforming to those subdued powers, but not most intense ones: as fire warms a cold hand in one way, tepid water in another way. From which it happens that on account of that resistance of the indwelling Holy Spirit, the sin of the regenerate is lesser and lighter. Hence

It is asked, does the resistance and reluctance of the Spirit against the flesh, in every sin of the truly regenerate, lessen sin and make it lighter, so much so that on account of that resistance, it does not happen with the full consent of the will? The Remonstrants deny it. art. 5. pp. 255, 256. For they say that resistance aggravates the sin of the regenerate rather than lessens it; indeed, it also declares how vehement the consent of the will is in sin, since, not even with the conscience crying out against it, was it able to impede the will from that consent: and therefore it increases and promotes the fullness of consent, it does not lessen and retard it.

But here I think we must distinguish between sin that is more serious simply, and sin that is more serious in a certain respect and from circumstance; Or by reason of external scandal, and by reason of the sin in itself. 2. Between sin that is more serious by reason of guilt, and more serious by reason of the intensity and measure of the action. 3. Between resistance with which the sinner joins and contributes his influx, and resistance which the sinner himself resists, and to which he opposes his own powers. 4. Between sin by reason of opposition, and by reason of dominion. Hence

Assertion 1. Sin is considered either 1. by reason of the subject in which it is, or 2. by reason of the free principle from which it comes, or 3. by reason of the circumstance around which it is. In the first way, by reason of scandal, the Adultery and Homicide of David the Prophet are more serious, and will summon more foul blasphemies of God's name among the Philistines and profane men, than the incest of Absalom, and the parricides of Adrammelech and Sharezer, who killed their father Sennacherib. 2. If the discussion is about sin in the category of obligation, from the nexus of God's benefits, he sins more gravely and is punished more gravely who knows the will of the Lord than one who is ignorant. In this way, in the category of sin against the obligation of beneficence, more serious is the sin of the regenerate, who sins 1. against the death of Christ, 2. against the grace of regeneration, 3. against the benefits of saving illumination; than of the unregenerate, who is not bound by so many benefits. But if the discussion is about sin in

the category of sin simply, insofar as it harms and violates the authority of the Legislator; then with a higher hand, a more secure conscience, and a lighter touch and sense of the Divine Majesty, the unregenerate sins, and thus with a more intense endeavor of the free will.

But in

Assertion 2. By reason of the free principle from which sin flows, and simply, the unregenerate sins more gravely than the regenerate; because the less there is of the voluntary, and the less there is of vicious and culpable inclination in sin, the less there is of ἀνομία [lawlessness], and the less of malice in sin. But in the regenerate person sinning, there is less of the voluntary and less of the vicious inclination to sinning than in the unregenerate: Because in the regenerate there is, as it were, half of the will, i.e. the will insofar as it is renewed and affected by the holy habit of grace, inclines to not sinning; and thus it takes away the greatest part of consent from the sin to which the will, insofar as it is affected by the flesh dwelling in it, consents.

From which the argument of the Remonstrants is easily answered: It is more serious to sin even with the conscience crying out against it, and with the spirit striving against it in the opposite direction, than simply to sin; But it would be far most serious, and the action of consenting would be far most intense, if the spirit were not there to strive against it, as it is not in the unregenerate, in whom the whole will, with the totality of powers concurring to sin, offers consent, without a holy resistance in the opposite direction. Hence the culpable action from a conscience seared with a hot iron, and laboring under ἀπώλεια [destruction], is a sin that is by far most serious.

Assertion 3. But by reason of circumstance, and in a certain respect, the sin of the regenerate is more serious than that of the unregenerate. Because the regenerate sins against a greater illumination of conscience: and to that extent indeed it is more serious, as they prove.

Assertion 4. By reason of guilt, the sin of the unregenerate is more serious than that of the regenerate; because 1. Sinners are outside Christ. 2. The whole of him, as much as he is, is flesh. 3. They sin with total impetus. But sometimes by reason of the matter and measure of the action, it can happen that the sin of the regenerate is more serious than the sin of the unregenerate: As David in homicide sinned more gravely than Absalom in an officious lie; because the matter here is lighter, and the sin lighter. But the unregenerate can, as a slave and servant, serve a lighter sin, as a reigning Lord; and the regenerate does not serve a far graver sin (for example, adultery, homicide) as a subjugated and vanquished servant through the grace of God.

Assertion 5. Sometimes the resistance of conscience lessens sin; and this always happens in the regenerate. Sometimes resistance aggravates it; and this always happens in the unregenerate. For resistance lessens sin, when we seriously subscribe to the holy resistance, and contribute our powers and consent to the resistance; And this 1. When we stand on the side of conscience, and of the Spirit striving against the flesh. 2. When we grieve that the spirit has been conquered, and that the flesh is victorious. 3. When a greater intensity of the will inclines to the side of the spirit, even if we are not able to accomplish it. Rom. 7:18, i.e. even if the omission of good follows, or the actual victory of concupiscence: just as a captive has a greater intensity of will for walking freely than he has powers for freeing himself from chains: And thus it is rightly said by Ours that resistance lessens sin. But when we oppose ourselves to the resistance of conscience, and grieve that conscience and the spirit are striving against it, and would wish that such a part would acquiesce and not rise up against the flesh; then indeed resistance aggravates sin: and this happens in the unregenerate, as often as they sin, with natural reason and conscience crying out against it, as happens in Pilate, condemning Christ against his conscience. But in spiritual sins, such as unbelief and spiritual complacency, the natural conscience does not oppose itself to the flesh. But such opposition with grief, because the spirit resists and yet is conquered by the flesh, is not in the truly regenerate. Resistance also increases and intensifies guilt, it does not lessen it, when that grief is not a pious resistance, but from mere natural conscience, and joined with a blazing hatred of God: as James 2:19, the Demons believe and shudder: for the will of the Demons resists the God who is believed, and pursues him with hatred, and would wish that God did not exist, that the act of believing did not exist. The will of Herod resists the remorse by which he is impeded from killing John the Baptist, and would wish that such resistance did not exist. But the regenerate always assents to the resistance of the Spirit.

Assertion 6. By reason of the opposing impetus, the sin of the unregenerate is far more serious than that of the regenerate; because he employs more powers for sinning than the regenerate; and also by reason of dominion it is more serious, because sin has less dominion and the evil inclination is weaker in the regenerate than in the unregenerate. The opposition of sin, indeed, with respect to more objects and extensively, is sharper and more vehement in the regenerate against the Spirit; because it has a stronger adversary in the regenerate than in the unregenerate; for the spirit of grace is not in the unregenerate, nor does the flesh in him have such an adversary; and therefore the battle is slower and more remiss; or nearly nonexistent, unless the natural conscience opposes itself: but it is defiled, and easily yields. For the natural grief and resistance arises from this, because the unregenerate is offended by sin insofar as it is something penal, not insofar as it offends God: But in the regenerate there is resistance and remorse, insofar as he hates sin as sin.

Rom. 7:15, For I do not do what I want, but I do what I hate. v. 22, For I delight in the law of God, according to the inner man.

From which it is that there is some sin in the regenerate, namely a culpable opposition made to grace and the spirit, which is never in the unregenerate; and in this way by reason of opposition, the sin of the regenerate is more serious. For he sins more gravely who rises up against the Judge personally present, than he who rises up only against the Law itself; because he who rises up against the Judge thus present both inflicts injury on the person of the Judge, and violates the Law. The regenerate rises up on the part of the flesh against God, and the Holy Spirit, really present through his grace, and (so to speak) in the vicarious person, and also violates the Law, and thus commits two sins: The unregenerate simply violates the Law alone, he does not violate the indwelling Holy Spirit, because he does not have such a spirit, and thus commits only one sin. From which the sin of the regenerate extends itself to more objects than the sin of the unregenerate. But this does not impede that by reason of Dominion, the sin of the unregenerate is far more serious than that of the regenerate.

Assertion 7. By reason of the light and quality of the spiritual light, there is more of the voluntary in the sins of the regenerate. And therefore David in this aggravates his sin, Psalm 51:6, In secret you had made wisdom known to me. But by reason of the elective impetus, which concurs more intimately than knowledge to the ratio of the voluntary, there is far more of the voluntary, and thus far more of guilt, in the sin of the unregenerate (in whom there is ὁρμή [impulse] and elective force totally, with delight and full consent) than in the sin of the regenerate.

Nor is it much, what they object, that there is not a twofold and contrary will concerning the same act, when the regenerate sins; because before the regenerate sins, and while the mind is at the crossroads, and the spirit dissuades, perhaps the sin of the regenerate is lighter than that of the unregenerate: But when the regenerate actually sins, and the flesh overcomes the spirit by an actual victory, then the spirit rests, and the battle is intermitted. I answer: 1. I do not know whether they profess ignorance or malice here. Because while a Father disinherits an incorrigible son, whom he wished to be corrected, and would desire to enjoy his inheritance, only if the son would turn out thrifty and good. While a Merchant casts his goods into the sea to redeem his life, which however he would wish to be saved. While one laboring under a lethal ulcer takes care to have a limb amputated; In all these actions, both before the act itself and in the act itself, the voluntary and the involuntary have a place in part; and in the very act of contrary principles, natural love towards a son and anger and hatred towards the vices of an incorrigible son, love of riches and love of life, fight in the same mixed action. Therefore, just as a dislocation of the shin actually concurs with the motive force to limping, but by a defective influx; and the

hot with the cold in the same tepid state; So the flesh and the spirit make one and the same free principle of one and the same action, both good and evil, and both concur, both by acting and by retarding the fervor of the action. And from this it is that a good supernatural action is not most intense, on account of the defective influence of the flesh; nor is an evil action most intense, because the spirit takes away some of the voluntary from the action. 2. The Remonstrants want there to be no battle of concupiscence and spirit, except before consent; which is shown to be false from Rom. 7:20, If then I do what I would not (there the ratio of the voluntary is in part in I would not), it is not I who do it; but sin that dwells in me. By sin he denotes the part affected by flesh and corruption, in which there is something of the voluntary; otherwise there would not be actual voluntary sin in Paul, which is in reality to deny this spiritual struggle.

It is asked, do the truly faithful, through the most grievous sins, not only not cast out the Holy Spirit and Faith, but does the habit of faith remain safe under those sins, so pleasing to God that on account of it God wills to give eternal life? The Remonstrants affirm this in art. 5. pp. 195, 196, and p. 201, that we teach this. But here they construct many calumnies against us. We therefore respond with these Assertions.

Assertion 1. The habitual grace of the Holy Spirit is diminished in degrees through the atrocious sins of the regenerate. Psalm 51:10. And the Spirit of God is vehemently grieved. Eph. 4:30. So much so that his acts are weaker and more languid, and not as cheerful, lively, and easy as before. But the habit of faith and habitual grace can by no means be entirely eradicated. 1 John 3:9. John 14:23. 1 John 2:27.

Assertion 2. The acts of Faith, Repentance, and Spiritual Vigilance can be intermitted for a time, with miserable complacency creeping in; as is clear in David being idle and at leisure while he was committing adultery, and defending the murder of Uriah by quite frivolous arguments: and in the Church securely sleeping, and refusing the entrance of the Bridegroom. Song of Sol. 5:2. Experience in the Saints declares this to be all too true.

Assertion 3. The grace, favor and love of God must here be acknowledged as threefold: The first is the love of εὐδοκία [good pleasure] in gracious Election. The regenerate cannot fall away from this grace or love through any most grievous sins. 1. Because the firmness and immobility of this does not depend on any works, acts or condition in the creature; but on the mere grace of the one calling. Rom. 9:11. 2. Because this love, and the decrees of God, are altogether immutable. John 13:1. Rom. 11:29.

2. Another is the love of beneficence, which is in God by way of execution, or with respect to effects. The regenerate can in part fall away from this love through atrocious sins: From which God deprived Solomon and others of many common gifts of the Spirit: For after his

horrendous defection he oppressed the people, and lost for the most part the gift of governing.

3. Another is the love of the covenant, by which God embraces his own according to the tenor of the Covenant of Grace: which love must be regarded here in two ways. 1. As it is measured, as it were, according to the gracious Election of God; and from this covenantal grace they never fall away, as has been proven above. 2. This love is also regarded according to some effects of covenantal grace; and these can be interrupted and obscured through the most grievous sins of the regenerate; from which is diminished 1. παρρησία [confidence] and προσαγωγή [access] in praying. 2. Spiritual joy ceases for a time. 3. Consolations become more tepid. 4. The confidence of remission, like a fire buried in ashes, lies hidden and concealed. 5. The regenerate feel certain effects and terrors of the punishing wrath of God under those sins. Psalm 89:39. Psalm 78:5-9.

Assertion 4. The regenerate man, under those more atrocious sins, retains in himself the internal habit of grace or seed of God; and thus remains truly faithful in habit and potency, yet not in act fit for entering the kingdom of heaven, until he repents. Rev. 21:27. Because he is defiled. Yet he remains truly elect in God's decree, he remains truly redeemed.

Assertion 5. The supernatural habit, remaining in the regenerate under those atrocious sins, is without doubt pleasing to God through Christ: For the new creature in the saints cannot be hateful to God; his image cannot but be pleasing to him. But it is altogether false that it is taught by Ours that that habit is so pleasing to God that on account of it he wills to give repentance, indeed, even eternal life, even if they do not repent. 1. Because both eternal life and repentance are given to the regenerate on account of the merits of Christ alone. 2. Because unless the regenerate would repent, they would have to perish for eternity; according to the Gospel threats. 3. Because God graciously revives the lapsed regenerate from that first fount of the gratuitous love of Election; and just as he gives Repentance and Perseverance from this fount, so from the same fount he restores interrupted Perseverance, apart from any meritorious regard to the habit of grace; for when the just man falls, the Lord lifts him up with his extended hand.

It is asked, do the Remonstrants rightly acknowledge no intrinsic and vital principle from which the very duration of Faith flows by necessity of consequence; nor any extrinsic principle, by force of any absolute decree, by which it is necessary that the elect also persevere? They affirm this in Script. Synod. art. 5. p. 140. We believe this to be blasphemous: and we propose our opinion in these Assertions.

Assertion 1. There is in all the regenerate a vital principle of eternal duration in fact, although not of eternal duration in potency and by intrinsic power: Because there is in

them the seed of God, 1 John 3:9. The Law of God, engraved on the heart. Jer. 31:33. A Heart of Flesh. Ezek. 36:26. Circumcised. Deut. 30:6. One heart and a new spirit. Ezek. 11:19. The Spirit poured out. Isa. 44:3. Zech. 12:10. The anointing remaining in them. 1 John 2:27. Christ dwelling in the heart through faith. Eph. 3:17.

Assertion 2. Although this principle is in fact never cast out, yet it is not by intrinsic power immortal and of eternal duration. 1. Because it does not prevent the saints from falling into the most atrocious sins, of which, unless they would seriously repent, they would perish for eternity. 2. Because such a principle does not determine the regenerate to persevering and not sinning. 3. Because unless Christ would intercede, habitual faith would fail. Luke 22:31. And therefore of itself it is not something immortal. But as it is subject to the intention of God predestining, and in fact, it is rightly called immortal seed.

Assertion 3. The extrinsic principles of our Perseverance are the safekeeping of God to salvation through faith. 1 Pet. 1:5. The intercession of Christ. Luke 22:31. Heb. 7:25 and 9:24. The actual grace of God. Phil. 2:13. 1 Cor. 15:10. Jude 24. From which principles the regenerate persevere, not by necessity of consequence, as they falsely ascribe to us, but by necessity of the consequence. But the Arminians contend that the Saints persevere by no necessity at all, neither of consequence, nor of the consequence; But from the pure influx of Freewill indifferent, all the regenerate stand or fall.

It is asked, can an Apostate, who formerly truly believed, through the knowledge by which it is recognized that what he formerly believed is true, although that knowledge is devoid of all assent, rise up and repent anew; so that there is no need of a total regeneration, much less of Baptism? The Remonstrants affirm this in art. 5. p. 176. We deny it.
1. Because it is Pelagian that a man can repent through bare knowledge, which is in Devils and the most profligate slaves of the Devil and of sin; since divine grace is needed for repenting.

2. Because David prays in Psalm 51:10 that God would create in him a clean heart and a right spirit; and this is more than bare knowledge.

3. Because not only by the bare proclamation of a Pastor, but the lapsed person himself through bare literal knowledge could thus rise up from sins.

4. If Apostates have cast out all saving faith, so that they are members of the Devil, totally excluded from favor and the kingdom of heaven, and for the time being non-elect, as they suppose; then there will be need of Regeneration anew, and of the Baptism of Regeneration as a necessary means by God's command.

5. But also the knowledge that is in the Intellect cannot be extinguished by acts of the will, as they themselves say. The regenerate, therefore, never fail totally, but there remains in them an internal principle, namely, literal knowledge, through which they themselves can place themselves anew in the state of Election, Regeneration, Grace and Adoption.

6. If this knowledge cannot be extinguished, and is a sufficient principle for rising up again; what Scripture teaches will be false, that it is impossible for those who have fallen into the sin against the Holy Spirit to be renewed, and for them to obtain forgiveness of sins either in this life or in the future. Heb. 6:4-6. Heb. 10:26, 27. Matt. 12:31, 32.

7. Through moral persuasion this second Regeneration will be accomplished anew, without the infusion of a new vital principle. And why is not the first Regeneration accomplished in the same way, by the same reason? What, then, will the grace of God be, if not a resounding letter?

It is asked, do the Remonstrants rightly ascribe to us that God forsakes us before we forsake him? I respond: Calumniously. For if the discussion is about desertion by way of merit, we forsake God first. 1. Because the merit of sin precedes punishment. 2. Because God, punishing antecedent sins by subsequent ones, punishes by forsaking sinners. But if the discussion is about desertion purely negative and not culpable, by which God denies predetermining grace, which he owes to no one; then God forsakes us before we forsake him: 1. Because God withdrew from Adam predetermining grace (or as Calvin calls it in his Response to the Calumnies of a Certain Worthless Fellow, p. 1016, Fortitude and Constancy), which, if given, he would have stood. 2. Because grace would not be grace, if it depended on the nod of Freewill.

It is asked, do the truly regenerate, deservedly excommunicated by the Church, and delivered (the key not erring) into the hands of Satan, truly remain faithful and sons of God, not excluded from the kingdom of heaven? The Remonstrants deny it. We affirm it.

1. Because this is not a valid consequence: The faithful are rightly and legitimately excluded from the kingdom of heaven in the Ecclesiastical court; Therefore, they are totally excluded from the kingdom of heaven in the court of God: Because the end of Excommunication per se is eternal salvation, the end per accidens is damnation. 1 Cor. 5:5.

2. Excommunication excludes from the kingdom of heaven only declaratively, Therefore, one excommunicated, the key not erring, was previously excluded from the kingdom of God; and is excluded only conditionally, as long as he does not repent. Therefore, there will be nothing else here except an argument from divine threats, to which a response has been given above.

Chapter 14. On the Certainty of Salvation.

Rom. 8:35. Who shall separate us from the love of God?

He understands principally the love of God actively, yet not altogether excluding the love of God passively. From which

It is asked, Can anyone be certain that he is truly justified, is in the grace of God, and will be saved? To determine the state of the question, certain things must be noted beforehand.

One certainty is of being and object, or entitative and objective, by which the things of faith are most certain in themselves, when the discussion is about axioms and general truths. The Adversaries, both Papists and Arminians, concede that this certainty is such that falsehood cannot underlie it; except that the Arminians assert that many truths about future contingents, even those predicted by God, are doubtful, and indifferent to either of the opposites. From which in the Old Testament these were not certain in themselves: Joseph is going to take Mary as his wife; Antichrist is going to come; The bones of Christ are by no means to be broken. Another is the certainty of the mind or subject, or subjective, by which a thing is certain to me and to my apprehension.

Every subjective certainty has some objective certainty on which it is founded. For no one certainly knows that a thing is, unless it is certain that that thing is certain in itself. The Arminians want the peremptory and complete Election of no man to be certain, either by certainty of being, or certainty of mind; because it is not certain in itself that anyone is peremptorily elected, until he expires in Faith and Repentance. Hence easily follows fluctuation and uncertainty of mind, from the uncertainty of being.

Subjective certainty is again twofold. One is intellectual in the mind, by which I am certain of all the truths in the Word of God. Another is fiducial adherence, or (as they say in the Schools) certainty of affection, which pertains to the will and affections, by which we rest and hope in God.

The opinions of the Papists, Arminians and Socinians are diverse here. The Papists are some more ancient, others more recent here. The more ancient are more sound. Cajetan, Scotus, Medina, Bannez, Ambrosius Catharinus in his Apology against Dominicus à Soto, want men to be certain that they are in grace. For which Catharinus is beaten by Franciscus de Sancta Clara, on Nature and Grace, problem 27. From which as to the point of certainty (he says), I think that he (Catharinus) fell into the error of Calvin, who confesses that this certainty is from special grace, yet granted to each one. But the more Recent, especially at Trent, Session 6, chapter 6, teach impudently and heterodoxly that no one can know that he is in grace, by a certainty of Faith to which falsehood cannot underlie.

Fiducial certainty is not commonly and always in Wayfarers, as the Papists teach. Yet Franciscus de Sancta Clara softens the opinion concerning this uncertainty, expounding that passage of Rom. 8, The Spirit itself bears witness etc. I said (he says) that a certainty of inclination or affection is given, which arises from hope; and hence it is more often called, and rightly, among Ecclesiastical Doctors, the certainty of hope, which although it can be accompanied by some fear, yet often excludes all actual fear of the opposite; and for the time being, places a certain holy peace and security and great confidence in the soul. We concede the certainty of hope, although not always and in every difference of time, to exclude all actual fear, even if the habitual always remains. But the Papists want it not to exclude all habitual and actual fear, so much so that one can, indeed ought ordinarily to fear and doubt whether he himself is in grace; as Gregory of Valentia teaches, vol. 2, disp. 8, question 4, point 4. He attributes the certainty excluding both the potency and the act of fearing, to the confirmed Apostles and the Virgin Mary. But the other certainty, which excludes the act of fearing, but not the potency, he attributes to those who are exceedingly familiar to God and his love; although such persons rarely doubt so prudently but that they can find signs of their salvation. But the third certainty, namely probable and conjectural knowledge of grace and salvation, he attributes to the common people of the faithful.

The Arminians and Socinians, 1. Do not even attribute to any the certainty of hope which excludes all fear of failing finally. Many Papists deny the certainty of faith, but admit the certainty of hope or confidence. The Arminians deny both. 2. They admit for the time being a certainty by which someone, without any fear, can know, and does know, that he is justified. But 1. They teach that no one in this life can know whether he is peremptorily elected to glory. 2. One who can finally fail cannot know whether he has full remission of all sins, and full Justification. 3. They proclaim that no mortal has full certainty, excluding all either potency or act of fearing the opposite, by which one is certain that he will persevere, and that he will be glorified. 4. They teach a hypothetical certainty of salvation and Perseverance, by which a man is certain that he will persevere in grace, if through

Freewill he will not be lacking to the grace of God; but they utterly deny an absolute certainty. Indeed, against the Jesuits, they deny that it can be known whether any mortals at all are to be saved, Whether there will be any future Bride of Christ in heaven; because they teach that all mortals can fail totally and finally. And thus the Arminians deny the certainty of faith in general, and not only the certainty of faith applied to individual believers, especially on the point of the Apostasy of the Saints. 5. They teach that it is probable that some who are confirmed in grace have an absolute certainty of their Perseverance and salvation, and one that excludes all fear.

The Question, therefore, is not, 1. About extraordinary certainty, through extraordinary revelation. 2. Nor about the certainty of object and being, although the Remonstrants also shake this out, who want it to be possible that no one is actually redeemed and saved through Christ. The Jesuits are more modest here, who concede the congruous and vague necessity of the Perseverance and salvation of the elect. The Arminians deny all necessity. 3. Nor is the question about conjectural and moral certainty; but about infallibility and a quasi-physical necessity, which by right excludes all act of fearing, and potency of failing finally. 4. Nor about certainty through natural revelation, but about that which is through spiritual grace, and the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit. Nor, 5, is it asked Whether the certainty of one's Perseverance and Salvation is always and in every difference of time inherent in the believer; but whether it ought to be inherent by right? Nor, 6, about the certainty of those who are in the state of sin, or who do not use the means of persevering in the fear of the Lord. Nor, 7, about the certainty of experience and sense, but about the certainty of Faith. Nor, 8, is the question about the certainty in the present, which the Arminians grant; but about the certainty for the future, namely, whether they can be certain that they will never fail totally and finally? 9. Nor about that certainty which is propped up by acts of Freewill, for which the Remonstrants fight; but about that which rests on the merits of Christ, and his grace. 10. Nor finally is the question about that certainty which for the most part includes confidence and excludes fear. The Jesuits grant such certainty to some who are long and much exercised in piety and faith; and the Arminians, to some who are confirmed in grace.

The Question is, therefore, Whether adult believers can (not only in the present, but also concerning their future state) be certain, by a certainty of the Intellect and by a supernatural confidence excluding all fear to the opposite (not indeed in every difference of time and in fact, but by right) of their final Perseverance and eternal Salvation, to be absolutely future, through that special grace which is proper to the elect? The Papists and Arminians deny it: We affirm it.

1. Because Rom. 5:1, Therefore, having been justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. v. 2, Through whom also we have been brought by faith into

this grace in which we stand, and we boast in the hope of the glory of God. The regenerate have the certainty of Faith and hope that they are to be glorified, Therefore, they have such certainty, Rom. 8:38, For I am persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels nor rulers nor powers, nor things present nor things to come, v. 39, nor height nor depth, nor any other created thing, will be able to separate us from the love of God that is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Col. 2:2, that their hearts may be consoled, being knit together in love, and attaining to all the riches of full assurance of understanding, to the knowledge of the mystery of God the Father and of Christ. Hence if believers are persuaded by faith, and have consolation from faith, that they will be saved; then they ought not to fear final Apostasy.

2. To whom the promise has been made, that it cannot happen that the truly regenerate totally and finally fall away from grace, and this on account of the eternal predestination of God. Rom. 8:30. 2 Tim. 2:19. Rom. 11:7 and 29. On account of the intercession of the Son, Luke 22:31. Heb. 7:25. John 17. And the sealing of the Holy Spirit to the day of redemption. Eph. 4:30. They ought, and thus can, believe that those promises are true, and be certain of them. But to all believers the promises have been made concerning their final Perseverance; as has been proven above. The response of the Arminians to this has now been diluted. The evasion of the Papists, namely, that believers cannot know by a certainty of faith that they believe savingly, is 1. Begging the Question. 2. Against the Scriptures. 1 John 2:3, And by this we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. And ch. 3:14, We know that we have passed from death to life, because we love the brothers.

3. Whatever the Spirit of God testifies to us to be true, that must be believed by us to be true, by right. But the Spirit testifies to each of the faithful, that he 1. believes, 2. will persevere finally, 3. will be saved. Therefore, these things must be believed, by right. The minor is proven from Rom. 8:16, And the Spirit himself bears witness with our spirit that we are sons of God. v. 17, And if sons, then heirs: heirs of God and fellow heirs with Christ, if we suffer with him, so that we may also be glorified with him. It is vain, that Bellarmine here flees to conjectural knowledge; because (he says) it is not settled by divine faith, whether it is the Spirit of God who bears such witness? Because just as, when God speaks in the Word, we must believe, not only that what he speaks is true, but also that it is God who speaks; so when the Spirit of God speaks within, in the conscience, we must believe that his testimony is true, and that it is true that it is God himself who testifies. Others say that the certainty of hope is understood, which often for the time being excludes all actual fear of the opposite; which is shown to be vain from 1 Cor. 2:12, Now we have not received the spirit of the world, but the Spirit who is from God, that we may know the things that have been graciously given to us by God. 1 John 4:13, By this we know that we abide in him, and he in us, because he has given us of his Spirit. It is settled, therefore, by divine faith, as often as the Spirit bears witness with our spirit. Eph. 1:13, 14, By the Spirit we are sealed to

the day of redemption. 2 Cor. 1:21, 22, Moreover, he who establishes us with you in Christ, and who anointed us, is God, who has also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts. If, therefore, the Spirit seals believers to the day of redemption, they can and ought to be assured of this sealing.

4. Because the saints were persuaded with the firmest certainty of their perseverance and eternal salvation, Job 19:25, For I know that my Redeemer lives, and that he will stand on the earth on the last day. v. 26, And after my skin has been thus destroyed, yet in my flesh I shall see God. Psalm 23:6, Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life, etc. 2 Tim. 1:12, For I know whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that he is able to guard until that day what has been entrusted to me. 1 John 3:16, By this we know the love of God, that he laid down his life for us. Nor can this be ascribed to a peculiar revelation, because Scripture speaks of all for whom Christ laid down his life.

5. From God's command. Luke 12:32, Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom. Matt. 8:26, Doubt is opposed to faith and is rebuked by Christ. Why do you doubt, O you of little faith?

6. Because no consolation, no peace, no hope (which does not put to shame), no joy of the Holy Spirit, could befall the Saints, but the fear of hell, perpetual agitation and vacillation of consciences, trembling, terror, the Spirit of bondage, would perpetually occupy them, it would be necessary; if they are ignorant 1. Whether they are in the grace of God and the state of Justification? 2. Whether they will persevere finally, or perhaps totally fall away from grace and faith? 3. Whether they are immutably elected to glory, or peremptorily destined from eternity to eternal torments with the Devil and his Angels? Against these there are clear testimonies to the contrary. Rom. 5:1-4, 1 John 3:2. Rom. 14:17. Col. 2:2. Rom. 8:35-38. Rom. 15:4. 1 John 2:1, 2. 1 Pet. 1:3, 4. 2 Cor. 4:18. 2 Cor. 5:1-3. 2 Tim. 1:12. 1 Pet. 1:8. John 16:22.

7. What the saints pray for, through the will of God, in Christ the Mediator; they can know by the certainty of faith that they will obtain it. But the saints pray for the testimony of the Spirit, final Perseverance and eternal glory. Therefore, etc. The major is from John 14:13. Mark 11:24. 1 John 5:14. John 9:31. The minor is apparent from Matt. 6:13. 1 Thess. 5:23. Luke 22:31. Psalm 119:34-36.

Finally Tertullian in his Apology, ch. 39: We are certain of the sight of God, unimpaired faith is secure concerning salvation. Cyprian against Demetrius, sermon on mortality: If you truly believe in God, why are you not secure? God speaks with you, and you, faithless, fluctuate? This is plainly not to have faith in the house of God, let him who is not reborn, who is delivered over to the fires of hell, truly fear to die. Chrysostom, Homily 2 on 2

Corinthians: If God, this earnest having first been given to us, will not add the remaining possession of the inheritance, he himself would suffer the loss of the earnest money perishing. Augustine on the epistle of John, treatise 5: Therefore let no one interrogate man; let him return to his heart; if he finds charity there, let him be secure, because he has passed from death to life.

It is asked, Whether the Arminian certainty (which they attribute to believers) can consist with the Scriptures, or with faith and hope? They affirm it. We deny it.

1. Because their certainty is conditional. For in Article 5, pp. 194, 195, they say: A faithful man can be certain, from the divine promise, that he will remain in the grace of God, and will without any doubt obtain eternal life and salvation, if he perseveres in faith and the observance of God's commandments: but for the rest, he is not certain absolutely and simply, that he will necessarily persevere in that faith with which he is once endowed. From which they deny 1. All absolute certainty of Perseverance, and one resting on the promises of God and the immutable decree of Predestination; but they admit only that which depends on the indifference of Freewill to stand or not to stand. 2. They deny such certainty as excludes all fear of final Apostasy and eternal destruction. 3. And they deny that which rests on the grace of God, and the infallible testimony of the Holy Spirit.

2. This hypothetical certainty is so vain that it can by no means consist with God and his truthfulness. For it conflicts with the immutability and truthfulness of God in promising our confirmation to the glorious day of redemption, with the oath of God, the Intercession and Prayer of Christ. Indeed the certainty of salvation, according to the word of God, is as absolute and certain, excluding every cause or just foundation of fear of the opposite part, as is the promise of God, that the world is not again to be drowned by the waters of Noah, Isa. 54:9, 10, and God's faithful covenant concerning the succession of nights and days, and the motions of the Sun and Moon. Jer. 31:35, 36.

3. Because conditional certainty of Perseverance and salvation suggests and instills confidence, hope, consolation, peace of conscience equally to the most wicked men as to the elect and believers. For it is certain that all mortals will persevere and be saved, only if they work righteousness to the end: and Cain can say: I confidently trust that I cannot be shaken out of the state of grace by any temptations; if indeed I will have worked righteousness in the fear of the Lord, to the end. Then it suggests terror, fear of hell, and miserable despair, diabolical sadness devoid of all consolation, to those who truly believe this. For anyone who believes can, indeed ought to fear, lest he perish for eternity; if indeed he will not have worked righteousness to the end; and thus he can say: Christ, not even by his own intercession and prayers, nor God the Father by his gracious custody and protection, nor the Holy Spirit by his grace superlatively most powerful, can procure my

Perseverance, and thus not even my eternal glory; if indeed I will have shaken off the grace of God and faith; which is as free to me as it is for Peter to dispute or not to dispute his anger. For the anchor of hope is thus fixed, not in grace (which cannot confer Perseverance, according to the Adversaries, if free will stands in the way) but the anchor is cast in all temptations, in Freewill. And hope resting on the creature cannot but put to shame: That faith must vacillate, nor can such faith be the faith of Abraham the Father of all believers, of whom the Holy Spirit says, Rom. 4:20, No unbelief made him waver concerning the promise of God, but he grew strong in his faith as he gave glory to God, v. 21, fully convinced that God was able to do what he had promised. But if God conditionally promises Perseverance to believers in this way, no one is fully convinced that God is able to do what he promised.

4. No one could pray for Perseverance, and therefore neither could anyone give glory and thanks to God for a prayer that has been heard; because the believer says, Grant to me through your grace, eternal God, to persevere, only if I pray, watch, perform my duty; which is the same as if he said, Grant to me perseverance, only if I will have persevered; grant that I may constantly pray and perform my duty, only if I constantly pray and perform my duty.

5. This conditional certainty consists with the eternal destruction of a man endowed with such a certainty of faith, and sealed by the Spirit to the day of redemption.

It is asked, Whether the Remonstrants rightly pass over in silence, in the doctrine of certainty, the certainty of our election; and whether Grevinchovius rightly denies against Amesius, fol. 138, all sense of election in this life? I respond: The Remonstrants deny that anyone in this life can know that he is peremptorily elected to glory; because no one, according to them, is peremptorily and irrevocably elected, except one expiring in faith. But we contend to the contrary, that men ought to be certain of their eternal Election, not indeed by an a priori certainty (for who has known the mind of the Lord?) but a posteriori. 1. 1 Cor. 2:12, Because we have received the Spirit who is from God, that we may know the things that have been graciously given to us by God. Therefore, also the Election made from eternity.

2. Because all the elect to glory are also predestined to Conversion and the Adoption of the Sons of God, Eph. 1:5, 6. But God has delivered to us many τεκμήρια [sure signs], by which we may know that we have been converted; Therefore also, by which we may know that we have been elected to glory. The major is Rom. 8:30. Acts 13:48. The minor is 1 John 2:3, By this we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. And ch. 3:14, We know that we have passed from death to life, because we love the brothers. Ch. 4:2, By this we know

that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep his commandments. v. 16, And we have known and believed the love that he has for us.

3. Because we are commanded to make our calling and election more sure through good works, 2 Pet. 1:10.

4. Because we know that we are called and justified, through peace of conscience, παρρησία [confidence], a sense of the love of God poured out in our hearts, through hope that does not put to shame, through boasting in afflictions. Rom. 5:1-4. Rom. 8:15-17. But those who are justified have the express Word of God that they have been predestined to glory, Rom. 8:30. Acts 13:48.

5. Because not only the Apostles, but also the 70 Disciples are commanded to rejoice, Luke 10:20, because their names were written in the book of life. Therefore, they knew and were obliged to know that they were elected to glory.

6. Because we are bound, by the example of Paul and the Faithful, to attribute our Election wholly to the glory and thanks of God. Eph. 1:2-8. 1 Pet. 1:2-4. But no one is bound to give thanks for a conjectural gratuitous benefit in Christ, which he is ignorant, and is obliged to be ignorant, whether it pertains to him.

It is asked, Whether a greater certainty of Perseverance is required by us than the nature of the free act itself bears, and than is that certainty which we have from the indifferent acts of Freewill? The Remonstrants in Script. Synod. art. 5 p. 198 teach that the whole certainty of Perseverance must ultimately be resolved into the constancy of Freewill, in whose power it is to persevere or not to persevere. We to the contrary want all such certainty to be founded on the Truthfulness, Immutability, and Constancy of God, on the Intercession of the Mediator, and the sealing of the Holy Spirit.

1. Because with the Arminian certainty standing, the whole confidence and hope of persevering, and thus the tranquility of conscience, is founded on miserable human liberty, more changeable than any hinge.

2. Because a man is as happy and as certain of his happy state of Adoption, as well as he can promise himself that he will cooperate with the grace of God through Freewill.

3. Because this opinion commits and entrusts all the promises of God, the eternity and stability of the Covenant of Grace, the Intercession of Christ, and its fruit with God the Father, to human Liberty, a most miserable guardian, having abandoned the fountain of living waters.

4. They teach this, so that from it they may construct that absolute certainty of Perseverance overturns all religion, the nature of free obedience, of commandments, of promises, of threats, and that it is better and more useful to lack that certainty. They themselves, however, believe it to be very probable that an indefectible gift of Perseverance is given, but in a miraculous and extraordinary way, to some who are confirmed in grace. From which it follows that their men of more chastised mortification are released from every bond of religion and obedience: since these are ἀσύστατα [inconsistent] (as they themselves want), that someone is obliged to obey God, who nevertheless is endowed with the indefectible gift of Perseverance. But they do not see that holy fear can very well consist with the certainty of Perseverance, and they always struggle with this hypothesis, that the fear of God and faith are incompatible. Certainly the fear of hell and the spirit of bondage, which the regenerate do not receive, Rom. 8:15, conflicts with true faith; 1. For perfect love casts out this fear. 1 John 4:18. 2. This fear is prohibited. Luke 12:32. 3. Because the regenerate worship God ἀφόβως [without fear], Luke 1:74. And for Zechariah to be speaking of the fear of men is against the series of the text; for it is added v. 75, To walk in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of our life. Nor does such fear harm a man under the New Testament. 4. Because the fear commanded to us has spiritual joy joined to it. Psalm 2:11, and its object is the goodness of God. Hos. 3:5. Which is certainly an argument that it is not fear properly speaking of final falling away and Apostasy; but rather a pious caution and holy anxiety to use all those means by which we may persevere in the state of grace.

Chapter 15 On The Church, and its marks.

Matt. 18:17.
If he refuses to listen to them, tell it to the Church.

Tell it to the Church, that is, Tell it to the Prelates and Presidents, as Chrysostom explains it. Pareus more clearly: Tell it to the Presbyters, the Pastors representing the Church. But it is not necessary for us to persist here in refuting the Papists, who drag these Words by a twisted neck to establish their hierarchy. For Lyra, raving here, says, Tell it to the Church, that is, to the Prelate by public denunciation. And Cajetan in his commentary on this place: Neither reason nor practice persuades that the Church must be gathered to correct an impenitent brother for a sin committed against me alone: but both reason and most

ancient custom hold that it should be told to the Head of the Church. These things are examined and refuted elsewhere by ours. We have business here with the Remonstrants, who bring forward another and different exposition of this passage from Ours and the Papists.

It is asked therefore, Whether the Remonstrants rightly define the visible Church in Apol. ch. 22 as the assembly of believers who profess saving doctrine? Grant (they say) that such do not truly believe; they are nevertheless the Church with respect to us, although not in the court of God.
I respond: Such an assembly, not even with respect to us, can be taken for the Church, Because it is true that a priori we cannot know with certainty, by a certainty of faith, whether such men truly believe or not? Because whether another believes savingly is not the object of my faith formally. But indeed a posteriori we can know the Church; because by a certainty of faith we can and ought to know whether that is saving doctrine which that assembly professes? But some assembly and multitude cannot profess sound doctrine, but that it is necessary that there be the true Church of the elect and called there, although there are very many hypocrites there. But this, not even with respect to us, is the true Church. Because to believe, for the Remonstrants, is to firmly establish that by no other reason than that which is prescribed by Jesus Christ can we attain to salvation. But the Anabaptists, Papists, Socinians, Antitrinitarians, Tritheists, Arians, etc. believe this and can believe it.

2. Nor is this the visible Church, which (as the most learned Professors of Leiden have rightly noted) is always defined in the Scriptures, both from its internal state and external, which contains both Christ the head, and the whole sacred ministry, and the means of gathering the Church: And such a Church is such, in whose power it is by ministerial power, i.e., by the power of the keys conferred by Christ, to remove offenses. But this assembly is not such.

3. If such an assembly is the Church professing saving doctrine only, grant that they are neither elect nor effectually called (since we ought to join ourselves to every Church true with respect to us, as they confess), it follows that we ought to join ourselves to the Church and assembly of hypocrites; which assembly, if it consists of none of the elect or effectually called, is no more the Church than a painted man is a man.

It is asked, Whether there is in the New Testament a Church destitute of all Presbyters, to which the Lord Savior has committed the power of the keys? as the Remonstrants want, Apol. ch. 22 fol. 233.

To solve this Question, we premise these distinctions. 1. There is some ordinary Ministry, some extraordinary. 2. There is some Mystical Church, composed of the faithful alone professing faith; and there is some Ministerial Church, composed of the flock and Pastors. 3. The Church can be called such by anticipation, as Hos. 12:12, Jacob served for a wife, that is, a future one; Or the Church is called such formally, because it is now constituted in its being.

Assertion 1. Sometimes a Mystical Church is given prior to a Ministerial one. 1. Because there can be a house before it is equipped with stewards and servants. 2. Adam and Eve in the order of nature previously made a Mystical Church, before there was Ecclesiastical Ministry in that assembly.

Assertion 2. The ordinary public Ministry is prior to the Mystical Church of believers. Eph. 4:11, He gave some as pastors, teachers, v. 12, πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἁγίων εἰς ἔργον διακονίας [for the perfecting of the saints for the work of ministry], etc. For because through the Ministry and preaching of the Word men believe, Rom. 10:14, therefore the Ministry precedes the assembly of believers. 2. It is necessary in the order of nature that Fathers be prior to begetting sons, and that seed be prior to the plant springing up: But Pastors are Fathers, the preached Word is the seed of the Mystical Church.

But that this may be discussed more exactly, it must be known that that Mystical Church which is destitute of Pastors and Presbyters neither has the keys committed to it by Christ, nor any ordinary power of ordaining Presbyters. With which two things having been demonstrated, the arguments will also be enervated by which the Separatists and Socinians, together with the Arminians, contend that the assembly of the faithful destitute of Presbyters is that Church to which the Lord Savior has committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

Assertion 1. Jesus Christ immediately, without any intervening power, ascending into heaven, instituted Presbyters for the Church. Eph. 4:11, 12. 1 Cor. 12:18. Although the designation of such persons to the office is made by means of the Presbytery. 1 Tim. 4:14 and ch. 5 v. 22.

Assertion 2. It is not to be denied that there is in the assembly of the faithful a virtual power, although not a formal one, in a case of necessity to supply the defect of Ordination through popular Election: Which happens if the assembly of the faithful is on some island remote from all Pastors. 1. Because if David without any revelation from heaven ate the bread of the Presence in extreme necessity (indeed, every positive Law yields to the natural one), then the faithful destitute of Pastors can elect Pastors for themselves. 2. Thus both Protestant and Papist Theologians prove; as Voetius, in the desperate cause of the

Papacy, book 2, section 5, ch. 5. Thus Flavian and Diodorus preached at Antioch, endowed with no priesthood, as Theodoret says, book 2, ch. 24. For sometimes God is accustomed (says Gerson, part 2, sermon 2 after Easter) to make an immediate intermission of the ordinary calling through Pastors. Concerning which more can be seen in Viguerius in Institutes of Theology ch. 15, paragraph 1, Suarez vol. 2 ch. 2, Vasquez on the first part of the second part, disputation 179 ch. 2, Soto on Justification book 2 question 3 art. 8.

Assertion 3. The order ratified and established by Christ for calling Pastors is through other Pastors, and thus through the succession of Pastors.

1. 1 Tim. 5:22, Do not be hasty in the laying on of hands. 1 Tim. 4:14, Do not neglect the gift you have, which was given you by prophecy when the council of elders laid their hands on you.

2. Because the Apostolic practice is for us a most certain rule in this matter. For we do not read in the New Testament of any presbyters ordained by the assembly of the faithful alone, destitute of Presbyters, indeed ordination was always done by Pastors. Acts 1:15, 16; 6:2-4; 14:23. 1 Cor. 3:6. 1 Tim. 4:14. Tit. 1:5. But the Separatists confess this, because the care of all the Churches was laid upon the Apostles.

3. If the Ordination of Pastors, according to the canons of the Apostle, is laid upon Presbyters as Presbyters, then that care is not committed to the assembly of the faithful as such. But the former is true. Therefore, also the latter. The major is certain, because something cannot be commanded by virtue of office which it falls to those to perform who are equipped with no office in the Church. The Assumption is proven. Because in 2 Tim. 2:1, 2, by that same power the power of committing the Ministry to faithful men who can teach others is given to Timothy, and therefore also to other Pastors and Presbyters, by which Timothy is forbidden to entangle himself in the affairs of this life, so that he may be approved as God's soldier, v. 5, and by which he is commanded also to admonish others not to quarrel about words, and to rightly handle the word of truth, as a workman who does not need to be ashamed, v. 14, 15. But these things are laid upon Timothy as a Pastor. Thus also 1 Tim. 5:17 shows the honorarium owed to faithful προεστῶτες [those who rule]; he also forbids admitting a testimony against a Presbyter, except on the evidence of two or three witnesses, v. 19, and laying hands hastily on any Pastor, v. 22. Tit. 1, Paul wants Titus, as a Pastor, to appoint Presbyters in every town; he wants him to rebuke the Cretans by Pastoral authority. But it is absurd that each and every one of the people should be admonished that an honorarium is owed to them, as to workers, that it is theirs not to admit an accusation against a Presbyter, and to lay hands deliberately or rashly on Pastors, and also to ordain Presbyters in every town, and to rebuke such as the Cretans were by pastoral authority.

4. The special argument of the Adversaries is feeble; Therefore, also the opinion itself. The Antecedent is proven.

Because they pretend that the Ordination of Pastors by Pastors is a Papistical succession. But they themselves are compelled to admit a perpetual succession of believers, and indeed a local one, even from the times of the Apostles: For they deny that anyone is legitimately ordained by Pastors, unless he is ordained by believers. Then, we by no means defend an absolutely perpetual succession of Pastors; for we acknowledge that it can be interrupted, and with Pastors failing, an Election made by the people in a case of necessity supplies the defect of Ordination by Pastors. 3. We do not defend a local, cathedral succession of Pastors, and one always eminently visible from the times of the Apostles.

But they object that Christ, in Matt. 16 and Matt. 18, conferred on the believing people the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Therefore, also the power of ordaining Pastors. I respond: Although the Antecedent were true, it would nevertheless no more follow that the power of ordaining is conferred on the people than the power of preaching and administering the Sacraments. What? because the keys are committed to the people; Therefore, they can also exercise any acts of Jurisdiction and Order? It by no means follows. 2. Nothing is more false than the Antecedent: it is not had in the Scriptures, either expressly or by any consequence, that the Keys were conferred on the assembly of believers. For in Matt. 16, through the keys given to Peter, it was conferred by Christ to open the doors of the kingdom of heaven, to bind and loose on earth, by administering the Word and Sacraments: But is this indeed given to the assembly of Christians?

They object 2. That in Acts 1, one hundred and twenty men cast votes in the ordination of Matthias as an Apostle. I respond: This is not in the text, but that there were one hundred and twenty in that gathering. It is indeed said v. 23, Therefore they proposed two; But these words ought to be referred, not to the whole assembly, but to the Apostles enumerated in v. 13, and to the words of v. 17, He was numbered among us, namely, with the Apostles. Nor does the series of the context refer this ordination to the votes of each and every one.

To the passage in Acts 1, the Adversaries object that no less confusion follows from our Presbyterial government than from a Democratic one; for it is said v. 13, Therefore they proposed two, namely those one hundred and twenty; and in Acts 6:5, The whole multitude chose seven Deacons before the Apostles: and the Apostles v. 6 spoke and prayed. When therefore the one hundred and twenty proposed two, they must necessarily have spoken. But did they all speak conjointly and at the same time? But this confusion is forbidden. 1 Cor. 14. Did the Women speak? But this is forbidden v. 34. Did the children?

but this is impossible. Thus in Acts 6. Did all 12 Apostles speak conjointly, and also pour out prayers to God vocally at the same time? This is also confusion. Did the whole multitude choosing the 7 Deacons also speak at the same time? By no means indeed. But by such phrases, children and women are altogether excluded: Why not also all others, except the Presbyters? And since all the Presbyters cannot speak conjointly without the greatest confusion, why are not all excluded, except one Prelate? And he alone will be the Church, and thus the Pope!

I respond: 1. This argument especially favors our opinion, because one hundred and twenty, Acts 1, and the whole multitude, Acts 6, cannot conjointly lay hands on Deacons or Pastors, especially if the Visible Church consists of 3000 professing Christ, as in Acts 2. It is therefore necessary, for the sake of order, that certain selected persons, i.e. προϊστάμενοι [those who rule] and Presbyters, lay on hands and ordain Pastors, and thus administer all the public affairs of the Church: And this is our representative Church, which the Separatists attack so vehemently as mere Judaism. For children and women are part of the Church of the redeemed: But the Adversaries want them excluded. Therefore, the keys were committed by Christ, even by their own admission, to the representative assembly. 2. Matt. 18, If he does not listen to the Church, namely, speaking and pronouncing sentence, let him be to you as a Gentile and a tax collector. But the whole Church, i.e. each and every one, children and women, absolutely cannot speak in the Church, nor speak conjointly. Therefore, in that place the word "Church" does not signify the assembly of the redeemed coming together into one visible assembly to perform sacred things; unless they want children and women to be excluded from the number of the redeemed and of those performing sacred things in the sacred assembly. And this is to acknowledge the representative Church with us.

But they cite one passage for the exercise of Ecclesiastical Discipline performed by the whole people. Col. 4:11, And say to Archippus, "See that you fulfill the ministry that you have received in the Lord." Therefore, the whole people (they say), namely of the holy Colossians to whom he writes, exercises the power of Jurisdiction over Pastors by admonishing; Therefore also by ordaining and excommunicating.

I respond: Καὶ εἴπατε Ἀρχίππῳ [And say to Archippus], Therefore, judicially and authoritatively say to Archippus: it does not follow affirmatively from the general to the specific. Thus Matt. 18:17, Εἰπὲ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ [Tell it to the church]. Does each private individual therefore exercise authority over the whole Church? John 8:48, The Jews said to Jesus, Therefore, they spoke with authority. 1 John 1:8, If we say we have no sin. 2. The Fathers, Augustine, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Jerome; the Scholastics, Aquinas, Suarez, Bannez, Gregory of Valentia, say that this admonition of Archippus is fraternal correction, not an act of Jurisdiction. Cajetan says that the act of correction is elicited by prudence,

commanded by mercy. Andreas Duvallius says that it is an act not only of divine law, but also of natural law, to correct and admonish an erring brother, as in Lev. 19:17, Hos. 2:1. But from this it is by no means gathered that the whole assembly of the Colossians had the power of Jurisdiction over Archippus.

But that the keys of the kingdom of heaven were by no means committed by Christ to the whole assembly of the Faithful, we demonstrate by these arguments.

1. The Keys were given to that Church which is built on the Rock, as the family of Wisdom, Prov. 9:1, the house of God, 1 Tim. 3:13, Heb. 3:4, and that through the doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles preached by the Doctors and Pastors given for building the Church. Eph. 4:11. But this house is not the assembly of the faithful united in some way and destitute of Presbyters; but the Ministerial Church. Therefore, etc. The Minor is proven. An assembly destitute of Pastors and Presbyters is not a house built through the Ministry of Pastors and Presbyters; because the matter of the house is not the house itself. For indeed if the power of preaching the Word and administering the Sacraments is lacking to them, the power of the Keys is lacking. But where the power of the Keys is lacking, according to the Adversaries, there is not the Visible Church. For if the building on the Rock promised is to the Visible Church from Matt. 16, then no other building can be understood here than that which happens through Pastors and Doctors, Eph. 4:11.

2. The Keys were promised to those who are stewards of the mysteries of God, 1 Cor. 4:1, who are servants of the household by office, 2 Cor. 4:5, and whose it is to open and close the doors, and to conduct themselves rightly in the house of God, 1 Tim. 3:15, and to distribute a portion to each one in the family opportunely, Matt. 24:45, and to rightly divide the word, 2 Tim. 2:15. But an assembly professing faith in Christ, and united by any covenant, yet destitute of Pastors and stewards, are not stewards of the Mysteries of God, etc. Therefore, to such an assembly, destitute of Pastors, the Keys have not been given. The Adversaries do not deny the Assumption, nor does it need proof. The Major is proven from the Phraseology of Scripture. Isa. 22:22, I will place on his shoulder the key of the house of David; he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open. By the consent of all Interpreters, the giving of the Keys is (as Musculus on the place) the sign of accepted power. To the steward and overseer of the house, the keys are committed by which he may administer his power. Thus Calvin in his Commentary there. Gualther, homily 114: The Keys are a symbol of power; they offer keys to kings. Junius: It denotes full administration. Beza in his greater Annotations on the place, Matt. 16: The power of Ministers is denoted. Pareus on the place: They will make you steward of my house. Jerome on Isa. 22: The key is the power of excellency. Thus Augustine, Chrysostom, Fulgentius teach that in Matt. 16 the power of binding and loosing, given to the Apostles and Ministers, is signified by the name of Keys. Thus also Isa. 9:6, The government shall be

upon his shoulder, i.e., by the consent of all Interpreters, the Keys of David were given to him; Rev. 3:7, The words of him who is holy, who is true, who has the key of David, who opens and no one shuts, and shuts and no one opens. Rev. 1:18, I have the keys of Death and Hades. Rev. 9:1, To the angel was given the key to the shaft of the bottomless pit. In all which places, by the consent of all Interpreters, is signified the Economic power conferred on Kings, Overseers, Rulers of Churches, even those who are by office Stewards. But the Faithful destitute of Pastors are by no means such.

3. In this text Matt. 16, the Keys are given to those to whom by the command of Christ the exercise of the Keys is given, by binding, loosing, opening, shutting the doors of the kingdom of heaven, i.e. by preaching the Word and administering the Sacraments. But this exercise by the command of Christ is given only to the Apostles and Ministers in the person of Peter; but not to the assembly of the faithful destitute of Pastors. The Major is clear in the text; To the same person to whom the power of the Keys is given, to him by special mandate the exercise of using the Keys is given, v. 19, And I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Behold the power is conferred. And to the same he says, Whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, etc. Behold there the exercise of using the Keys is conferred. Then, if Christ alludes to the place, Isa. 22:22, which is plain in the text, then it is certain that by the keys, the official and dispensatory power is denoted. Then there is no clear testimony by which the power of the Keys conferred on Pastors as such may be proven, if this place is taken from us. Therefore, here is not denoted the power conferred on Peter in the person of believers, and thus on all believers: for what is conferred on believers as believers, that cannot at the same time be conferred on Pastors; because very often there is a contradiction between believers and Pastors, as between believers and non-believers. Then this place is plainly the same with the place Matt. 28:19 and the place John 20:23. But in those places, the power of administering the Sacraments and Baptizing was given. Then to bind and loose are acts of Jurisdiction and official power in Scripture communicated only with Princes, Rulers, and Pastors of the people and Church of God. Therefore, they have not been communicated with all the faithful. The Antecedent is proven. Isa. 52 and 49:9, where Christ is said to loose the imprisoned. Thus in many other places of Scripture. Ps. 105:27, Judg. 15:10, Ps. 149:8, Matt. 22:13, Acts 21:11, Acts 22:4, Mark 3. In which places, to bind signifies the official power proper to Rulers. So also to loose, Lev. 14:7, Ps. 102:20, Jer. 40:4, Ps. 105:20, Acts 2:24, Rom. 7:2, 1 Cor. 7:27, Rev. 20:7, Rev. 9:15, Job 12:18.

4. If Christ neither Matt. 16 nor Matt. 18 says that he confers the Keys with respect to power and exercise to the assembly of the faithful destitute of Rulers; then in the New Testament there are no testimonies by which this power conferred on the faithful may be proved. But the latter is true. Therefore also the former. The Major is clear, because they contend that only by these two testimonies it is proven that the Keys were committed to

the assembly of the faithful. For Matt. 16:18, speaking about the Church built on the Rock, with a change of persons, he turns his speech from it to Peter v. 19, And I will give to you (Peter, not to the Church built on the Rock) the keys of the kingdom of heaven. But what they say, that the keys were given to Peter insofar as he represented the faithful, because he gave that notable confession in the name of the faithful, but not insofar as he represented the College of Rulers, is altogether worthless. 1. Because the Keys were not given to the Faithful as such, and as the Bride of Christ, but as professing the faith of Peter, according to the Adversaries, and as united by such a covenant. Therefore, not on account of that confession, but on account of the profession of that confession. But I ask about that profession, on account of which they want the keys to have been given to the assembly of the faithful, Whether it be a sincere and true confession or not? If the former, all baptized by Pastors not sincerely professing are baptized by those not having power, and are to be rebaptized. 2. He who is excommunicated, the key not erring, by ten not sincerely professing the faith, yet united in the Visible Church, is not bound in heaven; because he was bound on earth by those not having power. But this is absurd, that someone justly bound on earth by the Church is not also bound in heaven. 3. Because the Adversaries want the power of the Keys to be part of the liberty acquired for the redeemed by the blood of Christ. But those not sincerely professing the faith are not to be numbered with the redeemed. But if a profession not sincere makes a Visible Church having the power of the keys; then the keys were not committed by Christ to the Church built on the Rock, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. For nothing is more prone according to Scripture than that an assembly not sincerely professing Christ can, and in time of temptation, actually defect from Christ, and against such a Church the gates of hell prevail.

Similarly, Matt. 18:19, Christ with a change of persons turns his speech from the Church, about which v. 17, to the Apostles v. 18, Whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven. And that whole discourse, as is clear from the beginning of that chapter, was made to the Disciples or Pastors.

But they also argue thus; The keys of the kingdom were promised to as many men as were built on the Rock, as the Adversaries quibble. But this major is neither expressly in the text, nor by consequence. 2. This major is also false, because the invisible Church is built on the Rock, and will never defect from Christ. But the Adversaries deny that the keys were given to the invisible Church; indeed they want them to have been given only to the Visible as such.

But that Christ Matt. 16 addresses Peter insofar as he represented the Rulers, not the Faithful, is clear. 1. Because the power of the Keys, according to the Adversaries, is denied to very many, namely to women and children, who nevertheless give this confession of

Peter no less than the Apostle Peter. 2. If believers insofar as they offer this confession of Peter, and insofar as they are built on the Rock, are that Church which is to be heard, and which has the official power of binding and loosing; then the Ministerial Church is as immune from defection and Apostasy as the assembly of the elect and truly believing; which conflicts with experience and the scriptures. For those seven Asiatic Churches, and also the Roman, Corinthian, Galatian, Thessalonian, Philippian, which nevertheless were all Ministerial Churches, endowed with the power of the Keys, defected from Christ the Rock, and lapsed into grave and capital errors and horrendous Idolatry. But we accuse the Papists of this, especially Gretser on the Inauguration of Luther's Doctorate, p. 29, Bellarmine on the Authority of Councils book 2 ch. 2, Suarez on the 3 Virtues disputation on the Church, Gregory of Valencia vol. 3, Hosius in Polish Confession, John of Torquemada on the Church book 1 ch. 24 and 25, that from this context Matt. 16 they want to construct the infallibility and ἀναμαρτησία [sinlessness] of the Visible and Ministerial Church. And certainly their argument on fundamental points is valid; if those to whom the keys were given can never defect from Christ, and if the Ministerial Church having the power of the Keys is such an assembly as will never defect from Christ. 3. Those to whom the keys were given, from these contexts, represent the person and place of Christ himself, so that it is said of them, He who rejects you rejects me; he who honors you honors me; which is said expressly of Ministers, Matt. 10:40. And of this Church it is said Matt. 16:19, Whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; And thus, those who have this power are co-workers of God, and Ambassadors of Christ. But we never read in the Scriptures that all believers are Ambassadors of God, and that all despisers of all the faithful binding and loosing in the name of Christ are despisers of Christ himself.

5. Those to whom the Keys were committed authoritatively remit and retain sins, and their acts are valid in heaven, just as men believe and repent, or do not believe and repent; as our Theologians teach against Sacramental Absolution. But an assembly of believers destitute of Presbyters has no such authoritative power. Therefore, etc. The Adversaries respond that even believers who are neither Pastors nor Presbyters have the power of remitting sins. Matt. 18:21, Peter says, Lord, how often will my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? Luke 17:3-4. 2 Cor. 2:10.

I respond: 1. Concerning the place 2 Cor. 2:10, the present question is about it, and it is to be understood of the potestative remission of the Church, which had excommunicated the incestuous man. 1 Cor. 5. 2. The private pardoning of an offense between brother and brother, and the public and authoritative one, differ much among themselves. But our argument proceeds concerning authoritative pardoning; For the former is an act of charity, commanded by the Law of Nature, obliging all even outside the Visible Church, indeed even the excommunicated, from whom the power of the Keys has been taken away; for Excommunication does not absolve men from the bond of the Law of Nature obliging

all. Matt. 6:12, 14-15. Matt. 5:44-45. But the public and authoritative pardoning of the Church is of positive law. 2. Private pardoning ought to be done even concerning our enemies, nor ought we to avenge ourselves, but also to commit vengeance to God, whether the offending party repents or not. Nor is private pardoning ratified in heaven, nor is anyone bound to it in manifest injury, when the offending party does not repent, Luke 17:4, except insofar as pertains to the omission of revenge, Rom. 12:14, and the showing of common charity, ibid. v. 20. And thus the Church is by no means bound to pardon the offending party not repenting, indeed it cannot but retain the sins of those not repenting from sins. But Peter, as a private person, offended by a private brother, ought to pardon a hundred times, if the offending brother repents; Luke 17:4. But Peter does this by no power of the Keys; indeed he can privately, as far as pertains to himself, pardon the sins of him who is bound and retained by the excommunicating Church on earth, and also by God in heaven.

6. The keys were committed only to those who have the pastoral Spirit of Paul of summoning, examining, pronouncing sentence, and delivering to Satan. But the faithful, destitute of Pastors, do not have the pastoral Spirit of Paul; for they cannot by that spirit publicly preach, or administer the Sacraments. Some Separatists therefore confess by the force of this argument that some, even destitute of all pastoral power, can administer the Sacraments; which certainly follows from their doctrine. For if the assembly of the faithful destitute of Pastors is the Visible Church constituted in its complete being, there is no reason why any of the faithful cannot exercise all the specific acts of the keys, among which the chief are to preach the Word and administer the Sacraments. Yet this is the opinion, not only of the Anabaptists, but also of the Arminians, in their Confession ch. 21, and also of the Socinians. Thus Socinus, treatise on the Church ch. 1 fol. 140, and Racovian Catechism ch. 11 fol.---.

It is nevertheless worthy of note that Christ, Matt. 18:16-17, addresses the Disciples v. 1, At that time the disciples came to Jesus, saying, "Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" To them v. 18 he says, Truly, I say to you, whatever you bind on earth; And this place is to be expounded by Matt. 16, where the Keys in a more restricted way are given to Peter alone, representing the College of Rulers. For the same Keys which bind and loose in one place, remit and retain sins in the other place, which were without doubt committed to the Stewards of the Church. Nor is there any reason why we should expound the Church, about which Matt. 18, of the assembly alone destitute of Rulers; for it is such an assembly which must be obeyed under peril of Excommunication; but that assembly is without doubt Ministerial.

Nor are we much troubled by what they say, that the Church in the Scriptures always signifies the assembly of redeemed believers, and of those built on Christ the Rock;

because this assembly is the Invisible Church, which the Adversaries perpetually confound with the Visible Church in this controversy.

Finally, all our Theologians, against the Papists, together with the Fathers contend that Matt. 16 the keys were given to Peter, not to him alone (for from this the Papists would forge their Papacy), but in the person of Peter to all the other Bishops, Pastors and Presbyters. Therefore, Gregory Nazianzen, Oration 21, On the Praises of Basil, on those words, I will give you the keys: "For Peter was made a partaker of the same throne with the rest of the Pastors," not with the rest of the believers. And Cyprian, On the Unity of the Church, on those words: "The rest of the Apostles were certainly the same as Peter was, endowed with an equal partnership both of honor and power." And Basil, On the Solitary Life, ch. 21: "He attributes the same power to all Pastors and Rulers; of which it is a sign, that all equally both bind and loose." Theophylact on Matt. 17: "Although spoken to Peter alone, yet they were granted to all the Apostles." Cyril on John: "Christ was remitting the answer to him who was the Apostle greater in order." Euthymius on Matt. 16: "I will give you the keys. But this gift belonged to the rest of the Apostles." Jerome, book 1 against Jovinian: "All the Apostles received the Keys, not Peter alone." Anselm on Matt. 16: "All the Apostles have the same judicial power." And hence it is clear that there is no visible Church destitute of Pastors in the New Testament to which the keys were committed.

It is asked, Whether the Remonstrants rightly teach, Confession 22, section 4, That is the true Church which agrees in the necessary faith and profession of the truth? We teach that this is false, according to their principles.

1. Because to hold necessary doctrine, for them, is to hold very few dogmas approved by all Christians, and called into question by almost no assembly; from which Antitrinitarians, Arians, Socinians, Papists, and all impure sects, which agree in certain uncontroverted dogmas of Christianity, will be the true Church.

2. They expound holding necessary doctrine as holding well that without which the commands of faith and obedience cannot be rightly observed, and consequently the forgiveness of sins and eternal salvation cannot be obtained, in the opinion of God himself. Because since acts of the Intellect cannot be subjected to the command of God, those who heretically think about God in their mind, conceiving God as an Idol, and a man to be revered for his gray hair; and thus, because an erroneous conscience, according to them, obliges to practice, those who worship Idols, as the Papists; who believe Christ to be a mere man, as the Arians and Socinians; who think the three Persons to be three infinite Gods; who believe the Socinian, Vorstian religion to be true, only if they rightly perform faith as defined by the Arminians, and the precepts of obedience prescribed by Christ, are true members of the Church. Jac. Arminius. disp. 20. thes.

3. He holds as Reformed all those Churches which disapprove any presidency of the Roman Pontiff, and profess to render faith and worship to God and Christ. Adolphus Venator against the Dordracene Brothers. pp. 134-135. Why should I condemn nations? to whom doctrines were not so clearly revealed, as to the Apostles, etc., yet they led a pious life. The Remonstrants in their Apology to the Censure of the Professors of Leiden, in the Dedication: They abhor quarrels and disputes about non-necessary dogmas. Their Theology is practical, which, being placed in the reformation of morals, and the correction and direction of the whole life according to the precept of Jesus Christ, orders only the impious, profane, worldly, contentious, cursing, rebellious, implacable to be absent. The same is had by Smalcius disp. 8. on the Church. p. 5. Socinus on the Church. ch. 2. p. 20.

It is asked, Whether the Remonstrants rightly teach, Apol. ch. 22. fol. 257, that it can happen that there is no Church of Christ on earth, but all totally and finally fail? The Remonstrants teach there that if the discussion is about the possibility which can pass into act, it is false that all can fail: But if it signifies a mere and true possibility, not that general one (by which it is said e.g. that it can happen that all men die at one and the same moment, that all think one and the same thing, that a poem coalesces from letters thrown into the air, etc.), it is true.

We teach the contrary. 1. Because if all can fail, the Kingdom of Christ will not be eternal, but will have an end: contrary to the scriptures Isa. 9:6. Luke 1:32-33. 1 Cor. 15:25. Micah 4:7. Dan. 7:14. It is futile what they say, that Christ is not deprived of his kingdom, but remains equipped with full right of the kingdom, and thus is king by right, even if all and each one of his subjects should fail; because his Royal power in no way depends on subjects. Because the Royal power of Christ causatively depends on no mortal: But if all and each one of his subjects should totally and finally fail, so that by the gracious influence of his Spirit, as Spiritual King, he would not actually influence subjects, and would not actually confer peace, righteousness, and joy of the Holy Spirit, which are the fruits of his kingdom, Rom. 14:17, his eternal kingdom would cease, and in this way would have an end. But the perpetuity of his Kingdom in this world, the act (I say) of reigning and of actual rule, is that he reigns over his own on mount Zion, i.e. in the true and living Church. Micah 4:7. Indeed, the eternal peace of conscience will be in his Kingdom; which peace would necessarily fail, if all his subjects can fail. Isa. 9:7, Of the increase of his government and of peace there will be no end, on the throne of David and over his kingdom, to establish it and to uphold it with justice and with righteousness from this time forth and forevermore. Luke 1:33, And he will reign over the house of Jacob forever. But the house of Jacob is the holy seed, the Church, the body of Christ. But if that house will fail and become an Apostate harlot, he will not actually reign over them, but will cease to reign in the house of Jacob. Indeed, not only naked royal power is promised to Christ, but a willing people is promised to him, Ps.

110:3, and a seed to serve him, which will be numbered to him in each generation, who coming will declare his righteousness to a people to be born. Ps. 22:31-32. Indeed, more than naked and titular power belongs to him: and this glory of his kingdom is promised, that they will render to him most devoted obedience. Ps. 72:5, May they fear you while the sun endures, and as long as the moon, throughout all generations. v. 6, May he be like rain that falls on the mown grass, like showers that water the earth. v. 7, In his days may the righteous flourish, and peace abound, till the moon be no more. And what, I ask, does Isaiah ch. 11 say about Christ the king, that shoot from the cut off stump of Jesse, and the branch sprouting from his roots? v. 4, But with righteousness he shall judge the poor, and decide with equity for the meek of the earth. v. 6, The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the young goat, etc. v. 9, They shall not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea.

2. Because God from his faithful promise gave to his Son, as King, and as King whom he anointed as King on his holy mountain, Ps. 2:6, the nations and the ends of the earth for a possession and inheritance, v. 8. A seed to serve him, Ps. 22:31. A willing people, Ps. 110:3. Dominion from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth, Ps. 72:8, 10-12. But if it could happen that all and each mortal would lapse into Apostasy, and there would be no Church; all these promises will be fallacious and void.

3. It is blasphemous and absurd, with all the decrees of God posited, concerning the saving and glorifying of the elect, with the oath of God made to the seed of Abraham standing, Heb. 6:16-18, and made to his Son, Christ, concerning his eternal priesthood, and thus his eternal intercession for his Church, Ps. 110:4, Heb. 10:11-12, Heb. 8:1-2, ch. 9:24-27, with Christ incarnate, dead, and having purchased and obtained the Church by right of Redemption by his death and blood, resurrected, glorified, having entered into heaven, made Intercessor at the right hand of the Father, constituted King and Judge of the living and the dead, and head of the Church: It is blasphemous (I say) to assert that it can happen that there is no Church, which by the oath of God he blesses with blessing, for which he intercedes at the right hand of God the Father, of which he was made King and Head.

4. It is just as contingent on the part of God that all would finally fail and perish for eternity as that letters thrown into the air would coalesce into a poem, and all men would think the same thing; because God no more unfailingly determines men to persevere than letters thus thrown to coalesce into a poem. For, according to the Arminians, both are contradictory, namely, that some cause operate contingently, and that it be unfailingly determined by God; nor does the Dominion of Providence have more place in one than the other for procuring indefectible perseverance, and preserving the Church of Christ on earth; because both are contradictory, as it pleases the Arminians.

6. It cannot be denied that believers honor Christ as King with royal honor. Ps. 45:11, The king will desire your beauty; bow to him, for he is your lord. 1 Tim. 1:17, To the King of the ages, immortal, invisible, the only God, be honor and glory forever and ever. Rev. 4:10, the twenty-four elders fall down before him who is seated on the throne and worship him who lives forever and ever. They cast their crowns before the throne, saying, "Worthy are you, our Lord and God, to receive glory and honor and power, etc." But if it could happen that all and each one would fail, and there would be no Church on earth and in heaven; this royal honor would not be Christ's; And thus the honor of Christ the King would depend on the Free Will of men, that it absolutely be or not be. But if the discussion is about Royal power contradistinguished from actual honor, the Remonstrants make it dependent on creatures in many ways. For first, it is free to parents to generate believers or not; it was free to Christ to be crucified or not; it was free to sinners to crucify him or not: And thus that through resurrection, Christ, equipped with no royal power, and constituted head of the Church, was plainly contingent and dependent on the liberty of the creature.

7. The gates of hell would especially prevail against the Church founded on the Rock, the Church could be nothing, and could be cast down from the Rock into hell; contrary to Matt. 16:18. Isa. 49:15-16. Jer. 31:35-37. Jer. 32:40.

John. 10:28.
My sheep hear my voice.

It is asked, Whether the doctrine of the Marks of the Church is useless and harmful? The Remonstrants affirm it. Episcopius, disp. 28. thes. 1. We deny it.

1. Because we are expressly commanded to join ourselves to the true Church, in which the voice of the Shepherd Christ sounds, Song of Sol. 1:8, Go out in the footsteps of that flock, etc.

2. Because the saints desire to join themselves to the Church. Song of Sol. 5:16, Where has your beloved turned, that we may seek him with you?

3. Because it is necessary for salvation that one associate himself to the true Church. Hence the Apostles want those repenting and believing to receive the Sacraments of the Church, in sign of their union with the Church. Acts 10:48. Acts 2:38-39.

4. Communication with the Saints in the external worship of God is necessary for all who profess Christ, and is contained under the communion of saints, which Christians believe.

It is asked, Whether there are no other marks of the Church than the profession of saving faith, and the external observance of Christ's commands? The Remonstrants affirm it, Confession ch. 22. thes. 78. We deny it.

1. Because the profession of saving faith belongs to all impure assemblies; and therefore profession, unless it be sincere, both as to the act of professing and as to the object (namely, the pure Word of God) which they profess, does not discriminate the Church from all other assemblies.

2. Because the profession of saving faith, for the Remonstrants, is remote from the preaching of the Word, which is truly a Mark of the Church.

3. Because the profession of saving faith and the observance of Christ's commands is a mark of one individual faithful man rather than of the Church; whose Marks are to be sought, not simply insofar as it is a homogeneous body consisting of the faithful alone; but insofar as it is a heterogeneous body, and the house of Jacob, the family of God, the flock, the city of the living God, consisting of pastors calling and persons called out, and the means of calling, the Word heard and the Sacraments. These signs therefore are rightly constituted, the sincere preaching of the divine Word, and the administration of the Sacraments; as they are clearly expressed in Acts 2:41, So those who received his word were baptized, and there were added that day about three thousand souls. v. 42, And they devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and the fellowship, to the breaking of bread and the prayers. Here is the pure preaching of Apostolic doctrine, and the right administration of the Sacraments; and Acts 4:32, Now the full number of those who believed were of one heart and soul. v. 33, And with great power the apostles were giving their testimony to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, and great grace was upon them all. There saving doctrine and consent with mutual charity in the same are proposed as Marks of the Church.

It is asked, Whether the preaching of true doctrine is wrongly established by Ours as a Mark of the Church? The Remonstrants affirm it, Confession ch. 22. thes. 8.

The preaching of the Word has various relations. 1. Insofar as it is the instrument of gathering the Church. And thus it belongs to the Church in becoming; but it is not thus a mark of the Church.

2. Insofar as it accompanies the Church already gathered. In this way it can be referred either to the faithful, or to the unfaithful. If to the faithful, they know the Church to be the Church through the preaching of the Word: just as rational is the specific form of man, so the act of using reason is the formal act flowing from that form, and a Mark flowing from the internal essence: Thus pure doctrine is as it were the essence of the Church; and the preaching of the Word as it were the external formal act flowing from the essence of the Church, and easily known by the Faithful; and although the preaching of the Word is the means of the Church in becoming, it is nevertheless a Mark of the same in being made, which Mark the Faithful easily discerns, and through it discerns the true Church. But this Mark referred to the unfaithful does not thus make the Church known to them by the preaching of the Word; indeed, since the unfaithful do not have ears to hear, therefore the preaching of the Word is equally unknown to the unfaithful as the Church: but in first act and from its nature, it is not equally unknown, but more known by nature and also to us; and in second act, when it convinces, it also makes the Church known. 1 Cor. 14:24, But if all prophesy, and an unbeliever or outsider enters, he is convicted by all, he is called to account by all. v. 25, the secrets of his heart are disclosed, and so, falling on his face, he will worship God and declare that God is really among you. But as long as the unfaithful remains unfaithful, there is no mark which in second act makes the Church known to him.

Nor is it enough what they say, that the preaching of the Word is not a mark of the Church, because it is the action of the Pastor rather than of the Church. For 1. Thus the profession of saving doctrine is rather the action of one individual faithful man (for action is properly of supposits) than of the Church; it is nevertheless a Mark for the Remonstrants: But the preaching of the Word is twofold: one private, or in any way preaching; But that is not a Mark of the Church; but public preaching and relative to the visible assembly called by the voice of the public Herald. Nor do we say that with the formal concional preaching failing, and the assembly gathered to hear the Word and administer sacred things, the Visible Church immediately fails. When therefore we make the preaching a Mark of the Church, we understand the promulgation either by reading, or by preaching, or (if formal assemblies are lacking) by communication of the Word, according to the measure of the Spirit imparted to each faithful; although then the integrity of the Church, which is a heterogeneous body, is violated. Nor certainly is the ratio the same of the whole homogeneous and heterogeneous. For since charity is twofold, as also obedience to the Word and hearing of the Word: one partial or private; the other total and public: Charity and hearing of the Word, in the former way, are Marks of disciples rather than of the Church. By this all will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another. John 13:35. But there is another charity and obedience, public and relative, which are referred to the Word publicly preached; and this is a mark of the Church.

Nor do the Apologists rightly form the state of the Question about the Marks of the Church, ch. 22. fol. 241, of the sign through which he who is ignorant of what the true doctrine is may come into knowledge of the true Church. For the sign which by its nature is apt to make the Church known, and the sign through which someone actually comes into knowledge of the Church, differ greatly. In the former way, we say that the preached Word is not a mark notifying the Church with respect to the unfaithful, but it is nevertheless a notifying mark. One cannot know the college of Grammarians, unless he first knows what Grammar is. If you want to show a man a Courtier by this that he is a man who is clothed in gilded purple; if he is ignorant of what gilded purple is, purple will not be a notifying Mark to a man ignorant of purple.

But that we may more exactly deliver our doctrine of the Marks of the Church, against the Adversaries, Papists, Arminians, Socinians, and Separatists; these distinctions are especially to be noted.

1. The Marks of the Church as true, and of the Church as visible, are different. The Mark of the Church as true is that Christ's sheep hear his voice. John 10:27-28. The Mark of the Church as visible is that it publicly professes and preaches the name of Christ, as the family of God, and his faith.

2. One is the Mark of the Mystical Church, another of the Ministerial Church. The Mark of the Mystical Church is not the simple profession of the Word, but also the sanctity of life: For by this all will know that you are my disciples, that you love one another, says the Savior. The Mark of the Ministerial Church is the pure preaching of the Word: just as the banner is the κριτήριον [criterion] of such an army and discriminating it from all other armies.

3. One is the Mark of the Church in first act, and from itself and its nature notifying the Church. Another is the Mark in second act, and notifying the Church. Or thus, one thing is a Mark, another a sign. The pure preaching of the Word, from itself and its nature, is a notifying essential Mark of the Church to all; because the preached Word is that which expounds to all what the Church is, and how it is discerned from all other assemblies; For what a thing is is not expounded either through what is more unknown, or through what is equally unknown. But the pure preaching of the Word is not a Mark of the Church in second act and notifying, with respect to all and each one; because to very many laboring under blindness, the preaching of the Word is equally unknown as the Church itself. For to the blind the dawn is not a notifying mark of the Sun about to rise; for if you showed to the blind that the Sun is about to rise, because the dawn has already risen, you would demonstrate the unknown to him through what is equally unknown: yet the dawn does not cease to be by its nature and in first act a mark of the solar rising, especially notifying. In

plainly the same way, to the unfaithful, whose eyes the prince of this world has blinded and darkened, the Preaching of the Word is not a Mark of the Church notifying in second act; for the preached Word is equally unknown to him as the Church itself. But what then? The preaching of the Word is nevertheless a Mark of the Church notifying from itself.

4. The preached Word, in diverse consideration, puts on different relations. 1. The preaching of the Word, as it is the instrument of gathering the Church, is a means, not a Mark of the visible Church. Rom. 10:14. 1 Cor. 1:23. Because the preached Word is in reality, by nature prior both to Faith (through which the Invisible Church is constituted) and to the Profession of Faith, through which the Visible Church is constituted. Therefore, it cannot be a Mark of the Church in this consideration. But the Separatists, Arminians, Socinians wrongly infer from this that the preaching of the Word is not a Mark of the Church collected; because the same royal banner is both the means of collecting the army, and also a mark of discriminating the king's army already collected from all others. Then the Word in any way, and in passing preached, before the Church is collected, or the ambulatory, occasional and not fixed preaching of the Word, is not a Mark of the Visible Church; And thus Paul preached to the Athenians and many Ethnics holding the preached word for ridicule and mockery; which assembly nevertheless was not the Visible Church. But the fixed and established preaching of the Word is a Mark of the Church; for where the tents of the Pastors are fixed, there is the flock and the sheepfold. Song of Sol. 1:8. But the preached Word in the state not ambulatory but fixed is either considered as it is simply preached, and solemnly heard, and thus it is a Mark of the Ministerial Church; because visibly Pastoral actions argue for a visible flock; It is also a Mark of the Mystical Church, either existing there, or soon to be; because God does not in vain and for no counsel light the lamp of the preached Word. Or 2. the preached Word is considered as it has the efficacy of the Holy Spirit joined to it; and thus against the Socinians, we say it is both a Mark of the Invisible and Visible Church: Of the Invisible, because the Word preached with fruit gives being, and thus essentially constitutes the Invisible Church. But as the same preached Word falls into the senses, and demonstrates that the Church is there where the Word is preached, it is a Mark of the Visible Church. Nothing therefore hinders, whatever the Racovians teach to the contrary, the preached Word both from essentially constituting the Invisible Church, and from being a Mark of the Visible Church.

5. Some Marks of the Church are improper, accidental, and temporary; some proper, essential, and perpetual. Of the former kind were formerly the glory of miracles, the Fortitude and Constancy of the Martyrs; but these are not Marks either essential or perpetual.

6. The Church, insofar as it is the effect of the Word, and of the immortal seed (by which it was begotten), is more known to us and posterior to the preaching of the Word: because

the effect is more known to us than its cause. But we are now speaking of the Mystical Church of the Saints. Nothing therefore hinders the preaching of the Word from being both more known and more unknown than the Church, in diverse respects.

7. In this Controversy about the Marks of the Church, the discussion can be either about the accurate and quidditative knowledge of the Church, or about confused knowledge. If the discussion is about the former knowledge, the preaching of the Word leads only the truly believing into the knowledge of the Church; because they alone understand what the preached Word is, and from it what the Church is, shown and demonstrated to them by such preached Word; and therefore to them it is a notifying Mark of the Church. But if the discussion is about confused knowledge of the Church, then the preaching of the Word is to the unfaithful and not yet regenerate a Mark more known than the visible Church itself, leading them, as such, by always ruder and more confused knowledge into the knowledge of the Visible Church. And the Word thus is always the means of all knowledge which we can have about the Church; just as the Doctor is more known to the disciple than the Logic of Aristotle; because he shows to the rude disciple the recondite doctrine shining in the Logic of Aristotle.

And by these Distinctions is easily diluted whatever the Separatists, or Papists, or Arminians, or Socinians bring against this Mark. Nor do we want any preaching of the Word to be a Mark of the Visible Church, but fixed preaching.

1. Because Deut. 4:6, To hear and do whatever God commands rendered the Judaic Church conspicuous and visibly wise in the sight of the Nations.

2. Because the Preaching of the Word and Administration of the Sacraments are so proper to the Visible Church that they distinguish it from all other assemblies. Ps. 147:19-20, He declares his word to Jacob, his statutes and rules to Israel. He has not dealt thus with any other nation. Deut. 12:29-32. Isa. 2:2-3. Isa. 59:21.

3. Because the definition of the Visible Church is elicited from Acts 2:42, that it is an assembly which professes the faith and continues in the Apostles' doctrine, in fellowship and breaking of bread. And that assembly is thus discriminated from all other assemblies.

4. The planting and gathering of Visible Churches is always expounded in the Word through the preaching of the Word and administration of the Sacraments. Matt. 28:19-20.

5. Christ's sheep hear his voice in legitimately sent Pastors. John 10:27-28.

6. Finally, the Church is the assembly built upon the doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles, Eph. 2:20. Nor for any other reason is it called the pillar and ground of truth, 1 Tim. 3:15, than because it teaches, professes, and shows to others the Word of God.

Thus Augustine, book on the Unity of the Church, ch. 12. Tertullian against the Heretics. Jerome on Ps. 133. Chrysostom, homily 49 on Matthew, want us to investigate the true Church through the preached Word of God, not through human Traditions.

Chapter 16. On the Ministers of the Word.

Rom. 10:15.
And how are they to preach unless they are sent?

The sending of Ministers is twofold. One immediate and extraordinary; such was that of the Apostles. The other mediate, ordinarily done through the Church. We have a dispute with the Remonstrants about both sendings. The former was extraordinary, because they were immediately acted upon and inspired by the Holy Spirit, so that they could not err.

Hence it is Asked, Whether the divine afflatus with which the Apostles were gifted by God was the norm and rule to which the Old Testament, as far as pertained to the matter which was contained in that afflatus, needed to be interpreted; or whether all their afflatus had to be examined by the norm of the Word? The Remonstrants say that those afflatus did not need examination through the Word of God.

We arrange the matter otherwise. But distinctions are needed here. 1. The ratio is one of those who are divinely inspired, another of the hearers. 2. The authority of those afflatus with respect to themselves and in themselves is one thing, of those afflatus with respect to us another. 3. The ratio of those afflatus in act or exercise is one thing, their ratio in habit another.

Hence Assertion 1. The Apostles themselves in act and exercise, while they were inspired by those afflatus, did not need to examine and prove them, as to the matter contained in them, through the Law of Nature, or through other Scriptures. Reason. Because Abraham through God's inspired address did not need to examine, Whether the slaughter of his son, with God commanding it, was conformable to the law of nature. Because that inspired

command concerning slaughtering his son essentially included the revelation made to Abraham that that command was licit and divinely inspired. From which the address of the Angel to Zechariah, and that voice made to Peter, Acts 10, which both this one and that one resisted, were not immediate afflatus, but a bare communication of the will of God sent to them through an Angel or a heavenly voice.

Assertion 2. But when the Prophets or Apostles were not in the actual exercise of those afflatus, they could doubt, and thus examine those afflatus through the Word of God. From which Jeremiah calling into question whether he himself ought to prophesy, ch. 20:9, I say, "I will not mention him, or speak any more in his name," needed to examine through the Word of God revealed to him ch. 1:7-10, in divine afflatus, whether this was rightly said ("I will no more speak in his name") and also to examine through the afflatus of God whether he was called to prophesy. If also the Apostles had doubted concerning the resurrection of Christ, they ought to examine through the Scriptures their afflatus through which they once believed that article.

Assertion 3. But the hearers of the Apostles and Prophets needed to examine, by the rule of Sacred Scripture and of the natural Law and of the Decalogue, whether what the Prophets and Apostles said was conformable to Scripture. For the immediate afflatus of the Apostles, although in themselves no less authentic than the canon of Scripture, since they contain the very will of God formally and through all the same with the Word of God, and the Word of God in itself is the Word of God and ἀνεξέταστον [unexaminable]; Yet those afflatus with respect to us are not formally the rule of faith ruling, but with respect to us the rule ruled. From which the Hearers needed to examine, indeed they could and ought to prove through the Word of God, whether those afflatus were, as to the matter, the Word of God. Which, against the Remonstrants, is proven.

1. 1 John 4:1, Beloved, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits to see whether they are from God. 1 Thess. 5:21, But test everything; hold fast what is good.

2. Because the Bereans are praised as more noble, Acts 17:11, because they examined the Scriptures daily to see if these things were so, which were announced by Paul, divinely inspired. Therefore, they were not bound to hold the immediate afflatus of Paul, although in themselves divinely inspired, for the ruling and unmoved rule, but to examine them from the Word of God.

3. Because the Apostles, indeed not even Christ, prove what they preached through divine afflatus; but through the Scriptures of the Old Testament, through the Law and the Prophets. 1 Cor. 15:4. Acts 26:22.

It is Asked, Whether the sending of Ministers, through the calling and ordination of the Church, now with the extraordinary Apostolic sending ceasing, is necessary from divine institution? The Remonstrants deny that it is precisely necessary, except in the constituted Church, for the sake of order and decorum. Apol. ch. 21. p. 227. And Episcopius, in the Second Collection of Private Disputations, disp. 26. thes. 4, 5, says that it is right and licit for a Christian man, at any time, to teach the divine word, if he is suitable for teaching, and those who want to be taught seriously and earnestly request it. Thus Andreas Radderius, the Socinian, in the refutation of the Gordian Knot, ch. 4. p. 8: As it is free in the Republic to choose him who is fit to undertake an office; so in the Church of Christ, which is most free, it will also be permitted to choose for that office him who is fit to teach others.

We to the contrary say that not only the δυνάμεις [powers] and gifts, but also the ἐξουσία [authority], through the sending and calling of the Church, from the institution of God, are necessary for someone to be a licit Pastor of the Church: And we prove this.

1. From Rom. 10:15, And how are they to preach unless they are sent? 1 Tim. 5:22, Do not be hasty in the laying on of hands, nor take part in the sins of others. 1 Tim. 4:14, Do not neglect the gift you have, which was given you by prophecy when the council of elders laid their hands on you. Acts 1:23, And they put forward two, etc. v. 24, And they prayed and said, etc. v. 26, And they cast lots for them, and the lot fell on Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven apostles. Acts 6:5, And what they said pleased the whole gathering, and they chose Stephen, etc. Even when God immediately called and sent, it was necessary that the Sending of the Church precede; which certainly was for an example to us: otherwise the immediate calling of God could suffice. Acts 13:2, While they were worshiping the Lord and fasting, the Holy Spirit said, "Set apart for me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them." Acts 14:23, And when they had appointed elders for them in every church, with prayer and fasting they committed them to the Lord in whom they had believed. Therefore, much more now it is necessary that through prayers and fasting the Ministers of the Church be called; and the calling would be profane unless such a Sending of the Church preceded.

2. It cannot be said that God, who is the author of order, permitted anyone at all, without any preceding calling of the Church, who are suitable for teaching, to fly into the chair of the Pastor; since it is required that the Bishop not only be endowed with gifts of mind, but also that he be above reproach, the husband of one wife, sober-minded, self-controlled, respectable, hospitable, not a drunkard, not violent, etc., well thought of by outsiders, etc. 1 Tim. 3:2-3 etc., which to refer to the testimony of the one himself aspiring to the chair, and not to the suffrages of the Church calling, is absurd. He who is such can desire the office of overseer, v. 1, but not usurp it without the calling of the Church.

3. Christ would wrongly reprehend the Thyatiran Church for permitting Jezebel the false prophetess to teach; if it were not in the power of the calling Church to prove, and to eliminate proven false prophets from the Church: And whose it is to reject, his it is to receive into fellowship. And the same was the fault of the Pergamene Church, which bore the champions of the Balaamitic doctrine. Nor would Christ rightly praise the Ephesian Church, because it cannot bear with those who are evil, and would test those who call themselves apostles but are not, and found them to be false; if it were not of the Church from the institution of God to prove and call true and approved doctors, to cast out and repudiate deceivers; as is Rev. 2:1-2, 14, 20.

It is Asked, Whether the Ministry of the Gospel and the preaching of the Word are precisely necessary for salvation? The Remonstrants deny it in Apol. ch. 22. p. 233 and Script. Synod. art. 2. p. 233. Episcop. disp. 28. thes. 11. And the Socinians in the Racovian Catechism, on the Church ch. 11. p. 301, 302. Where they teach that after Scripture has now been revealed and is given to all to be read, the Ministry is not so necessary as useful. The Apologists say that it is necessary from the hypothesis of time, if e.g. the public ministry can be exercised, and from the hypothesis of the divine will: But God (they say in Apol. ibid.) did not will it to obtain, because it is precisely necessary for always and through always, since someone can believe through the Word read and heard. But in Script. Synod. the place cited they teach that it is unknown to us whether God leads many to Christ without the external Ministry of the Gospel.

We say 1. The Question, about the absolute power of God to save, without Christ the Mediator and the Gospel announced, is curious and outside the Scriptures. 2. That the matter of the Gospel, if not the words, are instilled by the Ministry of Angels, or in another way to those who have never heard, we say is an unwritten invention. 3. That through the Word read, and understood in a way equivalent to the concional mode, certain ones believe, we do not deny. But we teach that the preaching of the Word, according to the order revealed to us and prescribed by God, is precisely necessary for salvation to all adults.

1. Rom. 10:14, How then will they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how are they to believe in him of whom they have never heard? And how are they to hear without someone preaching? Rom. 1:16, For I am not ashamed of the gospel (namely, preached, in which name v. 14 he acknowledges himself a debtor both to Greeks and to barbarians), for it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes. 1 Cor. 1:21, For since, in the wisdom of God, the world did not know God through wisdom, it pleased God through the folly of what we preach to save those who believe. 1 Cor. 3:5, What then is Apollos? What is Paul? Servants through whom you believed.

2. He who does not believe cannot be saved. But without a preacher no one believes, because without him how will they hear? Rom. 10:14. Christ's sheep hear his voice. John 10:27-28.

3. Because God commanded it, Matt. 28:19, Go therefore and make disciples of all nations. Mark 16:15, And he said to them, "Go into all the world and proclaim the gospel to the whole creation."

4. From the office of Ministers. 2 Cor. 5:19, That is, in Christ God was reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them, and entrusting to us the message of reconciliation. v. 20, Therefore, we are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us. We implore you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God. 2 Cor. 3:6, Who has made us sufficient to be ministers of a new covenant, not of the letter but of the Spirit.

5. From the practice of the Church. Acts 15:21, For from ancient generations Moses has had in every city those who proclaim him, for he is read every Sabbath in the synagogues. Neh. 8:8, They read from the book, from the Law of God, clearly, and they gave the sense, so that the people understood the reading. And that this will be perpetual is said Eph. 4:11, And he gave the apostles, the prophets, the evangelists, the shepherds and teachers, to equip the saints for the work of ministry, for building up the body of Christ.

6. From the practice of God himself. Indeed he did not will to teach Saul and Cornelius through himself or through an Angel; but entrusted this one to the Ministry of Peter, that one to the Ministry of Ananias. Acts 9 and 10. Justin Martyr Apol. 2. Tertullian, Chrysostom, and all the Fathers in their times preached the necessity of preaching.

It is Asked, Whether the distinction of Presbyters into teaching Presbyters and ruling Presbyters is a novelty? The Remonstrants affirm it, Apol. ch. 21. fol. 228.

We deny it. 1. Because Scripture expressly acknowledges ruling Presbyters. Rom. 12:7-8. Where he distinguishes Prophets into Doctors and Pastors, and distinguishes ruling Presbyters from both, v. 7, if service, in our serving; the one who teaches (namely that one is a Doctor), in his teaching; v. 8, the one who exhorts (that one is a Pastor), in his exhortation; the one who contributes, in generosity (that one is a ruling Presbyter, who is contradistinguished from the Deacons and Ministers of the treasury). 1 Cor. 12:28, And God has appointed in the church first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then miracles, then gifts of healing, helping, administrating, and various kinds of tongues. If from the Apostles, Prophets and Doctors he contradistinguishes administrations i.e. guardians of Ecclesiastical discipline or Elders; then ruling Presbyters are of divine institution. Thus

Acts 15:23, In the Synod of Jerusalem the Apostles, Presbyters and Brethren defined and subscribed. With those things having been written through their hands: The brothers, both the apostles and elders, to the brothers who are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia, greetings. Nor can anyone in an ample assembly at the same time be devoted to the Word of God and prayers (which is of Pastors) and attend to the government of all at the same time with the care that is necessary. Acts 6:2-4. And if to each one a gift is given as God wills for edification, 1 Cor. 12:7, then to those to whom the gift of Government is given, it is given to them for the office of governing: For many are endowed with the gift of Government who cannot teach. And 1 Tim. 5:17, Let the elders who rule well be considered worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in preaching and teaching. Hence we conclude that there are two species of Presbyters; some are those who only rule well; others who at the same time labor in teaching, i.e. some only ruling, and these are worthy of honor; but there are others at the same time teaching and laboring in the word, who are worthy of far greater honor.

The Remonstrants say that Paul wants nothing other than that Pastors endowed with the gift of governing are worthy of double honor; but much more worthy of double honor are those who are not only endowed with that gift, but also who labor diligently in teaching and preaching; nor does it follow from this that there are two kinds of Presbyters.

To the contrary. 1. This exposition would perhaps stand if Paul had said in general that a Presbyter is worthy of honor, much more one diligent and assiduous in preaching; But Paul says in particular καλῶς προεστῶτες [those who rule well], as one species; then he enumerates another species, namely Presbyters laboring in the Word.

2. This καλῶς προεστῶτες is not διακριτικόν [distinguishing], but as the Professors of Leiden note in their Censure ch. 21 sec. 5, it is an indication of the common office. For they are worthy of double honor with respect to the Widows (whom he says are to be honored) and the rest of the common elders, or elders in age. 1 Tim. 5:1-3.

3. By this interpretation οἱ κοπιῶντες [those laboring] in the word, not laboring in the Word, but only ruling well, as Bishops (Thus Cajetan expounds the place, with the Papists) would be worthy of double honor: and thus mute dogs would be to be honored with double honor, which is absurd. But to rule well includes laboring in the Word, as Heb. 13:17, Obey your leaders. Acts 20:28, To care for the church of God includes faithfully feeding the flock, as the whole includes the part. (For no one rules a Family well unless he who uses the Word of God, as the key opening the kingdom of God, and shutting it.) And in this way Paul would say the same thing twice: Those laboring well in the Word are worthy of double honor; and not only they, but also those laboring in the Word are worthy of double honor.

4. Κοπιᾶν, to labor, does not necessarily denote weariness in laboring, but positively denotes labor. 1 Cor. 3:8, κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον κόπον [according to his own labor]. 1 Cor. 15:58, ὁ κόπος ὑμῶν οὐκ ἔστιν κενὸς [your labor is not in vain]. 1 Thess. 1:3, καὶ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης [and labor of love]. Certainly, if I say (says Whitaker), "All Academics who study well are worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in the study of Theology," I either imply that not all apply themselves to Theology, or I speak foolishly.

Chapter 17. On Synods.

Acts. 15:6.
The apostles and elders were gathered together to consider this matter.

We have here an illustrious testimony for the Authority of Councils. In which Question there has been sin, both by the Papists and the Separatists; while the former extol the authority of Councils beyond measure, attributing ἀναμαρτησία [sinlessness] to them; the latter depress the same below what is proper. We proceeding by the middle way inquire how much is to be attributed to Councils, while the Arminians take away all necessity of Councils. From which we premise these considerations in place of distinctions.

1. The constitutions of Synods are understood to obligate either authoritatively, as if commands of God; or charitably, as if counsels and exhortations.

2. A friendly exhortation or counsel obligates, both on account of the intrinsic goodness in the object or matter, in that the counsel of the brethren is the very Word of God; and on account of the authority of the friend counseling and exhorting; For every counselor, as such, is superior; But all superiors are to be obeyed, according to the fifth Commandment of the Decalogue.

3. From this a twofold superiority is to be acknowledged in the fifth Commandment of the Decalogue; One is of Dominion and Jurisdiction; the other is of Reverence and Gifts. The former superiority is the inadequate and narrower subject of the fifth Commandment.

4. All friends, brothers, equals, endowed with greater grace, experience and light, insofar as they counsel us what is just and good from the Word of God, are to be acknowledged as superiors. For indeed if David had repudiated the counsel and persuasion of Abigail dissuading him from inordinate vengeance, he would also have repudiated the counsel of God and sinned against the fifth Commandment of the Decalogue, no less than if the high Priest or a Prophet of God had commanded by prophetic authority the very same thing which Abigail had only privately persuaded. But with this difference, that private persuaders are superiors by the superiority of Reverence, not of Jurisdiction, nor do they have the power of Ecclesiastical Censures, which they would exercise against the despisers and contemners of their counsels and exhortations; which power, however, a Synod and the Church has.

5. A distinction must be made between the power or aptitude of judging, and the Ecclesiastical right of judging. Some inferior Presbytery has the right of judging about many things, about which it cannot actually judge on account of a defect of gifts; and therefore such causes are to be committed to Synods, either Provincial or National.

6. Although the government of the Church through Synods is of positive law, yet with this foundation laid, that the Lord Savior committed to each particular Church the power of the keys, the Government of the united Churches, either in a Province or in a Nation, is of the law of nature.

7. Synods are necessary for the well-being of the Church, and there are always Synods in the Visible Church, either composed of fewer, as in the Parochial Church, or of more, as in the Provincial, National Church, or in a General and Ecumenical Council: For more and less do not change the species. And by the same argument by which it is proved that it is lawful for a Parochial Synod to be gathered, by the same also it is demonstrated that a General Synod of the whole Visible Catholic Church is lawful.

8. Whoever concedes the consociation of the authorities of particular Churches, he must necessarily confess the authority of Synods, both Provincial and National, over particular Churches.

Hence our first Assertion. A General Council, or General Synod, is a congregation of Pastors, Doctors and Elders, made in the name and authority of Jesus Christ, from all the Visible Churches, to some one place, to treat those things which concern the faith, morals, and Εὐταξίαν [good order] or right administration of the Discipline of the Church. Concerning this definition, James Almain can be seen, on Ecclesiastical and Lay power ch. 15, and also John Gerson, treatise on the power of the Church, who hand down the same definition of a Council, except that they want a General Synod to consist of those only who

are in the Hierarchical state, and to be gathered in the name and authority of the Roman Pontiff: Although Almain concedes that a General Council can be gathered, with no intervening Authority of the Roman Pontiff, in three cases. 1. When the Pope is naturally dead, or civilly, i.e., excommunicated on account of some crime or heresy; because it is known (he says) that the Apostolic see was vacant for two years. 2. When the Pope is averse and refuses Reformation. 3. When the time and place were designated by the next General Synod; as was done in the Council of Basel.

The Papists confess that from that Matt. 18, Tell it to the Church, it is rightly proved that a General Council is of divine law. 1. Because a Council is the means of saving and edifying all, both Pastors and Apostles. 2. Because the Apostles, although in prophesying and writing Canonical scripture infallible, could nevertheless err in other things. And if Peter had pertinaciously adhered to Judaism, and had not obeyed Paul or the Church rebuking him, he would without doubt have been excommunicated.

3. By the Church Matt. 18, we cannot understand only the Prelates and Bishops, says the Parisian School on the Power of the Church p. 17, because Christ in those words addresses Peter, a Prelate. But Peter cannot (say Almain and Gerson) be both accuser, and judge, and witness. They therefore think that Peter himself was obliged to obey the Church. 4. The power of the Keys was given immediately by Christ to all the Rulers of the Visible Catholic Church. Therefore, the exercise of this power. And although it is impossible for the Christian Church, by a certain physical necessity, on account of wars prevailing in the Christian World, or other impediments; it is nevertheless morally lawful: for many things are inconvenient, and thus here and now inexpedient, from the depravity of human nature, which nevertheless are morally lawful.

Assertion 2. Any particular Pastor, even outside a Synod, has the Power of Jurisdiction in preaching and determining the truth according to the Word of God. Jer. 1:10, See, I have this day set you over nations and over kingdoms, to pluck up and to break down, to destroy and to overthrow, to build and to plant. Behold, prefecture and power is attributed to one certain Pastor, separated from the Church. 1 Tim. 6:17, As for the rich in this present age, charge them not to be haughty. 2 Tim. 4:1, I charge you in the presence of God etc., preach the word etc. Paul could therefore, as a Pastor, before the Synodical determination was made, Acts 15, by preaching determine that Circumcision was not necessary, and that it was necessary to abstain from things strangled, from blood, and from fornication. Nevertheless, a singular Pastor does not have full power of Jurisdiction concerning his acts of preaching.

1. Because the Church can for just causes deprive him of such power.

2. Because he cannot use the censure of Excommunication against the despisers of the preached Word, unless the Power of Jurisdiction of the whole Church intervene.

3. Because he alone cannot Synodically determine the same truth which he had already before determined by preaching by Pastoral Power; because one singular Pastor is not a Synod. And therefore the Apostle James Acts 15:19 can only say, This is my judgment etc. And although that judgment of James was the very Word of God, which James as an ordinary Pastor could preach; it is nevertheless not a Synodical dogma, nor an Ecclesiastical Constitution, except insofar as it is determined by the Church Synodically gathered. Thus Samuel, as a Prophet, was equipped with the immediate power of anointing David as King: Nevertheless, Samuel, as a member of the Israelite Kingdom, does not have the power, separately and apart from the whole kingdom, of anointing David as King in Hebron. For that anointing and Inauguration of David as King could not be done, except by all the Orders of the Kingdom; but not by some one Prophet.

Assertion 3. There is an authoritative Power in Synods of obligating all particular Churches in that place in which the Synod was gathered.

1. Because if by the common suffrages of the Church Synodically gathered, Acts 1, Matthias is chosen into the Apostolate; then all particular Churches are obliged to have Matthias for an Apostle. Nor can this consequence be eluded, as if this Synod was Apostolic and extraordinary.

1. Because the Adversaries cite this very place to establish the ordinary power of the whole multitude, as the assembly of all Christians has the right of electing their Pastors by free suffrages, even to the second coming of Christ.

2. James Almain, and other Papists, from this place validly conclude that Peter, and thus the Pope, is subject to a General Council, since Peter himself did not want to elect Matthias as an Apostle, except with the rest of the Apostles and the whole Church there Synodically gathered consenting.

3. If this synod was extraordinary and Apostolic, to what purpose are the suffrages of the whole multitude required? For whatever is concluded by extraordinary and Apostolic Power, that can and ought to be concluded without the consent and suffrages of the multitude.

2. Thus also Acts 6, if the Apostles did not ordain, by ordinary Synodical power, the seven Deacons, but by Apostolic and extraordinary Power, To what purpose is the Election of the

Deacons attributed to the whole multitude? v. 5, And what they said pleased the whole gathering, and they chose Stephen, etc.

3. Acts 15, A Synod of many Visible Churches establishes Synodical decrees (which ch. 16:4 are called δόγματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων καὶ Πρεσβυτέρων [the decrees of the apostles and elders], and which are obligatory on other Visible Churches) v. 28, For it has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay on you no greater burden than these requirements. Therefore, the right and authority of Synods is over particular Churches. Those who say that this Synod is not the rule and exemplar of other Synods are far deceived; Their reason rests on a threefold privilege of this Synod. 1. That it was an Apostolic Synod. 2. That the Holy Spirit was present at the Synod. 3. That the matter Synodically determined was the very Canonical Scripture.

But we respond 1. That the Synod is no more to be called Apostolic because the Apostles were members of this Synod, than it is to be called Presbyterian and Ecclesiastical because the members of this Synod were not only Apostles, but also Presbyters, brothers, and (if the Adversaries are to be believed) the whole people.

2. This response is an open way of eluding all the promises made to the Pastors of the Word and the Church of Christ, until the consummation of the world. For all these promises were made primarily to the Apostles themselves. For these promises (Behold, I am with you always, to the end of the age. Also, I will send to you another Helper, the Holy Spirit, who will lead you into all truth. Also, I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which none of your adversaries will be able to withstand or contradict. John 16:13. Matt. 28:20. Matt. 10:19-20. Luke 21:14-15) were fulfilled Acts 2 and Acts 5:29, Acts 4:8-10, when the Apostles were filled with the Holy Spirit. But since these promises were both made and fulfilled in the Apostles; it follows, the hypothesis of the Adversaries standing, that they are by no means made to us; indeed, we who are neither Apostles, nor immediately inspired, nor Synodically gathered in the name of Christ, do not have the promise of such a presence of the Apostolic Spirit, who was both promised and indeed poured out on the Apostles. But this is very absurd. For the same Holy Spirit, though not in the same measure, who was promised to the Apostles, is promised to the whole Catholic Church to be Synodically gathered until the consummation of the age, and to us.

3. But that the Apostles in this Synod set for us an exemplar of an Ecclesiastical and ordinary Synod, not an Apostolic and extraordinary one, a type and living effigy for our imitation until the end of the world, is clear from various circumstances in the text. For v. 2, Paul and Barnabas were sent as Delegates of the Church to the Apostles and Elders concerning this question. But Paul, as an Apostle, perfectly knew the whole mystery of the Gospel, through supernatural revelation, Gal. 1:12, 16, 17, Eph. 3:3-4, 9. Therefore, he was

not sent, as an Apostle, to know more through Synodical determination than he had already perfectly known beforehand. He was sent, therefore, to the Synod, as an ordinary Pastor, and for our perpetual imitation in such cases.

2. Because the Apostles were gathered v. 6 to consider this matter. But as Apostles, they were in no way in need of any Synodical assistance; Indeed, Paul, Gal. 1:16-17, while he was being taught the Mystery of the Gospel, did not consult with flesh and blood, and thus with no Synod. The Apostles were gathered therefore as ordinary Pastors, for our imitation.

3. It is said v. 7 that there was much debate and discussion about this matter. But the Apostles, as Apostles, in handing down the Canonical Scripture, needed neither disputation, nor discussion, nor taking counsel with others: for in writing Sacred Scripture, they were illustrated by the immediate irradiation of the altogether infallible Spirit.

4. They propose their judgments in order in the Synod. First Peter v. 7, then Paul and Barnabas v. 12, and last of all James v. 13, to whose more exact and fuller judgment than the rest the whole Synod, with the Holy Spirit assisting, v. 22, acquiesced. But if they had proposed their judgments as Apostles, there would be no reason why the whole Synod would acquiesce in the judgment of James rather than of Peter, or Paul, or Barnabas; since an equal Apostolic illumination and infallibility led them all equally.

5. Finally, the decree of the Synod is the judgment to which the Apostles, Presbyters, Brothers and in their place also the whole Church, after laborious discussion and investigation of the truth, with counsels communicated here and there, equally acquiesced. But nowhere in the Scriptures do we read that the Brothers were either immediately ἀναμάρτητοι [sinless] and infallible, or collateral causes with the Apostles in dictating or writing Canonical Scripture. For the Apostles themselves, if indeed they had used the Apostolic Spirit, could have proposed outside the Synod this dogma concerning abstinence from blood, from things strangled, and from fornication, to be believed by all Churches whatsoever, no less than the Article concerning the death of Christ, concerning the resurrection; unless they had intended to leave to all posterity an exemplar of Synods, and what is to be done in the Church until the consummation of the age, as often as controversial Questions arise, and conflicting judgments concerning the Articles of Faith; namely, according to the practice of the Apostles, the Question is to be committed to the Synodical determination of Pastors, Doctors and Elders.

First, therefore, we argue thus. If according to the Law of Nature, no one can be a Judge in his own cause, then appeal and provocation can be made from the Presbytery of one

particular Congregation to the Presbytery of many Congregations Synodically assembled. But the former is true. Therefore also the Latter.

For 1. When Paul and Barnabas had a great dispute with false brothers concerning the necessity of circumcision Acts 15:1-2, and they could not be Judges in that cause in whose judgment the adverse party would acquiesce, they appealed to the Synod of Jerusalem. Also, when the Churches of the Greeks and Hebrews contended about alms, and neither party had any Power of Jurisdiction over the other, the matter was brought to a Synod composed of the twelve Apostles and Particular Churches, and there the matter was judged and determined.

2. It is alien to the Wisdom and Providence of Christ, that he instituted no remedy for relieving the poorer and afflicted, as often as they are oppressed by Particular Churches; which nevertheless is proper to the care of Christ, Ps. 72:4. Experience also cries out that a Diotrephes sometimes dominates, and the wicked servant excommunicates his fellow servants. Jerome complained against the Luciferians, that in the time of Constantius and Valens, the Arians had power over affairs. And Athanasius in his Book on the solitary life complained that the Church was oppressed by the Arians in no other way than it was once oppressed in the time of Elijah by the Baalite Priests. And Basil Epistle 17, Now it is permitted for us to say (he says) that in this time, there is neither prince, nor prophet, nor prayers, nor offering, nor incense; From which the Author of the book which is entitled The Burden of the Church, whether Occam or another, ch. 42, and Franciscus Picus of Mirandola in his Oration to Leo X, deplore the calamities of the Church, that there is neither faith, nor truth, nor religion, nor discipline; that Ecclesiastical dignities, Benefices, Bishoprics, and the very Papal dignity, and all things in the Church are for sale. From which Occam, James Almain, clamored that an Ecumenical Synod was necessary, because the Pope in his own cause cannot be Judge. From which the Emperor, Louis the Bavarian, as is in the German Chronicle book 4 p. 297, appealed from Pope John 21 badly informed, to a General Council, and the Pope better to be informed. For the Emperor had been excommunicated, because he had usurped the title of Emperor, without the confirmation of the Pope. Sigismund Duke of Austria appealed from Pius II to the next succeeding Pope and a General Council. Thus Philip the Fair appealed from Boniface VIII to the Apostolic see and a General Council; as Platina says in the life of Boniface. The Gloss also of the Canon Law, can. 27 quest. 3, forbids that anyone judge in his own cause. The University of Paris appealed from Leo X, who impiously rejected the Council of Basel, and also Luther appealed from the same Leo to a General Council.

From all which it is clear that it is of the Law of Nature that those injured and oppressed by the particular Presbyteries of Churches appeal to more General and superior Synods.

2. When common enemies, Heresiarchs and Pseudo-doctors pollute and lay waste many particular Churches, all particular Churches ought, by the very instinct of nature, to come together into one General Synod, with united and conjoined authorities, to repel the common enemy. Thus James Almain wants the power of gathering a General Synod to be charitable and denunciatory, to be in the power of all private persons; although the authoritative power is in the Pope alone, or, as we teach, in all Rulers. From which in the treatise on the Authority of the Church, last chapter, proposition 4, For if (he says) the right hand should be bound, or to the nod of imagination should pertinaciously refuse to be devoted to the defense of the body, then with the left hand will reside the whole authority of defending the body; And if one part of a Province, with enemies wanting to destroy it, should refuse to meet them, who doubts that the remaining part, although it be lesser in number, for the time being has the authority of defending the whole Province? And certainly this is very agreeable to nature, if foreign enemies should invade some Kingdom, or a Province of the Kingdom, that all the inhabitants of the kingdom, with forces joined to repel the public enemy, are obliged by the very law of nature. In the same way, when many particular Churches consociated effect one Visible body, and cultivate one external and visible communion among themselves, both in the Word, and in the participation of the Sacraments, and in mutual admonitions, exhortations, etc., visibly united under one Christ the head, they ought with forces joined to repel all errors, scandals, heresiarchs, and cast them out of that Visible kingdom of Christ; and that not only as Christians, but also as Churches: indeed, every part, and all parts even joined together, are bound to look out for and consult the salvation and safety of the whole. The reason for this connection is, that if the communion of gifts ought to flourish among Christians, then also the communion of authorities among sister Churches, as such. This argument rests on the necessity of Synods. For the Adversaries are compelled to confess the necessity of Synods, by which sister Churches, with mutual counsels, admonitions and exhortations, help each other. But they deny the Authority of Synods, and the power of Jurisdiction over particular Churches; but this is in reality to deny the necessity of Synods. For the Synod of Jerusalem Acts 15, which they acknowledge as an Ecclesiastical assembly, lawful and necessary, commanded and imposed its dogmas and decrees on particular Churches, not only by way of counsel and fraternal persuasion, but by way of authority and power of Jurisdiction. v. 28, For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay on you no greater burden than these requirements. But to impose the burden of a command is not only to counsel or persuade. And ch. 16:4, As they went on their way through the cities, they delivered to them for observance the decisions that had been reached by the apostles and elders who were in Jerusalem. Nor is a Synod a fiction of the Papists, but an institution of Christ. From which it was decreed in the Council of Basel that a General Council should be gathered within five years; then within seven years after the dissolution of the Council; and thirdly that an Ecumenical Council should be gathered every decade; nor is it right for the Roman Pontiff to transgress that prescribed time; And therefore the

asserters of purer Discipline among the Papists, such as Gerson on the Church, and Franciscus Zabarella treatise on the Schism, heavily complained that contrary to what had been decreed in the Council of Constance and Basel, there were now no General Councils. And Bellarmine confesses, on Councils book 1 ch. 6, that the Pisan Council was convoked against Julius II, and therefore that Council was rejected by the same Julius in the Lateran Council. And because most General Councils condemned the Roman Pontiffs and stripped them of Papal dignity, and also dared to strike the heresies and errors of the Roman Church with censures; from this it is that those who strenuously contended for Papal dignity and the Primacy of the Roman See, dared to deny the necessity of General Councils. Therefore Bellarmine on Councils book 1 ch. 10, Just as (he says) in those three hundred years after the birth of Christ, the Church remained unharmed without General Councils; so also it could have remained for another three hundred, and again for another five hundred, and for another thousand. And Pereira in his Commentary on Exodus 19, Disputation 2, number 14, In vain it happens through more (he says) what can be done equally conveniently through fewer. And Pighius book 6 ch. 10 On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy calls a General Council an invention of Constantine the Great, destitute of the authority of the Word of God. And Clement VII said that General Councils were in a certain way useful; But if the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, and his power be called into question, they are dangerous.

Similarly also the Arminians deny the necessity of Councils, as do the Socinians; From which the Remonstrants in Apology ch. 15 fol. 289 teach that the decision made in a Synod is not to be held lightly, indeed also deservedly inclines our minds to a sharper consideration of the decision made; But that it prescribe to anyone, or compel the dissenter to assent or obedience, reason does not permit. And Episcopius disp. 33 thes. 4, For the establishment of divine truth (he says) and the rooting out or extirpation of heresies and errors, we determine that Synods are useful only in that case, if they are gathered for deliberating, ventilating, examining, and persuading by reasons and arguments. To make an end of disputes about the heads of Religion otherwise than by persuading, is both to bring tyranny into the Church, and to bind and tie, if not altogether take away, the liberty of Consciences. Thus the Socinians, Theophilus Nicolaides in the refutation of the Treatise on the Church says, by this reason (Synodically) errors or controversies are not removed, but only force is brought to bear on our consciences.

Similarly the Separatists, denying the authority of Synods, say that Synodical decrees are only as valid as the authority and reason they bring from the Word of God; and those decrees are suasory, not mandatory or imperatory, unless force is brought to bear on consciences. But if this reason were valid, it would follow that the preaching of the Word, and all Pastors commanding faith and obedience in the name of Christ, can only persuade, but not command by authority. For the preached Word is only as valid, no less than a

Synodical Decree, as it has authority and reason from the Word of God. But it is certain that Pastors can command in the name of God. Gal. 1:9-10. 1 Thess. 2:13. Then no confessions of faith, Symbols of Orthodox doctrine, or Declarations would have authority; because all Symbols of faith and all confessions obtain only as much authority as they have from the Word of God. We deny, however, that the conclusions of Synods are of absolute, unlimited, and peremptory authority; yet from this it is not concluded that all authority of Synods is abrogated.

But that, with the other adversaries now omitted, we may deal more closely and foot to foot with the Remonstrants;

It is Asked, Whether Synods are neither useful, nor suitable means for deciding controversies? The Remonstrants affirm, and all Christian Doctors judge that it would have been much more advisable to have abstained from making Symbols, Confessions, rules. Thus Episcopius disp. 26 thes. 10. The Remonstrants' Preface to their Confession p. 10, Thus the Socinians, Smalcius in the refutation of the book on the error of the Arians book 1 ch. 1 p. 6.

We teach that the declarations of Synods, insofar as they agree with the Word of God, are to be stood by.

1. If an erring brother is to be brought to the Church deciding against a Heretic, or pronouncing sentence against a brother who offends a brother, and he is to be excommunicated who does not hear the Church; then Synods have decisive power. Therefore, they ought to be assembled not only for persuading, ventilating, consulting, examining, as they teach. But the former is true. Matt. 18:16.

2. If Christ promised that he would be present with his own, assembled in the name of Christ, judicially pronouncing sentence; then their sentence is to be stood by. But the former is said Matt. 18:20.

3. Acts 15:29, The apostles, presbyters, and brothers, Synodically assembled, deliver dogmas which are to be obeyed in the Lord, and which are called Acts 16:4 τὰ δόγματα τὰ κεκριμένα ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων καὶ Πρεσβυτέρων [the decrees that were ordained by the apostles and elders], which nevertheless any singular Apostle could infallibly determine by himself, without a Synod, unless their intention was to propose an exemplar of a Synod.

They indeed say; But to convince the minds of wavering and false brothers, they gathered a Synod; not because Synods have any authority and right over consciences, was this done.

But this is to concede the whole; because all Synods are gathered for the sake of men. Scripture in itself condemns all heresies; and a private Doctor can refute heresies from the Scriptures. But to convince men, the Lord wanted Synods to be gathered, whose decisions bind consciences only κατ' ἐπεπο [by persuasion], and insofar as they agree with the Word of God. Add that this reason would militate against a Parochial Synod, no less than a National one; indeed in the Corinthian Church, it would not have been necessary for the people to be gathered to excommunicate the Incestuous man; Paul could have done this by himself; but God nevertheless wanted the Excommunication to be done Synodically, to convince the obstinate men.

4. The authority of Synods is to be stood by, if the Synodal sentence of Excommunication, commanded by the Holy Spirit, is to be acquiesced in. 1 Cor. 5:4.

5. If the Synodical doctrine and decision has no authority, neither will the Symbol, which is called Apostolic, be of any authority, which so prevailed by the approbation of Synods, and whose authority the Remonstrants themselves acknowledge: and faith relying on the Articles of the Symbol and heads of faith will always be doubtful, fluctuating, wavering and temporary, not fixed.

6. The Thyatiran and Pergamene Church would be wrongly reprehended, because it did not eliminate Pseudo-doctors; if the Synodically assembled Churches had no power divinely granted to them to pronounce and declare authoritative sentences from the Word of God against erroneous and heretical doctrines.

7. The Presbyters and Churches would have no power of electing their own Ministers; contrary to Acts 1:24-25, Acts 6:5, Acts 13:2, Acts 14:23, 1 Tim. 4:14, if there were no power, no authoritative sentence of Synods, which was to be stood by. Hence Episcopius speaks wrongly, disp. on Synods: It is much more preferable and necessary that each Church strive to cure its own evils, by tolerating, persuading, and counseling. Also thes. 4: We determine that they (Synods) are useful only in that case, if Synodical assemblies are gathered for deliberating, ventilating, examining, and persuading by reasons and arguments. But thus no Church can remit sins, retain sins, condemn a heretic. But it ought to tolerate all heresies and blasphemies, and to want to eliminate and extirpate errors from the Church by persuasion alone, and no otherwise: Christ would have left no reasons for deciding disputes in the Church, no authority, if the matter is to be carried out by persuasion alone; because heretics always have something to oppose; There would be no authority of the Ministers of the Word assembled, to impose silence judicially on those contradicting through the Word of God.

8. From this they deny that the Word of God in the mouth of a Synod finally obligates the consciences of men, because heretics do not see that to be the Word of God, which nevertheless the Word of God truly dictates to be the Word of God. But if this were valid, not only the canon of a Synod, but not even the canon and words of the Prophets, Christ, and the Apostles would obligate consciences; because the Sadducees do not see it to be the Word of God, what Christ says, that the dead are to be resurrected; Hymenaeus and Philetus do not see it to be the Word of God, what Paul says, that the Resurrection has not already happened, but is only future.

It is Asked, Whether those who have the right of suffrages in a Synod ought to be plainly indifferent, and bound to no party? The Remonstrants affirm it, Confession ch. 25 sec. 2, where they expound this thus, that those who are delegated to Synods are truly free; and during the examination of the dispute, are simply bound to no person, or Church, or Confession, etc., but to God alone and Christ, and his holy Word. The reason is in Apol. ch. 25 fol. 287: Because the judge, in a contradictory judgment, ought not to be the other party of the dispute.

I respond: A delegated suffragator ought to be free, that is, during the dispute, sworn to no person, Church or Confession, but to the Word of God alone; he ought to be sworn to no confession as it is human, either during or after the examination of the dispute. But if they want the Suffragator to be simply bound to no party at all, even that which is agreeable to the Word of God, they are talking nonsense.

1. Because Peter and Paul and James, before the Synod of Jerusalem was assembled, prejudged in their mind the necessity of Circumcision and other Ceremonies. Acts 15. Thus Elijah before the Synod assembled with the Prophets of Baal, prejudged the Baalitic worship. 1 Kings 18. And Nicodemus and Joseph, before they set out for the Council, determined in their mind to stand on the side of Christ. Nor would anyone call these illegitimate members of the Council.

2. Because they want the Judges to be with respect to the truth like prime matter, indifferent of itself, or a blank slate, or clean paper, on which nothing is inscribed, whose mind is at the crossroads. But it is necessary that those who are more exercised have senses, who are rooted in the Truth, and established in Christ through faith; for those who are plainly indifferent about some divine truth, they are those who can be carried about by every wind of doctrine, whose light is exposed for sale in the market.

3. Because they thus imply that Synods are useful for no purpose. For if the matter of the Canons is a Fundamental Article, then the Suffragator is by that much better, the more unfaithful he is; which is most absurd. For if he believes the Fundamental Article to be

reduced to a Canon by divine faith, then he is not free, but bound to the other party through faith. If he does not believe, but is unfaithful in this part, then the more unfaithful, the more licit and due the Suffragator is. But in reality they deny that any Canons can be made about Fundamental Articles, because Fundamentals are not truly controversial. But if the matter of the Canons is something truly controversial, contradistinguished from Fundamentals, there is no need for Canons: For if it is truly controversial, even with the examination of the dispute finished, all can be free, and bound to neither party: And thus for what purpose is a Synod? to make a game for the people.

4. Nor did the Remonstrants come to the Synod of Dort free, and not bound to the opinion of Arminius, which they had taught in Writings, in Academies and Pulpits before the Synod was assembled.

5. Right and truth are not in our power; Thus the Apologists in the place cited. No one, Therefore, comes, or rare must he be, who comes to a Synod bound to no party.

Chapter 18. On The Sacraments and Ecclesiastical Discipline.

It is Asked, Whether the Remonstrants rightly say, Apol. ch. 23 fol. 244, that the Sacraments are signs, not only representing and adumbrating to us, but also in a certain way (namely significatively and commemoratively only) exhibiting and sealing? For here they conspire with Socinus, who in his book on the duty of the Christian man (as the most learned men the Professors of Leiden observe in their Censure of the Confession of the Remonstrants, ch. 23) says: When the Lord's Supper is celebrated, the remission of sins is indeed not sealed, but it is only consequently commemorated and preached that it was once sealed together with the death of Christ, whose effect that sealing is. From which the Sacraments are only essentially declarative and commemorative signs, not seals exhibiting Christ and his benefits. In this sense, therefore, we deny the opinion of the Remonstrants, and thus oppose it.

1. If the Sacraments were only commemorative signs of Christ and his benefits; the bread in the Lord's Supper would be no more a seal of the body of the Lord to the one eating, than to others not eating at that time; and Baptism would be no more the washing of regeneration to the one who is baptized, than to the witnesses standing by and beholding the Administration of Baptism. For to those standing by, the water is a commemorative

sign of the blood of Christ; and to those not eating, the bread is representatively and declaratively a sign of the body of Christ.

2. Paul, Rom. 4:11, says that a Sacrament is an exhibitive sign: He received the sign of circumcision as a seal of the righteousness that he had by faith while he was still uncircumcised. The purpose was to make him the father of all who believe without being circumcised, so that righteousness would be counted to them as well. Ch. 6:4, We were buried therefore with him by baptism into death, in order that, just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life. But this burial together is not shadowy and representative, but true and real crucifixion of the old man. 1 Pet. 3:21, Baptism, which corresponds to this, now saves you, not as a removal of dirt from the body but as an appeal to God for a good conscience, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ. But a mute and shadowy sign will be a sign operating in that way only in which the aurora is said to effect the day, which is neither cause nor instrument, but a mere sign of the day.

The Remonstrants indeed say ibid. fol. 245: Those using the signs with true faith, God deigns with the sense of his singular grace; from which it happens that they perceive in their mind the taste of divine grace, as if a certain seal, by which they are rendered more prompt and cheerful to love in return such a benevolent and merciful God, and to celebrate his benefits and praises in the Church. To call them seals in another way, and to say that they seal divine grace, is incomprehensible. But they make the Sacraments merely memorial signs; and thus they detract from their dignity and efficacy and right use. For in this way, he who keeps watch through the whole night, having seen the morning star, is rendered more cheerful, and greatly rejoices at the rising of the Sun; although the rising of the Sun only operates on his mind in the manner of a bare sign, by a merely objective action, not a physical and real one.

3. Paul says in 1 Cor. 10:16, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" If he wishes the bread to be the communion of the body of Christ merely and only by signification, the Sacrament will not be a more efficacious means of salvation than the twelve stones erected in the middle of the Jordan, which were commemorative signs, even by God's institution, of the miraculous entry of the people into the holy land. Indeed, the bread which we eat in private houses can excite a literal memory of the heavenly bread, the body of Christ. But in v. 21 he explains what it is to take the cup of the Lord, namely, it is to be a partaker of the table of the Lord; just as to drink the cup of demons is to be truly and really a partaker of the table of demons. Indeed, the Sacrament will be a sign to the believer in the same way that the bare letter of Scripture is said to be a sign by mere signification.

Nor do we care what they say, that an organic exhibition of grace cannot be conceived which is neither physical nor merely moral and objective, nor both at the same time, but something more, and something relative and Sacramental. For we grant a third, namely, a hyperphysical one, which is neither physical nor moral. Moreover, even among men there are exhibitive signs of the thing signified, which have both a physical and a moral rationale, and more than a bare signification or commemoration. Just as the exhibition of the keys of the Royal Fortress to the Duke is neither a physical handing over of the stones and wood of the Fortress into his hand, nor a mere memorable and moral signification which can be done with bare words; it is nevertheless a real exhibition of the Fortress to the Duke to be guarded. And the seal of a diploma appended to a paper is not a physical exhibition of lands, nor is it a bare sign merely objectively and literally exciting the mind of the Lord of the estate; but it is a real exhibitive confirmation of the lands. The same must be said about the giving into the hand of a stone and clod of earth by the Lord of the estate to him who is legally established as the new legitimate Proprietor or Possessor of the estate; It is not a physical giving of all the acres of land, nor a mere bare signification; but a real transfer and alienation of the estate into the possession or right of the new Lord.

Nor again do we care what they say, that it cannot be understood how these signs concur as instruments or exhibitive means of grace; since the believers who use them, before they use them, are most fully persuaded of the promised grace, and have already beforehand apprehended by firm faith the thing signified by these signs; and since the immediate operation of grace on the mind and will, and instrumental operation, are incompatible. For if this reason were valid, the Sacrament would scarcely be a bare commemorative sign; because even before the eating of the bread in the Supper, the believers have apprehended by faith the grace of Christ. But indeed we say that a more augmented grace is given through the reception of the Sacrament; and although the Organic action of the Sacrament is incomprehensible to us, and because the Arminians cannot measure the thing by reason (by which measuring rod they always try to measure the mysteries of God), should the thing itself therefore be denied?

It is asked, Whether the Sacraments can be administered by any Layman? The Remonstrants, together with the Socinians, teach that it can be done, Apol. ch. 23, fol. 246.

We, with the Scriptures, restrict the administration of the Sacraments to Ministers only.
1. Because in Matt. 28:19, Acts 2:42, 1 Cor. 1:14-17, Acts 10:48, 1 Cor. 11:23, the administration of the Sacraments is commanded and attributed to Ministers only.
2. Because no necessity of the Sacraments (since they are not absolutely necessary for salvation) compels us to depart from the practice of Christ and the Apostles.

The Council of Carthage, Canon 100: Let a woman not presume to baptize. Gratian, de Consecras. distinct. 4, perversely and corruptly adds these words, Unless compelled by necessity. Tertullian, On the Veiling of Women: It is not permitted for a woman to speak in the Church, but neither to teach, nor to baptize, nor to offer. Augustine speaks doubtingly, not with certain faith here, against the Epistle of Parmenianus, bk. 2, ch. 13: If a Layman should give Baptism to one perishing, compelled by necessity, I do not know whether one would piously say that it is to be repeated.

Matt. 28:19.
Go therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

It is asked, Whether the Remonstrants rightly teach in Apol. ch. 23, fol. 252, that Paedobaptism is used by them as an ancient rite; but that it has authority neither from the precept of Christ, nor from Apostolic institution? We deny it.

1. Because we have here the argument of the Holy Spirit. Acts 2:38, "Let every one of you be baptized," etc. v. 39, "For the promise is made to you and to your children." Hence Peter's argument: Those to whom the promise is made are to be baptized; But to the Jews and to the children of the Jews, the promise is made. Therefore, etc.

2. It is God's argument. Gen. 17, To those to whom the promise of the Covenant pertains, to them pertains the seal of the Covenant, even if very many by defect of age are ignorant of the seal of the Covenant. But the promise of the Covenant pertains to all the children of the Faithful. Therefore, etc. The Major is in Gen. 17:7-13, "I will be your God, and the God of your seed;" Therefore, "every male on the eighth day shall be circumcised." But this argument holds for us, because Baptism, as to its substance, is the same Sacrament with Circumcision, and the seal of the same Covenant; as is clear from Rom. 6:4-5, Col. 2:11-12.

3. It is no wonder that the Remonstrants call Paedobaptism into question, since Scripture asserts that Baptism is done for the remission of sins, and they deny that there is any sin properly so called in infants. According to which hypothesis, the custom and rite would be not holy nor indifferent, but plainly illicit and repugnant to the Word of God, that is, Paedobaptism.

It is asked, Whether Baptism is only a temporary rite, not to last until the end of the world by Christ's institution? The Remonstrants say yes. Episcopius, private disputation 29, corollary 1. So the Socinians.

We deny it. 1. Because it is a Sacrament of the New Testament, annexed to the preaching of the Word and the doctrine of the Gospel, and of the same institution and duration with it. Therefore, by Christ's institution and promise, it will last until the end of the world. Matt. 28:19-20, Mark 16:15-16.

2. Because Baptism is commanded to all adults, just as Faith and Repentance, who wish to be saved. Mark 16:16, Acts 2:37-39.

3. Because it is commanded to all families professing faith. Acts 10:47, "Can anyone forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Spirit just as we have?" But the Holy Spirit is received until the consummation of the age; and remains with his own until the end of the world. John 14:16.

4. Because Baptism is a means of regeneration instituted by God, and is said to save us. Rom. 6:2-4, Col. 2:11-12, Titus 3:3-4, 1 Pet. 3:21. And its effect is also the internal washing from sins. Acts 2:38, 1 Pet. 3:21. Therefore it ought to last in this world, as long as regeneration and remission of sins lasts; that is, until the end of the world.

It is asked, Whether Baptism is only a solemn rite, by which we are distinguished from others, and inserted into divine worship, but not through which grace is really conferred? The Remonstrants say yes, Confession ch. 23, thesis 3, Apology ch. 23, fol. 243. Episcopius, disputation 29, thesis 8. Socinus, On the Duty of the Christian Man, ch. 4. Smalcius, disputation 9 against Frantz, p. 299. It is a fable that there is any internal efficacy in Baptism.

Against this: 1. Mark 1:4, "John preached a baptism of repentance for the remission of sins."

2. Rom. 6:4, "We were buried therefore with him by baptism into death." And 1 Pet. 3:21, "Baptism, which corresponds to this, now saves you, not as a removal of dirt from the body but as an appeal to God for a good conscience, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." But to represent in Baptism the remission of sins and regeneration only literally, by bare signification, is for Baptism to be a bare sign.

3. Because the end and intention of Christ is that he might sanctify the Church by the washing of water with the word. Eph. 5:25-26.

4. Because if Paedobaptism is a rite not necessary by divine institution, it cannot be a moral admonition to infants about the remission of sin; since they teach that there is no sin properly so called, which needs remission, in infants. Apology, fol. 84-85.

It is asked, Whether in the Lord's Supper the death of Christ is only announced and commemorated, but no spiritual gifts are sealed? The Remonstrants say yes, Confession ch. 23, thesis 4, Apology ch. 23, fol. 249. Arminius in the Articles to be Considered. So the Racovian Catechism on the Prophetic Office of Jesus Christ, ch. 3, p. 186. We, on the contrary, teach that Christ and his benefits are sealed and really conferred to us, but in a spiritual manner.

1. 1 Cor. 10:16, "The cup of blessing that we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The bread that we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ?" Matt. 26:28, "For this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins." Exod. 12:13, "The blood shall be a sign for you on the houses where you are. And when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and no plague will befall you to destroy you, when I strike the land of Egypt." But the liberation of Israel from the slaughter and killing was real, on that night when the firstborn of Egypt were killed.

2. Because although we deny communion with the physical substance of the body, nevertheless we must acknowledge a real but spiritual communion (as opposed to imaginary and merely significative): otherwise Christ is not given to us as true and real food for the soul.

They object: But we are partakers of Christ's body in the Sacrament only in the way that we are partakers of it in the Word, i.e., by faith alone. I respond: 1. But the Arminians will not say that we are partakers of Christ's body through the Word in any other way than by signification and moral action alone. 2. Calvin, Institutes bk. 4, ch. 17, sections 7-9, calls it a deep and wondrous communion. And Beza, in his treatise on the Sacraments, says it is an incomprehensible mystery. But although it is a communion by faith, by which as with a spiritual mouth we eat the body of Christ, yet it is not by faith alone, which accompanies the preaching of the Word; but as faith perceives the gracious exhibition of the things contained in the Sacrament: since God truly exhibits grace really at the presence and right use of the Elements and rites.

It is asked, Whether the Remonstrants rightly deny, in Apol.c.24.fol.256, that the Church in the act of Discipline exercises absolutely no power; not only not carnal power, such as the Magistrate exercises; but not even internal and Ecclesiastical power, which holds the conscience of the guilty party bound before God, and excludes him from the kingdom of heaven, on account of the crime of heresy? We deny it.

1. Because the voice of the Church, proceeding against a Heretic with an unerring key, is the voice of Christ, according to that, He who despises you, despises me; he who hears you, hears me. And, Whose sins you shall remit, they shall be remitted; whose you shall retain, they shall be retained. Therefore, if Christ has coercive power over him who errs concerning Fundamentals, and believes Christ to be an Impostor; the Church has the same coercive power under Christ. And if Christ binds principally, the Church also binds ministerially.

2. Because this is the same as what they teach elsewhere, Apol. cap. 24. fol. 277. Any sect will be able to exercise Discipline, according to the dictate of its conscience; and what is permitted to us against others, the same will be permitted to others against us, without prejudice to the pursuit of piety on either side, and to the obedience which is owed to Magistrates. Hence the Arians lawfully and according to the rules prescribed by Christ the King, excommunicate us: And it will be permitted to the Anabaptist Sect, the Socinian, the Arian, to excommunicate and proscribe from heaven all other Sects; (for this their conscience dictates) and it will be permitted to us, to excommunicate and proscribe from heaven the Socinians, Anabaptists. And to proscribe from heaven those believing Christ to be a mere man, and to proscribe from heaven those not believing Christ to be a mere man, but to be true God, makes the objects of two licit acts of Discipline to be contradictory dogmas; which is altogether absurd.

3. Because they suppose the private dictate of conscience to be the rule binding the conscience in the exercise of Discipline. Rightly therefore, the Sect of the Papists, if it does not struggle against the dictate of its conscience in its Discipline, has struck us with the thunderbolt of Excommunication. Why then do we renounce the infallibility of the Pope?

4. They deny, or call into doubt, the power of Ecclesiastical Discipline compelling consciences, not only concerning those erring, i.e. erring by simple error of the mind, but also concerning those sinning. Concerning sinners (say the Apologists) we see this happen, how much more is it right for this to happen concerning those erring? And perhaps it will be safer to tolerate the erring person, as long as he is honest and pious, for a very long time, than ever to keep him away from our assemblies, if he enjoys them, if he loves them. But if error is not a fault, as they teach, it deserves pardon and mercy; indeed it is innocence and piety, indeed (Ibidem) properly called innocence; then not perhaps at last, but never should the erring person, i.e. the excommunicated person, be kept away from our assemblies: Because Excommunication is a punishment instituted by Christ; and the Church ought not to punish the non-sinner, much less can it punish a man on account of properly called innocence. If therefore any Jew, from simple error of the mind, believed Christ to be a False-prophet.

Chapter 19. On the Magistrate.

Rom. 13.4.
For he is God's minister for your good. But if you do what is evil, be afraid; for he does not bear the sword in vain; for he is God's minister, an avenger for wrath to the one who does what is evil.

It is asked, Whether it is lawful for the Magistrate to inflict capital punishment on the wicked and murderers? Some Remonstrants deny it: as Henricus Welsing. lib. on the duty of the Christian man. p. 1. Henricus Slatius in open Declaration. page 53. Joan. Geisteranus on the duty of the Magistrate: And the Socinians. Ostorodius Instit. Relig.cap.28. Smalcius disp.6. on the civil Magistrate, against Frantzius, They deny, that the Magistrate can shed blood; they deny, that Wars are lawful for Christians. The Society of Remonstrants in its Confession, indeed does not deny it; But neither does it assert it openly enough, as the Leyden Professors have well noted. Punctured by whose Censure, in Apol. cap. 12.p.141. they speak more openly; but when they knew, that there were among their own, who had denied it in public writings, they say that those are to be tolerated, who hold, that it is not lawful for the Magistrate, to animadvert on the innocent by shedding blood and capital punishment.

We altogether affirm that it is lawful, and we openly disapprove and reject the contrary opinion, as erroneous.

1. Because Gen. 9.6. Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed. Exod. 21.14. But if anyone acts presumptuously against his neighbor, to kill him by cunning, you shall take him from my altar to die. Num.35.31. Moreover, you shall take no ransom for the life of a murderer, who is guilty of death, but he shall surely be put to death. But that this is not a Judicial and temporary Law, but of the Law of Nature, is evident from the effect; because innocent blood cannot otherwise be expiated; which is never said of the Ceremonial, or Judicial Law. Verse 33. So you shall not pollute the land in which you are; for that blood would pollute this land: but for that land, no atonement could be made,

except by the blood of him who shed it. Matt. 26.52. All who take the sword will perish by the sword. But not all murderers will in fact perish by the sword. Therefore, Christ speaks of the right, which the Magistrate has.

2. Because the Remonstrants urge the place Gen.9.6. not only against killing, but also against any shedding of blood. But by no distinctions can it be avoided, that under the N. Test. it is lawful for the Magistrate to bear the sword; because, by divine institution, Rom.13. he bears the sword, as the minister of God, for vengeance. But the sword is an instrument, not of a pecuniary fine, but of shedding blood. And there are many places in the N.T. if they are pressed according to the letter, as the Arminians expound them with the Anabaptists, which evidently prove that no revenge, either pecuniary or in any way corporal, is lawful to be taken on parricides or matricides or the most wicked assassins and regicides. And thus it will be necessary that the Magistrate compensate parricide and regicide with good and love, as is expressly Matt. 5. 39, 43. Indeed, one must not even resist the one who wants to remove the King, Parents, Country, from our midst by sword and fire and being burned alive; and to such assassins, one must only wish well, do good. Hence the Magistrate only bears the sword, to flatter with prayers, and sweet entreaties, soft words all the execrable pests of the Church & Republic; And Christ himself acted against his most gentle precepts, who with a whip made of cords, cast out the sellers & buyers from the Temple. Nor will they give me in the whole N.T. a place (unless the place Matt. 5. is expounded of private men, seizing by force the vengeance of private revenge) from which they will conclude, that the Magistrate is other than an unarmed Monitor, who can use neither sword, nor any force by right against the wicked and the most execrable guilty. Let them produce the place! Indeed, in this way, food must not be denied to the one stealing and not working with his hands, nor any punishment inflicted on anyone; but the lightning from heaven must be awaited on the heads of all the guilty. And thus Magistrate & King, will be mere names. For where in the N. T. are the laws about Incest, Adultery, Theft, about Sodomy, and monstrous lust between men & beasts, to be punished by death?

3. We must be subject to Kings & Governors, who are sent for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of those who do good. 1 Pet. 2.13,14.

4. If the killing of men in War were unlawful, John the Baptist would have responded badly to the soldiers asking the way to eternal life, allowing them to live in that unlawful life without reproof, and only teaching the way & manner, by which they should live in unspeakable murders, Luke 3. 14. So also Peter, would have taken less care for the salvation of Cornelius, Acts 10. Nor could faith, than which there was none greater in Israel, Matt.8. in the Centurion, nor justice & true conversion to God in Cornelius, consist with daily conversation in War; if War were unlawful.

5. Because many Wars, with Christ the Lamb as Leader, Sponsor & Approver, are made in Revelation against the Dragon & Beast. Thus 1 Cor. 9.7. Luke 3. 14. &14.31 , 32.

6. The Adversaries teach, that the Magistrate ought to inflict punishments according to the quantity of the fault. Therefore, homicide is to be punished by shedding blood unto death.

7. It is the Law of Nature, to repel force with force, and, in the unjust defense of life, to kill rather than be killed.

It is asked, Is it not the Magistrate's duty to punish the Heretic? Or is it in agreement with the Laws of our most merciful Savior Jesus Christ, that the Magistrate tolerate in the Republic Jews, Turks, Papists, Arians, Socinians, Libertines, & all Heretics, erring by pure error of the mind?

In this Question, these distinctions are to be observed.
1. A distinction must be made with Bullinger decad. 2.ser.8. between the Heresiarch, & seduced men.
2. With Polyander, in Synopsis of Purer Theology. disp. 50.thes. 57. between the blasphemer, & another heterodox person.
3. Between the universal Apostate from Christianity, & between the one attacking or denying a Fundamental article.
4. It is one thing 1. Knowledge. 2. Another, conscience. 3. Another, external profession.
5. It is one thing positive profession; another, negative.
6. It is one thing common punishment; another, capital punishment.
7. It is one thing a curable error; another, incurable.
8. It is one thing cumulative power; another, privative.

Assertion 1. Liberty of pure knowledge & opinion ought to be granted by the Magistrate to all men, thus far, that the Magistrate cannot compel anyone to think or feel this or that in Religion. Because the acts of the mind, since they are internal, are not subject to the Authority of the Magistrate. The Magistrate can command the informing of the mind, through Doctors & Pastors; but not the opining of the mind.

Assert. 2. The power of the Magistrate over conscience, directly & immediately, is none; yet indirectly & secondarily, the Magistrate has an accumulative power over conscience; because he can command, that one diligently & earnestly apply oneself by all means to Orthodoxy. But he has no privative power; because the King, the tyrant, no created power can deprive the conscience of the liberty of thinking rightly about God.

Assert. 3. The Magistrate ought to compel the Heretic to a negative profession of sound faith, i.e. he ought to & can compel the Heretic, not to profess, teach, or disseminate externally anything in the exercise of Religion, which is contrary to sound faith. Hence we think that all, openly & plainly professing a false Religion, are to be punished according to the quality of the offense.

1. Because the Magistrate bears the sword for the punishment of evildoers, Rom. 13.4. 1 Pet. 13,14. But such Heretics, are evildoers; & Heresy is a work of the flesh, Gal. 5. 20. But the King is not the Minister of God, if he does not restrain those thinking & professing wrongly about the Divine Majesty.

2. Those whom the Church ought to punish Ecclesiastically, as scandalous, the Christian Magistrate, as Keeper, Foster-father, Tutor, Defender & Protector of the Church, ought to punish with a civil punishment: the office of Keeper, Tutor, & Protector demands that. But the Church ought to convict those contradicting, & excommunicate the contumacious, & avoid them as Heretics.

3. Public false Religion against God, either is a public sin, or not. If the latter, men can be saved in any Sect or Religion; which is absurd, since there is one faith. Eph.4.5. & salvation through the name of Jesus alone. Acts.4. 12. If the former, the Minister of God ought to punish & restrain it.

4. Because if this reason of the Remonstrants were valid, that Heretics are not to be restrained by the sword, because Religion is persuaded only by reason, not by sword, flame, & force; then this reason would prove, that not even Blasphemers & Heresiarchs (who in their erroneous consciences believe, that they are obligated by the greatest crime, if they do not teach their deadly Heresies about Christ the False-prophet, and indeed in public places) are to be restrained. But they teach that it is lawful & necessary for the Magistrate, to forbid the Teachers of deadly errors the temples & public places. But thus it must be answered; That it is to be persuaded by reason, that such a Heresiarch ought not to teach in public places the doctrine, which he believes to be salutary & necessary for saving souls; but he is not to be kept away from public Temples by force & sword.

Assert. 4. The Magistrate cannot directly compel the Heretic to a positive profession of sound faith, & to profess as salutary truth, what he thinks to be blasphemy; because thus he could compel him to hypocrisy: But he can compel him to put off the erroneous conscience, in weighing, hearing, & learning the causes, means, & reasons & motives.

Assert. 5. The Magistrate ought to inflict capital punishment on blasphemers, & those professing heretically & blasphemously about God, & defecting from Christianity to Judaism, or another false Religion.

1. Because God commands this. Exod. 22.20. He that sacrifices to other Gods, except to God alone, let him be destroyed as anathema. The Law is Deut. 13. The dreamer, & the one tempting to serve foreign Gods, to be killed without any indulgence. The worshipper of the Sun & Moon, to be stoned. Lev.24.16. Whoever curses his God, shall bear his sin; & he that blasphemes the name of the Lord, shall surely be put to death.

These laws indeed do not pertain to us, as Judicial (as Beza notes on the punishing of Heretics) 1. Because they are prescribed by Moses, not by our Magistrate; to the Israelites, not to us. 2. Because they speak of bodily sacrifices &c. 3. Because they were made against dreamers. These now cease among us. But as far as natural equity is concerned, it cannot be proved from the Scriptures, that these Laws are of those, which are taken away by the death of Christ; unless they say, that it was effected by the death of Christ, that to blaspheme the name of God, since it was a sin among the Jews, is lawful or indifferent to us; or if it is a sin, it is a sin taken away by the death of Christ, at least thus far, that it ought not to be punished by the Magistrate.

2. Because the edicts of King Nebuchadnezzar are praised, which did not pertain to the Political or Judicial Law of the Jews. Dan. 3.29. & of Artaxerxes, Ezra 6.11. & 7. 25. 26. decreeing death & eradication to those, who spoke blasphemy against Jehovah, & refused to obey the Law of God. So 2Chron. 15, 13. Ezra 10.8.

3. This is not a little confirmed by the examples of Jehu, who slaughtered the Priests of Baal; Josiah, butchering the Priests of the High places; Elijah, killing the Priests of Baal at the brook Kishon; Peter, striking Ananias & Sapphira; Paul, striking Elymas the Magician with blindness. All these prove by the lesser, that it is much more lawful for the Christian Magistrate to devote blasphemers to death, since the Justice is natural in both cases, since this sin is most serious, not less than parricide.

Assert. 6. Where seduced men err by others; there one must act with much patience & with all gentleness, the repentant are to be pardoned, & the erring are to be restrained by a lighter punishment in any case.

It is asked, Whether no one errs on purpose, or persuades himself to err, when it is a matter of his eternal salvation? The Remonstrants say, Apol. fol. 278. We deny.

1. Because on purpose, Jeroboam, to establish his kingdom, erected golden calves; & deliberately, Solomon sacrificed to foreign Gods: & it was clear to both that it was a matter of eternal salvation.

2. Because thus one could not lie, that God is bodily, the author of sin, for the sake of shameful gain or vain glory: which is contrary to experience.

It is asked, Whether that blasphemous Heretic is not he, who strives to prove his blasphemy by the Word of God; & is touched by so great a reverence for the Divine Word, that he would prefer to undergo a thousand deaths, than to desert it? The Remonstrants, establish such a Heretic as harmless, honest, & pious. Apol. cap. 24. fol. 263. We deny.

1. Because those whose conscience is seared with a hot iron, can be so judicially hardened by God, that they believe their Heresy to be in conformity with the Word of God, & undergo death for it: as is evident in the Priests of Baal, & in the Jews, who from the Old Test. contend that the Son of Mary is an Impostor, & are prepared to die for that religion of theirs.

2. Because thus a blasphemer abominable to God would never be found in the nature of things, who with a bewitched conscience would believe, that Christ is a seducer most bitter enemy of God the Father, & that his Religion, is a fable; that it is lawful, indeed pious to kill Christ & the Apostles; which is contrary to the Scriptures. For what is to be said of those, who believe the immolation of their children to Molech, to be a religious obedience, such as God commanded to Abraham? Jer. 7. 31. Likewise about the murderers of Christ & the Apostles. Math. 26.65, 66. 1 Cor. 2.8. Joh. 16.2,3.

3. Because the chief reason, why it is not lawful for the Magistrate to inflict capital punishment on the Heretic, is, because the Magistrate, & no mortal, can judge about the hidden heart, whether he holds that blasphemy against the dictate of conscience? But thus, he who defends that God is a body to be worshipped in an Idol, & that the Son of God is an Impostor, & that there are three Gods, cannot but be tolerated; Indeed, he who rubs the gangrene of his false doctrine on others, cannot be kept away from public places by corporal force; (contrary to what they themselves teach. Apol. cap. 24. fol. 257.) Because whether internal obstinacy accedes to blasphemy, only the Heart-knower knows. And thus Moses, & the Kings of Israel, & the people, could not stone the one soliciting to the worship of false Gods; because it could be, that that Heresy, was piety itself & innocence. What? Does the people know the hidden things of the heart? Nor can any Heretic, be he Hymenaeus, who made shipwreck of faith, be excommunicated; indeed not even publicly reproved by the name of Heterodoxy, or marked by any censure; because, whether he is

obstinate, or seduced by simple error of mind? only the Heart-knower knows, not the Church, nor any mortal.

It is asked, Whether the power of the Magistrate, in the external Government of the Church, is supreme, immediately subject to God alone, superior to the power of the Church in general? The Remonstrants say, Apol. cap. 25. fol. 291. 292. We deny, & determine the matter by these Assertions.

Assertion. 1. The King, as a member of the Church, is subject to the Royal Power of Christ reigning in the Word & Ecclesiastical Discipline.

1. Because it is said of all without exception (But it is not to be distinguished, where the Law does not distinguish.), He who hears you, hears me; he who despises you, despises me.

2. Because Ministerial authority in the name of God, above Kings, is given by God to the Prophets & Pastors of God. Jer. 1. 10. See, I set you this day, over the nations themselves & kingdoms, to pluck up &c.

3. Because all created Power is subject to the Royal Power of Christ in the Word & act of Ecclesiastical Discipline, which is an act of Christ's royal power. Psal. 2.12. kiss the Son, lest he be angry. Psal. 72.10. The kings of the ocean, the inhabitants & islanders shall bring a gift; the kings of Sheba & Seba shall offer a present. v.11. Finally all kings shall bow down, showing him honor, all nations shall serve him. Christ is the King of Kings & Lord of Lords Rev. 17. 14. & 19. 16. Therefore, Kings are his subjects, & subject to his laws.
4. All in the Church, are either the Supreme Pastor, or sheep. Christ alone is the supreme Pastor; The King, Therefore, is a Sheep: He is bound, Therefore, to hear the voice of Christ speaking & commanding through his servants: He is subject, Therefore, to the power of binding & loosing, granted to the Church. For what belongs to Christians, as Christians, belongs to all Christians; and so to the Christian King.

Assert. 2. The King, as King, is the keeper of both tables, & the supreme governor in all causes whatsoever, both Ecclesiastical & Spiritual, and Civil & Temporal, by political government & civil influence. But he is not the true, proper, or supreme governor, & Judge of Ecclesiastical causes, contradistinguished from Political ones. Reason. In every Ecclesiastical cause, there are two things; one Political, which touches the King & human Law, as the subject is subject to the King commanding in his Sphere; & so far the King is the supreme Judge. The other Spiritual & Ecclesiastical; & this is subject to Ecclesiastical judgment, not to the King. For if the King, were simply the Judge of all causes even Ecclesiastical; then he would be Judge about the Translation of the Bible from the Hebrew & Greek fountains into Latin or the vernacular language, even if he did not know the

Hebrew letters: Indeed he would be Judge of all Philosophical Disputations, of all Questions about Navigation, Military matters, Agriculture; which is to place the King below the King, while they strive to honor him. Whatever is Political in such Questions, which concerns civil right & law, that pertains to the King, in his sphere, Rom. 13.4. He is the minister of God, Isa.49.23. And kings shall be, your nursing fathers; & women princes, your nursing mothers. Psal. 101.8. Each morning I will cut off all the wicked of the land, to cut off from the city of God, all who work iniquity,

Assert. 3. Hence the Doctors rightly say, that the King through his royal authority, exercises commanded acts, not elicited ones concerning Ecclesiastical matters; just as the will & the governing & ruling faculty, exercise royal & commanded acts, concerning all faculties, both of soul, & of body. The will commands the eye, to see; the ear to hear; the locomotive faculty, to walk; but the will itself, has no elicited acts in these; nor does the will itself see, hear, move from place to place.

1. Because the offices of the King & Ecclesiastical Rectors are distinguished by object, nature & species; Therefore, the King, as King, cannot preach, ordain Pastors, Synodically make canons, & impose them on the Church.

2. What belongs to the King per se, belongs to all Kings, even Heathen ones. But it does not belong to all Kings to do this, as the Adversaries confess.

Assertion 4. Nor is it true what they say, that the King, although not as King, yet as a Christian, i.e. as such a King, properly directs & disposes in Ecclesiastical Government (as Camero speaks, Prelections tom. 2. pag. 50.) while the Ministry & exercise properly belong to the Ecclesiastics. Trifling nonsense!

Who would bear, that the King has the power of preaching the Word, administering the Sacraments, exercising Ecclesiastical discipline, prescribing canons: But that the act & exercise of preaching, &c. properly belongs to the Pastors?

For 1. The Power of exercising the act of a Pastor is in the Pastors, namely, the authority conferred on them for edification, & for exercising the acts of Discipline. Matt.18.18,19,20. Mark 16.15,16. Eph. 4.11, 12. 1 Cor. 4. 1, 2, 21. 2 Cor. 2, 10, 11. 2 Cor.10.8.

2. Thus the Ministers would be only the hands, instruments, & executors of the will of Kings, & Pastors preaching in the name & authority of the King, & exercising acts of Discipline. But they are the servants of God, Ambassadors acting in the name of Christ. 2 Cor.5.20. Gal. 1. 1, 2.

3. It is especially to be noted, that the Christianity of the King extrinsically accruing to the office, does not superadd to the Christian King a new authority, which he did not have before, by which he could dispose of Ecclesiastical matters; but Christianity only as it were extends & intends the pre-existing Civil & Political Power, more widely & intensively. Because a Heathen & Mahometan King is equally essentially a King, & obligated from the office of the Royal function (this being granted, that the Gospel is revealed to him) to contribute his Regal Authority to the amplification of Christ & his kingdom, as much as a Christian King. Which I want said about the obligation of the Law, not about the obligation under the mode of special gratitude, according to that; To whom much is given, from him much will be required back. Luke 12. 48. But the Christian King, not as King, but as such a King, as a Christian, is bound to contribute his Authority, for the measure of grace received, more copiously & earnestly to the good of the Church, than the King simply, & the Heathen King, who has heard nothing about Christ. Therefore the King as Christian, is subject to a greater obligation, than the Heathen King; but he is not endowed with a greater royal power in the first act. Because it is said of all Kings, Prov. 8.15. By me Kings reign.

Hence it is easy to judge about the Canon of the Pseudo-Bishops of the Scottish Church obtruded in the Book of Canons, in the Year 1637. cap.1.c.2. Whoever shall hereafter affirm, that the King's Majesty does not have the same Power in Ecclesiastical Causes, which the pious Kings of the Jews had, & the Christian Princes in the Primitive Church; or shall in any way diminish his Regal Prerogative, let him be excommunicated &c. But 1. The Canonists are guilty of Lèse-majesté, who want the Regal power to belong to the King, as he is pious & religious, just as the pious Kings of the Jews & Christian Princes were, but not as he is King. From which it follows, if the King becomes impious or Heretical, no regal Prerogative belongs to him; which is openly quite Jesuitical, & the foundation of this doctrine of the Jesuits, that the impious King & one hostile to the Catholic-Roman faith is to be cast down from the throne. And it is clear that this is their mind; because they say, to deny to the King the same Regal authority, which pious Kings formerly had, is to diminish the King's Regal authority. But the King's Authority is thus diminished: unless we say, that the Authority is the same, which both belongs to the King, as King, & which belongs to him as a pious & religious King. But these are distinct. But they have not a word in this Canon about the King's Authority, as he is King.

2. The Canonists leave in the middle, what is the King's Authority here, since they confuse here the pious Kings of the Jews, & the Christian Emperors. Because the Kings of the Jews, are either considered, as Kings; or as Prophets, as David, Solomon. If they are considered as Prophets, they wrote Canonical Scripture, & prophesied. Are those to be excommunicated, who deny to the King the Power of writing Canonical Scriptures & prophesying, preaching, & exercising truly pastoral acts? Really? If they are considered as

Kings, then they say nothing in the Canon, except that those are to be excommunicated, who deny that authority in Ecclesiastical causes to belong to the King, which belonged to all Kings not only pious, but also impious, Ahab, Domitian, Nero, Julian. Then it is certain, that the pious Princes in the Primitive Church, did not have equal Power with the pious Kings of the Jews who were both Kings & Prophets. If what they usurped in fact in the Primitive Church, is attributed to our King; they fight slipperily & in bad faith for the King's authority. If what by right belongs to the Emperors in the Primitive Church, is to be attributed to the King, then they say nothing, & badly name here the pious princes; & it is a begging of the question, because they ought to explain, what Authority in Ecclesiastical matters is rightly owed to the King, lest the innocent be struck in the darkness, by their Excommunication.

Assert. 5. Certain spiritual acts belong to the King, as King; For as King, & from the office of the Royal function, he can & ought to exhort & with royal authority command, that all idle bellies, all Ecclesiastics panting after Court honors, should betake themselves from there, to feeding the flock of the Lord; Indeed he ought to command, that whoever in his Kingdom, what is his from office, should perform it diligently. 2 Chron. 24. 5. And Hezekiah said to them, Listen to me, O Levites, now sanctify yourselves, & sanctify the house of your ancestors, & bring out what is to be separated from the Holy place. For thus Jehovah had commanded. Num.8. 6,11. & 18. 32. And this exhortation, as to the substance of the command, does not differ from the Ministerial one; But as to the Authority of the one commanding, & the penality to be inflicted, it differs. The King from royal authority, & under threat, censure, & civil punishment (for would that Kings would flog Pastors who are slothful, intent only on the belly, the Court, & honors!) the Pastor commands the same from Ecclesiastical Authority, & under the penalty of spiritual Censure.

Assertion 6. In the case of the Universal Apostasy of the Church, when the Pastors are Heretical, neglect what is their duty, & the people defecting from the true worship of God, the King can & ought to reform Religion.

1. Because Josiah piously & laudably accomplished this. 2 Kings 23. He renewed the Covenant between God & the people, purged the Temple, demolished the Altars of the Idols, slaughtered the Priests of the High places.

2. Because it is of the Law of Nature, that any member, but especially so eminent a member, as is the Political head, should look out for & consult the safety of the whole body, with all its might. But here he can perform nothing, from absolute & independent royal liberty, but all things according to the prescription of the divine Word.

Assertion 7. The King, as King, can by right deny his royal sanction to impious statutes, even if they are Canonically determined by a Synod.

1. Because the conscience of the Magistrate, is subjected to the Canons of the Church, not absolutely, but conditionally, insofar as they agree with the Word of God.

2. What belongs to all Christians, also belongs to the King as he is a Christian. But private discretion, whether a Law, or Canon, is in agreement with the word of God, belongs to all Christians. And here the King, & as King, has public judgment, & as Christian, private; lest he execute anything or approve it by his authority, which is repugnant to the Word of God. Nor is there anything for anyone to object; If the King in conscience judges the Canons impious & heterodox, & thus refuses his royal sanction, & the Rectors judge the Canons of the Church pious & orthodox, who will settle the dispute? Certainly this controversy is the same as that, which can arise between us & the Papists, which can arise between any Servant & Master, Flock & Pastor. Here the Word of God must by all means be consulted by both parties to the dispute, which renders judgment in the name of God. The determination of the Church is a condition of Faith, required according to the order prescribed by God; but not the Formal reason of faith, nor as such, binding the conscience either of the King, or of the Rectors of the Church, or of the people. It belongs to the Rectors of the Church to determine, & it belongs to the King to execute the determinations (if indeed they are in agreement with the Word of God); & it belongs to the King here, to obey those acting in the place of Christ, as ambassadors.

Nor are the Consequences of the Remonstrants valid to the contrary. Hence they infer 1. The Ministers, therefore, or Pastors, have power & authority immediately, i.e. first & supreme, under, & from Christ. Therefore, the Magistrate, either does not have that power, or also has it immediately, together with the Ministers, from Christ, or is the Minister & subject of the Ministers, in that matter.

We say, that power in the external Government of the Church, has been given immediately to the Church alone, not to the congregation, but to the College of Rectors; who alone have immediately from Christ the power of loosing & binding (as the places prove. Matt. 18. 16, 17, 18. John 20.21,22,23. Acts 1.24,25,26. Acts 15. 22, 23, 24.) and so the power in external Government. Nowhere does Scripture grant such power to the Magistrate; nor is it of the King in the whole Scripture, to excommunicate, to make canons for the Union & right order in the Church; but of the Church alone.

2. The Magistrate, not as Magistrate, but as an politically eminent member of the Church, & keeper of both Tables, has collateral authority under Christ immediately conferred on

him with the Church. But this power belongs to the King, because & insofar as he is a member of the Church.

3. Nor does it follow, that the King is the Minister & Subject of the Church, because it is his to take care, that the Laws & Canons of the Church, are executed; because he commands with plainly royal authority that the Canons of the Church, are executed. Indeed because the King commands all legally, & it is his to take care, that the Pastors preach the Word diligently, & the Canons in conformity with the Word of God are observed, he is the Minister of God, in this name, not of the Church.

2. They infer; Either the Architectonic power immediately under Christ belongs to both, i.e. & to the Magistrate & to the Ministers of the Church, or only to one of the two. That it belongs to both at the same time, is absurd: For otherwise two collateral Architectonic powers would have to be established in the Church of Christ, of which one would not depend on the other; which is against the nature of good Government. Therefore, it belongs to the Ministers, without the Magistrate.

Resp. Some say, that it is not at all absurd, that there are two collateral Architectonic Powers immediately under Christ, of which one does not depend on the other; because they are Powers each supreme in its own kind. For as Barclay against Bellarmine cap. 14. pag. 110. Neither is subject to the other, neither can invade the ends or Jurisdiction of the other, without the greatest crime; but both are connected like the shoulders of one body to the head, which is Christ. Meisner, Sober Philosophy. part. 3. sect. 2. cap. z. The Civil Power depends on the Ministry in Spiritual things, & the Spiritual Power depends on the Magistrate in Temporal things. But properly speaking, the Architectonic Ecclesiastical power, resides in Christ alone, the King & head of the Church: But only Ministerial power belongs to the Ministers. The supreme power of punishing, & the real punishment of the disobedient, is & remains with Christ the King: To the Ministers only the Ministerial denunciation of punishment according to the word, & excommunication is left. But the King & supreme Magistrate truly has the Architectonic power of making Laws in agreement with the Word of God & right reason; & of punishing transgressors, from the fullness of power, not only with a lighter, but also, according to the nature of the offense, with the penalty of death. That there are two powers supreme in their own kind, subaltern & not subaltern to each other, in a different respect, is not only not absurd, but necessary. For the King Politically, & by the Government of Domination, is the supreme keeper of both tables; but his supreme power here is cumulative, that is, he can, & is bound to add & accumulate his Royal Authority, to convening a National Synod, Politically presiding over it, adding Civil sanction to the Canons, punishing contumacious violators of the Canons: But his power is not privative, by which, by power conferred by Christ, or by exercise of Ecclesiastical Power, he can deprive the Church. Hence the power of Christ, is positive &

privative; that of the King is permissive, accumulative, supplementary, not privative. And the Power of the Church in another kind, in the kind of Ecclesiastical, Pastoral, Spiritual Power, is supreme in its own kind & order, nor is it subject to the King, but immediately to Christ. Thus the King, as King, is less than God alone, & a second God, superior to the Church, by Civil Power: & the Rectors of the Church, by Spiritual Power, are superior to the King. For the King, as a member of the Church, is subject to the Church, as a Son to a Mother, a part to the whole, a member to the body, a sheep to the college of Pastors. Nor is this the Papal view, as the Remonstrants suppose.

1. Because the Papists subject the King, & the King's conscience, to the Decrees & Canons of the Church, as to the infallible Word of God. But this view, subjects the King's conscience to no Synod, no Decree of the Church, except insofar as it agrees with the Word of God.

2. The Papists want the virtual Church, i.e. the Roman Pope, to so surpass Kings, that it is permitted to the Pope to dispose of Kings, to cast them down from the throne, to deprive them of crowns, from the fullness of Papal Power. We detest such Tyranny; & we teach that all souls, even of Pastors, ought to be subject to the King in the Lord, & that for conscience' sake. The Papists also want, that the Pope can, by command, command Kings; that Kings ought to subject their conscience to his Word, as to the living oracle of God on earth; & that the King, as executor & minister, is subject to the Pope. We teach, that Kings are subject to the Church, as sheep to Pastors: yet in such a way, that they are not obligated from conscience to execute the Decrees of the Church, because they are Decrees of the Church, but insofar as he sees that they are in agreement with the Word of God. Nor do the British Theologians believe, that the King is the head of the Church, i.e. has the same power of the Head, which the Pope formerly usurped in England. (What the servants of the Court, & slaves of Kings teach, I do not care.) Nor is the controversy of the English Church with the Jesuits, Whether the King is the Head of the Church, in that sense, in which the Pope boasts that he is the Head? but, Whether he is not the Political Head of the Church, subject to no Pope, as King? The English say yes, the Jesuits deny.

Chapter 20. On The Soul, & the Resurrection of the Flesh.

Acts. 7.59.
Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit.

It is asked, Whether souls are immortal? The Remonstrants & Socinians doubt it. Joan. Geisteranus in Confess. says he does not know, whether the soul after death lives or is dead, whether souls are mortal or immortal?

And Henricus Slatius in Open Declaration p. 53. says, that he does not know whether souls remain after they are released from the body, at least, this is not comprehensible. The Remonstrants, Apol. chap. 19. & Confess. chap. 19. teach, that the Faithful are to be raised, and they alone are to be endowed with a glorious & incorruptible body against Eccles. 3. 21. & 12. 7. Matt. 19. 28. Acts 7.59.

It is asked, Whether the same bodies in number, will rise again, which were dissolved into dust? The Remonstrants, Apol. chap. 19. fol. 217. say, that the Reasons for both sides are probable; the dispute is to be decided by God in the future age. Slatius, Open Declaration. Our bodies are not to rise again. The Socinians say, that it is Mahometan, to believe, that these bodies are to be resurrected for bodily pleasures. But neither do we believe this. In the meantime we have been taught from the Scriptures, that these same bodies in number will rise again; & indeed to glory, & heavenly joys, & eternal life. Job. 19. 26. I know that in my flesh I shall see God. v.27. I who am the same, & not a stranger will see for myself, & my eyes will behold, though my reins are consumed within me. 1 Cor. 15.52. The dead shall be raised incorruptible, & we shall be changed. v.53. For this corruptible must put on incorruption. v. 54. But when this corruptible, τὸ φθαρτὸν τέτο, shall have put on incorruption, Καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τότε, & this mortal shall have put on immortality; then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory.

2. Because Scripture speaks of the body, as of a thing, which, remaining the same in number, is changed. 1 Cor. 15.42. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption. v. 43. It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. But the Holy Spirit would say in vain, that the body is buried & committed to the earth with these or those qualities, & rises again with other new ones; unless the same in number rose again, which was buried.

3. We argue from the Redemption of bodies. If the Body was bought with the price of the blood of Christ, no less than the Soul; then the Body, no less than the Soul, is to be restored on that day, which is the day of the redemption of our body Rom. 8. 23. & our vile body is to be changed, that it may be fashioned like unto his (Christ's) glorious body,

according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself. Phil. 3.21. But the former is true. Therefore, the latter. The Major is clear from 1 Cor.6.v. 14. where the Apostle proves, We must not commit fornication in this body, which we bear; because God, who raised up the Lord, will also raise up us by his power, i.e. our bodies. 2. Because our bodies are the members of Christ. v. 15. Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? Shall I then take the members of Christ, & make them the members of a harlot? God forbid. If the bodies of the Saints are members of Christ, they are to be glorified with him: But they cannot be glorified with him, unless they are to be resurrected the same in number. 3. v.19. Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God; & ye are not your own? v. 20. For ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body, & in your spirit, which are God's. What is bought with the blood of Christ, & by the right of redemption is God's, not ours; that cannot utterly perish, but is to be resurrected with Christ. But these mortal bodies in number, which we bear, are not ours, but God's, by the right of redemption. Therefore, these same are to be resurrected. The reason for the Major; because what is not redeemed through Christ from destruction, is not glorified with Christ; what utterly perishes, & for which another in number is substituted.

5. From the Justice & Equity of God. As if a soul, different in number, & not this same one, which sinned in this life, were punished with eternal death, the Justice of God would be violated in this part: So if the body, which was offered as a living sacrifice to God. Rom. 12. 1. which was an instrument of Righteousness, Rom. 6. 12, 13. were rewarded with no reward, no wages; we do not see how each one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad; which yet the Holy Spirit says. 2 Cor.5.10.

6. The Omnipotence of God would be obscured here, in the resurrection of the dead preached by the Scriptures. Because in this the Omnipotence shines forth, that those same bodies, which are in the graves, will hear the voice of the Son of God, & come forth; some to the resurrection of life, others to the resurrection of damnation. John 5.28, 29. But souls are not in the graves. And that those who sleep in the dust, are to be raised. Dan. 12.2. And that the sea, will give up the dead which were in it; & death & hell. Rev.20.13. If other bodies in number from these, which we now bear, are to be given to us in the resurrection of the dead, & indeed to be created anew; they are no more to be created anew from the graves or from the sea, than from other matter; it would be a curious & unscriptural limitation of Jehovah to determine his Omnipotence to this matter rather than that, to the sea rather than the sepulchral dust in the lands; since he could form or create other new bodies from any, or from no matter. Nor do they sleep in the dust, whose bodies are never to be resurrected, any more than those who were never begotten of parents.

7. Since Christ is true man, Heb. 2. 16,17. like us in all things, except sin. Heb. 4.15. And Christ presented his own body the same in number marked with the same stigma & trace of the nails, with which it was wounded on the cross, to be seen, & touched, & handled with the hands by Thomas & his Disciples. John 20. 20.--- 29. It is necessary, that he resurrect our bodies the same liable to death, dissolved into dust.
8. Finally the nature of Resurrection persuades the same. For that which is created anew cannot any more be said to be resurrected from the dust & from the Graves; than a Son begotten anew & born into the light, is said to be resurrected from the dead; because a body, different in number, created anew, was never dead & in the graves; It is not, therefore, to be resurrected.

Finally this is not a curious & useless question, but full of consolation to us, who in this dwelling of the earthly & muddy tabernacle, groan for the heavenly home, & await the glorious body. 2 Cor. 5. 1, 2, 3. Nor did Calvin, Epist. 103. call it curious, as the Remonstrants suppose, Apol. fol. 219. because he there accurately confirms the orthodox opinion, & expressly refutes the contrary error; but he rightly called the question raised by Lelio Socino against the manifest Scripture, on account of certain vain speculations about the numerical identity of the resurrected body, & about the impossible or incredible mode of Resurrection, curious, & unless he had still thought well of that man, pretending to be a brother, & cohabiting with Pellican the Theologian of Zurich, he could have also called it impious.

Matt. 25.41.
Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil & his angels.

It is asked, Whether the infernal torments of the damned, are eternal; or whether they will at last have an end, so that the impious will at last utterly perish, & be reduced to nothing? The Remonstrants do not shrink from this Epicurean opinion. They indeed say in the words of Scripture not expounded, but liable to the Socinian sense, that God will inflict infernal torments, & eternal punishments, on the unbelievers, --- when he will cast them into eternal fire, together with the Devil & his Angels, that they may pay the penalty of eternal destruction, driven from the face of God, & from his glorious power. But Socinus expounds these, Comment, on 1st Epist, John chap. 2. pag.104. of total cessation, & reduction to nothing. And when the Most Learned & Most Illustrious Professors of Leyden in the Censure of the Confession, chap. 20. sect. ult. pag.264. object to the Remonstrants, that they do not clearly explain themselves, Whether they think that those infernal

torments will last for eternity, & the impious men themselves affected by those punishments, will live eternally in those penalties? because the words are ambiguously conceived, & agreeably to Socinus: To this very serious objection, in their Apology (in which they discuss this Censure, 1. They do not answer a word or syllable to chap.20. or elsewhere. 2. They consider the opinion about the substantial destruction of the world, Apol. chap. 19. fol. 219. far more probable than the contrary. 3. They have nothing about the eternal state of the damned. 4. Confess. chap. 19. sect. 2. they say, For then he will raise his faithful & holy ones, who indeed died, from the dust of the earth to eternal life, & will endow them alone with a glorious & incorruptible body. Henricus Slatius, their follower in all things, in Open Declaration p.53. says that the Impious will either not be resurrected, or reduced to nothing.

We on the contrary, judge this opinion Epicurean, & Atheistic.

1. Because if the places of Scripture, for the eternity of infernal torments can be eluded; by equal reason the places for the eternity of eternal life can be eluded; & it could be answered to both, that life & eternal death are said, in that sense, in which circumcision & ceremonies, are called eternal, i.e. by Hebraism, which are to last for a certain time, & at last to cease. But thus, neither will the soul live for eternity, but plainly die; nor will the kingdom of Christ be eternal, but at last perish: And what prevents, that the humanity of Christ, will at last be reduced to nothing?

2. Because Scripture says the contrary. Isa. 66. 24. For their worm shall not die, & their fire shall not be quenched. Matt. 25.41. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil & his angels. But according to the Adversaries, rejecting Our opinion, it follows from these, 1. That eternal life v.46. is not eternal; and so the good Angels & glorified men, will at last perish & be reduced to nothing, or be deprived of their blessedness, and so be miserable. 2. Also that the Devils & his Angels, will be freed from eternal torments, & either reduced to nothing, or obtain eternal life, or a state immune from misery. Mar. 9. 43. It is better for thee to enter into life, maimed (rather) than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched. v.44. Where their worm dieth not, & the fire is not quenched. v. 56. & 48. Jude v.6. The Devils, are reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. v.7. Sodom & Gomorrah suffer the vengeance of eternal fire. But it is never said of Circumcision, that it will not cease, as it is said of that fire, that it will not be extinguished. And Rev. 20.11. And the Devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire & brimstone, where the Beast & the False prophet are, & shall be tormented day & night for ever & ever.

3. Because there is no deliverance from Hell for eternity: according to that Luke 16.26. And beside all this, between us & you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence.

4. Because the soul of all men is immortal, Matt.10.28. & can be killed by no mortal. Therefore souls, will live for eternity, either in eternal joy, or in eternal torments, which is the point; or they will live for eternity in a middle & neutral state, which is not written; or souls are to be annihilated by God, which cannot be affirmed from the Scriptures.
What they say, that Scripture asserts that the dead are not; in this way non-existence simply, but in a certain respect, & non-existence among the living in the flesh is denied to them. But if this is extended to not being simply; now it could also be proved, that Christ the man dead, was plainly reduced to nothing; & all, both saints, & unbelievers, deceased, both as to soul, & as to body had utterly perished & were nothing.

THE END.