

JOHANNES MACCOVIUS REVIVED:OR, HIS MANUSCRIPTS PRINTED. Containing, Polemic Theology.

The Primary Error of the Papists, Socinians, Lutherans, Arminians, Anabaptists.

Cases of Conscience according to the norm of Socinian Doctrine.

Anti-Socinus, with an Appendix on Atheists.

Procured by

NICOLAUS ARNOLDUS POLONUS,

Minister of the Church of Beetkum.

FRANEKER.

Printed by IDZARDUS ALBERTUS, and at the expense of himself and JOHANNES ARCERIUS. 1647.

With Privilege.

Copy from the Original License.

The States General of the United Netherlands have consented, accorded and granted license, and by these presents do consent, accord and grant license to Johannes Arcerius and Ids Albertsz., both Booksellers at Franeker in Friesland, that they alone in these United Netherlands, associated Provinces, Cities and Members thereof shall be allowed, for the time of the fifteen next coming years, to Print, publish and sell all the Philosophical and Theological works of Doctor JOHANNES MACCOVIUS of blessed memory, in his life Professor in the holy Theological faculty at Franeker aforesaid; Forbidding each and every one, inhabitants of the aforesaid United Netherlands, Provinces, Cities and Members thereof, within the aforesaid time of the fifteen next coming years, to reprint, cause to be reprinted, publish and sell the aforesaid Philosophical and Theological works, in whole or in part, or, when reprinted elsewhere, to bring them into the abovementioned Lands, upon forfeiture of all the reprinted copies and moreover of a sum of three hundred Carolus guilders, to be applied one third part to the benefit of the Officer who shall make the calenge, the second third part to the benefit of the Poor and the remaining third part to the benefit of the aforesaid Johannes Arcerius and Ids Albertsz.

Done at the assembly of the High-mentioned States General, in The Hague on the thirteenth of October 1645.

C. ROORDA.

By Order of the High-mentioned Lords States General,

Signed:

CORNELIS MUSCH

AND ALSO,

To the Most Illustrious by Nobility of Family, Outstanding in Erudition and Experience of Affairs, the CURATORS OF THE ACADEMY.

D. JOACHIM of ANDREÆ. Golden Knight, celebrated for embassies to the Most Serene Kings of Poland, Sweden, Denmark, Most Grave Assessor of the College of the Estates of the federated Belgians, which is at The Hague.

D. TIARD of AYLUA. Grietman in Wonseradeel.

D. LIVIUS SCHELTINGA. Secretary of the Illustrious Frisian Order.

D. JOHAN of NYS. Most just Senator of the Frisian Curia.

Most Illustrious Count, Most Powerful Lords, Most Noble Curators of the Academy.

There is no need for me to seek or even give a reason for long, why I wanted these papyraceous remains of the Most Famous MACCOVIUS, of blessed memory, for nearly thirty years Professor in Your Academy, my honorable Teacher and Compatriot, arranged for publication by my work, such as it is, to go forth into the public light of the Church under the Most August auspices of your name. For indeed, if, as that maxim of Aristides has it, temples are to be consecrated to God, but Eminent Men are to be venerated by the dedication of books, You surely, you, I say, are most worthy to be affected by me with this honor. You, Lords, wage wars for the Church afflicted in many ways, and although everywhere pressed by the yoke of the Anti-Christ, yet not oppressed.

You, the Spanish tyranny having been shaken off, and the most hostile enemies of your name and Religion having been conquered in the course of time, have erected Temples to God, Academies, Schools, most fertile seminaries for the Church and Republic; to You therefore, whatever has been born in them, is owed after God. Without doubt if our MACCOVIUS had survived, he himself would have offered these papers, hastily written down by him from memory, examined to the most accurate file of his genius and judgment, to you as the Fosterers of the Church and Academy.

Wherefore I would seem injurious to you, if I should divert elsewhere those things which were destined for you; Especially, since also for me, a foreigner, cultivating the vineyard of the Lord in your soil, the right of citizenship is to be redeemed, and homage is to be paid; than which, since I have none more present, I have thought that this, whatever of work it is, and with it myself, should be offered to you. Having prayed God, that He may more and more constrain you, whom He has proposed as a most illustrious example of concord, joined most closely by both the bond of civil society, and of spiritual piety, by this bond of both peaces, and make You build up, rule, adorn the Republic, the Church, the School, with wisdom, piety, erudition. Farewell, and live happily forever according to my wish. I gave this at Beetkum on the 10th of January in the Year of Christ 1647.

Of Your Illustrious Generosity, Nobility, Amplitude,

The devoted Servant in Jesus Christ.

NICOLAUS ARNOLDUS POLONUS

Ecclesiast of Beetkum.

TO THE READER.

Come hither, Reader, whoever you are who do not so much disdain the more prolix Syntagmas of Theology of a busier life, as (because art is long, life is short) you are not able to read them, gratefully taste here the kernel and essence of them contracted by MACCOVIUS; which from my notebooks I exhibit to you beyond indeed the will of the Author, not beyond your benefit. Indeed, I would have wished these to be published by some other of the Disciples of MACCOVIUS, but in vain, with them pretending this, others that, others hiding them like bats,

others selling them as their own in Gymnasia and Schools, I should await. Therefore, since I saw that more were held by the greatest desire of these writings, with the warnings of Learned men being added, I easily allowed myself to be induced to this, that those things which I myself once acquired, wrote down with great zeal and labor, I should now reread in spare hours, and make public. You have here, candid Reader, Polemic Theology; the Primary Error of the Papists, Socinians, Lutherans, Arminians, Anabaptists; Cases of Conscience according to the norm of Socinian Doctrine, likewise Anti-Socinus. I promise also the rest, as much Theological as Philosophical, if those things which I lack shall have been communicated to me by the Most Famous Lord JOHANNES STARKIUS, Rector of the Illustrious Gymnasium of Kédainiai. For others are inexorable in this part; about whom although it is certain that they have treatises of MACCOVIUS most worthy of light, and especially profitable to the studious, they want them to be consecrated to bookworms rather than to men, not unlike the dog of Aesop, who although he himself did not feed on hay, envied it to others to be eaten. They shall be gravely punished by God, who do not lend at interest with their own talent; but more gravely they, who having stolen the talents of others, hide them, and wickedly withdraw them from the use of men. It will therefore be yours, candid Reader, to receive with grateful mind those things which we draw forth from our storehouse. In these now published you will perhaps desire some things. And indeed first the simplicity of Style will not be to the palate. But it becomes a Professor of Sacred letters to speak properly, not to speak eloquently, and to intend the truth of the thing, not the ornament of speech. For the seat of truth is not in the tongue but in the heart: Nor does it matter in speaking true things, what kind of speech we use; for falsehood needs eloquence and bejewelled words, so that it can insinuate itself into the minds of men, but the speech of truth exists simple, not seeking paint or pigments. Then you will want some things said more accurately. But these, like most of MACCOVIUS' things, are extemporaneous, dictated to the studious, on the spot, without any help of books, I confess they would have been more polished, if they had been reread by MACCOVIUS himself and consecrated to the press. I have thought it a sacrilege to change anything, both because I confess myself a Disciple of MACCOVIUS, and because in publishing such things as these, faith is most greatly required. In the Primary Errors that the authorities of the authors of the adverse part are alleged, that indeed adds nothing of perfection to the work itself, or takes away, since it was done only to this end, lest the adversaries should deny and those things which are alleged in their name, either shamelessly deny, or impute the crime of falsehood to MACCOVIUS (which they are accustomed to do to another). Lastly, you will be nauseated, best reader, at the typographical errors and those frequent; but, Lord, if you had been present, said Martha, our brother would not have died; If it had been allowed to me also to be present at this correction and edition, at least this book would not be filled with so many and so great errors. I warn you about this, in the little preface prefixed to the Cases of Conscience according to the norm of Socinian Doctrine it is said that he who performs the role of Respondent speaks from the Orthodox opinion when the one interrogating does this very thing. Also something has been sinned by the typographers in the superlinear title of Anti-Socinus, for they extended the title On the Method of Disputing beyond what they ought. The System of Anti-Socinus itself begins from the seventh chapter. But you reader, if you are candid, will easily forgive such things, and will await the rest, as far as it will be able to happen, better. But you
Zoilus, what laughters do you threaten with furrowed brow?

If you are wise, read these things; are you foolish? therefore be silent.
Perhaps you will find things which you may assail with black tooth,
I have known that the Gods themselves have displeased.

POLEMIC THEOLOGY. CHAPTER ONE.

QUESTION I. Whence is it certain that Scripture is the word of God?

Resp. It can certainly be established from the criteria which are in it. I. Because the Gentiles were able to know from them, Deut. 4:6. Therefore much more Christians who are illuminated, when they were not. II. What an uneducated person grasps, that much more will someone endowed with some knowledge grasp. But 1 Cor. 14:24, 25. Therefore. The reason for the consequence: Because an adult has senses more exercised than an uneducated person. Heb. 5:13.

Obj. I. No testimony in its own matter is valid. Therefore neither can Scripture give that to itself. John 8:13. Resp. It does not give it authoritatively, but rationally, as Christ with the people, John 5:36. Instant. Not even rationally. Because its testimony is obscured, when it brings forth about itself. Resp. It is not obscured with those to whom God has given ears to hear. 2 Cor. 3:14, 15. 2 Cor. 4:3. Obj. II. Its authority depends on the Church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth. 1 Tim. 3:15. Resp. The consequence is denied. For the Church is called the ground of the truth, because it upholds and confirms the truth of the Gospel, as much as is in it. But the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets is the word of God. Eph. 2.

QUESTION II. Is Scripture necessary for salvation?

Resp. Not absolutely but hypothetically, namely with respect to the divine mandate. The Papists deny it. Our reasons are: I. 2 Tim. 3:16, 17. II. Rom. 15:4. III. God wanted His word to be written. Obj. I. It was not until Moses. Therefore it is not necessary. Resp. It is an ignorance of the issue. Because we also say it to be necessary only from the hypothesis of the efficient cause. Obj. II. The Holy Spirit teaches internally. Resp. Things subordinated do not fight. Instant. With the instruction of the Holy Spirit posited, all the rest are taken away. Resp. By no means, because it now pleases the Holy Spirit to teach ordinarily through the word; and so again, things subordinated do not fight.

QUESTION III. In what language is Scripture authentic?

Resp. Hebrew in the Old, Greek in the New Testament. Reason: I. Because in the Old Testament God had the Church only among the Jews. Ps. 147:19, 20. Acts 14:16. Instant. But there were many proselytes. Resp. They were bound to appear at Jerusalem every year, and to learn the Hebrew Language. Deut. 16. compare Acts 2 and 8. II. Because to the Jews are entrusted the oracles of God. Rom. 3:2.

Obj. I. God rejected that people; Therefore also the language. The reason for the consequence: Because if He gave His word in their own language to those whom He rejected, much more to those whom He received. Resp. The consequence is null. Instant. If God gave the word immediately, in their own languages, to those whom He rejected, and did not give it to the Gentiles, then He loved the former more than the latter. Resp. God can love one more than another, and so confer on this one certain benefits, which He does not confer on the other.

Obj. II. The Hebrew Bibles are corrupted. Ps. 22. for the word "carrech" "they hated", is read "carri" "like a lion".

Resp. Granted, not conceded, if corrupted in one place, yet not in another. Instant. The Jews were most hostile enemies of Christ, Therefore it is impossible but that they corrupted, at least those things which deal with Christ.

Resp. 1. The Holy Spirit commends them, that the oracles of God were entrusted to them.

2. The providence of God in preserving the Scriptures whole is greater than the wantonness even of the most hostile in corrupting them. Instant. They were plainly given over to a reprobate mind. Acts 28:26, 27. But to such any crime is perpetable.

Resp. So indeed unless they are restrained by God.

Objections against the Greek text. I. It is corrupted. John 8. about the adulterous woman.

Resp. False. Instant. It is not had in Syriac.

Resp. The Greek is not to be valued from the Syriac, but the reverse. Instant. On the contrary, there is less suspicion of corruption, because Christ and the Apostles spoke in Syriac. Matt. 16. Cephas.

Resp. Although He spoke in Syriac, yet He wanted it to be written in Greek.

Obj. II. In Greek fundamentals are omitted, 1 John 5:7, 8. these two verses are not had in the ancient codices. Resp. In certain ones. Instant. If they had been had in certain ones, they would be cited by the Greek Fathers. But they are not. Therefore.

Resp. Although they are not cited by Augustine, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, yet they are cited by Athanasius, against Arius.

Obj. III. The Greek language is the most mendacious of all nations, as is clear from the histories. Resp. Not the malice of men, but the providence of God is to be considered, about preserving the sacred books. Instant. Matt. 27:9. Jeremiah is cited for Zechariah.

Resp. 1. Granted, not conceded, it yet remains to be the saying of the prophet.

2. The word Zechariah signifies the same thing as Jeremiah.

QUESTION IV. Ought Scripture to be translated into other languages?

Resp. Affirm. I. God orders all to read the Scriptures, but he who wants the end wants also the means.

John 5:39. Exception. This pertains only to the Jews, with whom Christ spoke.

Resp. To whom the reason for the precept pertains, to them also the precept. But the reason for the precept pertains to all. Therefore also the precept. The major is certain; for the reason makes why this or that is commanded. The minor: It pertains to all that they be saved; I say to you that you may be saved etc.

II. The word of God ought to dwell in all abundantly, Col. 3. Exception. This pertains only to the Colossians.

Resp. Rom. 15:4. 2 Tim. 3:16. ↑ III. 1 Cor. 14:9 and 15, 16.

Obj. I. Nehemiah explained the law to the people. Neh. 8:9. Resp. As to the sense, not as to the words and expressions. Instant. If the Apostles explained from the Hebrew to each one, then we also ought to explain. Because the Apostles did this for our doctrine and imitation, yet they did not translate into vernacular languages. Resp. The consequence is null, because they had to traverse the whole world.

Obj. The laity would thus be able to judge concerning the Ministers, which is against 1 Cor. 14:32 where it is said that the Prophets are to be subjected to the Prophets. Resp. It is one thing to judge concerning the gifts of Prophecy, another concerning the gifts of God; the former is referred to the Prophets, the latter to all. 1 Thess. 5:21. Instant. The sheep cannot judge concerning the shepherd. Resp. Not by a judgment of authority but of discretion it can. John 10:45. Instant. Many shameful deeds are commemorated in Scripture. 1. For avoiding, not for imitating. 2. Much more shameful things are contained in the mirror of examples, which the Papists call, which nevertheless is read in diverse languages. Instant. We strive toward the forbidden etc. from reading they will nonetheless be incited to imitation. Resp. They to whom Christ is an odor of death to death. 2 Cor. 2:16. Instant. The uneducated stir up heresies from things not understood. But occasion is not to be given. Resp. 1. It happens by accident, nor on

account of abuse is the use of a thing to be taken away. 2. A distinction is made between the learned and the unstable, and the learned adhering to the Holy Spirit and the truth. 2 Pet. 3:16.

QUESTION V. Is Scripture perspicuous, by whom and how can it be perceived salutarily?

Resp. I. No one can know the word of God salutarily unless taught by God. Exception. The word of God is said in two ways, either through internal illumination, or through external information which happens through nature, Rom. 1:19 and 20, and through Scripture. But to the contrary: if any are called externally, they are not called internally. Therefore external information profits nothing, without internal illumination. Because such do not perceive the word of God, otherwise they would believe. II. Christ is only a stumbling block of external calling, 1 Cor. 1:23, 24. The consequence, because if Christ were known by them salutarily, He would not be to them foolishness and a scandal. Exception. By the called there are understood the stubborn and rebellious. Resp. If every man is rebellious, where God does not change the heart; then certainly everyone called only externally, and not internally, becomes rebellious to God. But the former is true; Therefore also the latter. The reason for the major is, because the Gospel is hidden to unbelievers. 2 Cor. 4:3, 4. Instant. There are two kinds of unbelieving men, either those who despise the preached Gospel; or those who first begin to hear it as not heard before; the Apostle speaks of the former, but not of the latter. Resp. Vain. Because they cannot judge spiritually. 1 Cor. 2:14.

Obj. I. The word of God illuminates the eyes. Ps. 19:9. Resp. The unfaithful do not have eyes, Deut. 29. Instant. Ezek. 12:2 and 4. Resp. It is said of external eyes, not of spiritual.

Obj. II. They can know and teach the word of God. Resp. They know theoretically, not practically, which is not true knowledge, Matt. 7:22, and the consequence does not hold from being able to teach to salutary knowledge of it. Instant. On the contrary, they also know practically. Matt. 19:20. The youth observed all the precepts, who nevertheless was an unbeliever. Resp. He observed by persuasion, not in reality. Instant. He observed in reality. Because he was not refuted by Christ. Resp. Although not directly, yet indirectly: Sell all etc.

Obj. III. They know the way of righteousness and Christ, 1 Pet. 2:20, 21. Resp. Under an alien form, not under His own; by an apprehensive knowledge, not a judgmental one. Instant. Not under an alien form. Because not all are blind, John 41. Resp. Namely to conviction, not to salutary persuasion.

QUESTION VI. Who is the Judge of Controversies?

The Papists establish the Church. We the Holy Spirit speaking in Scripture. Proof: I. We are ordered to accept that interpretation of Scripture, which is made through Scripture. Therefore the Holy Spirit speaking in Scripture is judge. The minor premise: Isa. 20. Exception. The interpretation of Scripture is made through Scripture with the Minister being added, Mal. 2:7.

Resp. Not simply, Deut. 17:9, 10, 11. Isa. 8:20. they are restricted to Scripture. Instant. Therefore neither the Prophets, nor the Apostles are to be believed. Because they also were men. Resp. The consequence is denied, because they were not the authors of those things which they brought forth, 2 Pet. 1:21. II. The Holy Spirit is the supreme author of the word of God; Therefore He Himself is also the best interpreter of His own words. Instant. Therefore the Church is in no way an interpreter. Resp. Instrumentally not principally, or, with examination, not without examination absolutely. III. We pray to God that He may illuminate us and give the sense of His word. Therefore the Holy Spirit is the supreme interpreter of His word. The consequence, because the interpretation depends on Him, on whom the illumination of our mind depends. Ps. 119:34. Instant. If illumination effects that the thing is grasped, then no interpretation comes in there. Resp. God illuminates, but not without the collation of the Scriptures, and the means ordained by Him for illumination.

Obj. I. The Church and councils decide controversies about religion. Therefore they are the supreme interpreters. Resp. Not by their own, but by the authority of the word of God. Instant. On the contrary, by their own, because the authority of the bridegroom and bride is the same. Resp. Not the same. Because He is the head of her, not the reverse. Instant. The interpretation of the Church is to be stood by absolutely. Matt. 18:17. Resp. The judgment of the Church is to be stood by not absolutely, but if it speaks from the prescript of Scripture, Deut. 17:10, 11. Instant. Therefore the Church will have nothing peculiar above a private person. Resp. Much. Because the Church interprets from authority, a private person from duty.

Obj. II. Mal. 2:7. From the mouth of the priests etc. Resp. So namely that it be done from the prescript of the law. Instant. Therefore it will be for the Laity to judge concerning the pastors, when yet the latter are for the most part more unlearned than the former. Resp. 1. It is false, that the more unlearned cannot judge concerning the more learned, Acts 17:11. 2. They cannot by a judgment of authority, but they can by a judgment of discretion from the prescript of the word. 1 Thess. 5. Prove all things.

QUESTION VII. Is Scripture perfect?

I affirm. I. Because it is so called. Ps. 19:8. They except: Even a regenerate man is said to be perfect, and yet he is not perfectly regenerate. Resp. It is different. Because Scripture is said to be perfect in this way, that it can restore the soul, and render a man perfect. II. Paul preached the whole counsel of God, Acts 20:22, but those things which he preached were from the Scriptures. For he had said nothing outside of Moses and the Prophets. Acts 26:22. They except: He also taught more things. 1 Cor. 7:12. Resp. Yet Paul said and taught those things which he said and taught outside of Scripture, as one to whom the Lord through mercy had granted to be faithful, v. 25, and who had the Spirit of God, v. 40, and so as immediately inspired by God. III. Through Scripture man is perfected, 2 Tim. 3:16, 17. Instant. On the contrary, it effects nothing without the Holy Spirit. Resp. By real, not moral efficiency.

Obj. I. Many books have perished. 1 Kings 4:32, 33. Resp. The perfection of Scripture is to be valued not from the multitude of books, but from the sufficiency of dogmas. Instant. But to what end then so many books of the New Testament, when in the books of the Old Testament all

necessary things are contained? Resp. Indeed it is contained in them, but only Christ to come; but in these, manifested.

Obj. II. It is not certain from Scripture on what day Passover, Christmas, etc. are to be celebrated. Resp. In the Passover, Nativity, etc. there are two things, the doctrine itself, and the day on which it is proposed, celebrated; the former is necessary to salvation, and is handed down in the Scriptures, not the latter. Instant. If the cessation from work is restricted to the day of the sun [Sunday]; then no reason is given why the doctrine of the Passover, Nativity, etc. of Christ should not be restricted to a certain day. But the former is true. Therefore also the latter. The reason for the consequence, because there is no less benefit in giving Christ, and raising Him again, than in creation, indeed also a greater good. Resp. The reason is most diverse.

Obj. III. Many things are lacking in the Old Testament which are cited in the New, as Matt. 5:43, You shall hate etc., this is nowhere. Resp. This is cited not as the word of God, but as a false interpretation of the Pharisees. Instant. On the contrary, certain things are cited about which there can be no doubt but that they are the word of God. Acts 20:35. Resp. Such things are deduced from Scripture by consequence.

QUESTION VIII. Are some things necessary to be known for salvation deduced and able to be deduced by good consequence?

I affirm. I. Christ thus proves the resurrection of the dead. Matt. 22:32, an article necessary to salvation. 1 Cor. 15:13. Instant. It could have been proved by an express [statement]. Dan. 12. Resp. The Sadducees received only the five books of Moses. II. The distinction concerning justification by faith and works is necessary to salvation. But this is deduced by Paul by consequence. Rom. 5:6, 7, 8. Instant. If the doctrine of justification by faith and works is necessary to salvation. Therefore it was also necessary in the state of integrity. But this is false. Therefore also that. Resp. The consequence is denied. Because in the state of integrity there was no place for justifying faith, for Christ the mediator, who did not come for the just, but for the unjust. III. The resurrection of Christ is necessary to salvation, and yet it is deduced by consequence. Acts 2:27, 28, 29, 30. 1 Cor. 16:17. Instant. It is not necessary, because the Apostles knew necessary things; but they did not know this. Resp. They knew confusedly, not distinctly.

Obj. I. The uneducated do not understand such arguments, and thus they would not be saved. Resp. I concede concerning remote consequences, not proximate ones. Instant. But they are ignorant of logic. Resp. Of artificial logic, not natural, which is nothing other than the faculty of reasoning.

Obj. II. Reason is not to be used in Scripture; Therefore neither consequence. Col. 2:8. Likewise, if reason were to be used in Scripture, it would be necessary to transcend from genus to genus. Resp. Reason is not to be used in Scripture as an argument, but as an instrument. For neither are infants or the insane capable of Scripture. Instant. If reason were to be used in Scripture as an instrument; then God would have chosen wiser men to announce it, but He did

not choose, 1 Cor. 1:26, 27. Resp. It does not follow, because God will abolish the wisdom of the wise. 1 Cor. 1:19. So that he who glories, may glory in the Lord. 1 Cor. 1:31. Secondly, Because reason is indeed the instrument of perceiving dogmas, but illuminated reason. 1 Cor. 2:14, 15.

Obj. III. Express [statements] instruct better than those deduced by consequence, therefore God handed down all things necessary to salvation expressly, so that He might accommodate Himself to the capacity of men. Resp. It does not follow. Indeed God handed down all things to the capacity of man necessary to salvation, but nevertheless He wanted the Scriptures to be searched. John 5:39, and meditated upon. Instant. If God wants to effect this in us through His word that we all in this life may approach most nearly to the angels of God, then He wants all things to be proposed through an express [statement]. But the former is true. Therefore also the latter. The reason for the consequence: Because the angels deduce nothing by consequence. For all things are open to them. Luke 20:36. Resp. Although the intellect of the Angels is most penetrating, nevertheless they reason, and desire to know something. 1 Pet. 1:12.

CHAPTER II. ON LAW.

And indeed

FIRST ON THE MORAL LAW.

QUESTION I. Is the moral law now more perfect than it was formerly handed down by Moses?

It is denied.

Reason: I. If Scripture dealing with our justification proposes no other law than that of Moses; then it follows that now the moral law is not more perfect than it was before handed down by Moses. But the former is true. Therefore also the latter. The reason for the consequence: Because if there had been some more perfect law, that would have been alleged. Rom. 10. II. If some more perfect law had been given through Christ, Christ would not have redeemed us from the execration of the Mosaic law, but He did redeem from it. Gal. 3:13. Therefore. Instant. Christ redeemed us from the execration of the Mosaic law, because we are now not under the ceremonial law. Resp. To free from the execration of the law, is not to free from the law, but from the transgression of the law, namely sin. For the law expressly denounces execration to sin and the sinner. Deut. 27. III. If Christ brought a more perfect law, then the knowledge of sin is not to be sought from the law of Moses, but of Christ. But Scripture does the contrary. Rom. 7:7. The reason for the consequence: Because from an imperfect law, sin cannot be known perfectly. Instant. The law of Moses is cited, because the Gentiles were converted to the faith on account

of the Jews, who admitted no other law than that of Moses. Resp. This is simply repugnant to the scope of the Apostle, who hands down the doctrine of sin, as it is, not as someone is persuaded about himself, by false persuasion.

Obj. Socin. I. Because Christ expressly says: But I say to you. Matt. 5. Therefore He corrected the law of Moses. Resp. He does not say "it is written" but "it was said." Therefore He does not speak about the law of Moses, but about the explication of the Pharisees. Instant. It is not said in the text "said by the ancients," but "said to the ancients." Therefore neither does Christ speak about the traditions of the ancients. Resp. 1. It is a usual mode of Scripture, that the preposition "by" or "from" is omitted, see a similar thing, Luke 24:34, "He was seen by Simon," for "from Simon." 2. It is one thing to cite the same words with the same sense, and another to cite words with an alien sense. Christ here cites the words of Moses with an alien sense. Instant. The very words are cited, v. 31, nor under an alien sense. Resp. The words are cited indeed, as proposed by Moses, but as on account of hardness of heart. Therefore they are not words of precept, but only of permission. For God is accustomed often to permit what displeases Him, namely as a punishment for one importunately demanding.

Obj. II. Christ Himself says: A new commandment I give to you, John 13:34. Resp. That commandment is new not in essence (because also in the Old Testament it was said: you shall love your neighbor as yourself; indeed this is the sum of the Mosaic law, Matt. 22), but in iteration, repetition, and example. Because Christ had given them a new example of love of neighbor. Therefore this commandment is both old and new; Old because proposed by Moses; New, because corrupted by the Pharisees it is restored to its integrity. Instant. But it was never said in the Old Testament, that one should lay down his life for another, which is commanded, 1 John 3:16. Resp. The antecedent is denied. Because it was said "you shall love your neighbor as yourself," and an express example is had in Moses: Exod. 32:32, where he devotes himself for the Israelites.

Obj. of the Papists, whose opinion is to be noted beforehand. They teach that there are certain counsels, which are not precepts, which, if someone omits, he is not condemned; but if someone performs them, he does more than the law itself requires, and so produces works of supererogation. Against this opinion our arguments are these:

I. If the counsels of God are diverse from the precepts of God, then that counsel about which Acts 20:27 [speaks] is not a precept of God. But this is absurd. Therefore also that. Because, with the counsel of God not observed, someone can be saved, but without this he cannot. They except: The Apostle there addresses Bishops, who, as they ought to keep watch for the souls of others, as the Holy Spirit speaks, Heb. 3:17, so they ought to be more perfect than others.

Resp. It is a vain evasion. Because, if we can do and not do counsels without loss of salvation, therefore also Bishops can do the same.

II. Luke 7:30. If counsel is diverse from precepts, then that counsel which the Pharisees and interpreters of the law spurned will not be a precept. The latter is false; Therefore also the former. They except: It is one thing to approve a counsel, another to perform it. Because someone can not do a counsel, and yet not disapprove it, so someone can not marry, and yet not disapprove matrimony. Resp. In the text it is had expressly "they spurned it against themselves."

III. Rev. 3:18. If counsels are something other than precepts, it follows that this counsel, about which in the said place, is not a precept. But the latter is false, Therefore also the former. The

minor premise: The non-performance of this counsel brings eternal death, v. 16. Exception. They had been passed over, about whom he speaks, therefore counsel was necessary for them on account of works of supererogation, so that they might pay off debts contracted. Resp. If no one can for past offenses satisfy by present punishments, then this response is vain. But the former is true; Therefore also the latter. The minor premise: Because anyone for the present ought to perform what he does.

Obj. I. Isa. 56:4, 5, 6, 7. To eunuchs keeping his sabbaths, he promises good things. Resp. The prophet deals with true eunuchs, not with the continent by a superstitious vow, such as is that of Monks. Instant. On the contrary, also with eunuchs who are such from a vow, Matt. 19:12. For there He says there are eunuchs who have castrated themselves for the sake of the kingdom of heaven, and He exhorts that those who can take it, take it. Hence the diversity of counsels and precepts. Resp. Christ exhorts to continence not all, but those who can take it.

Obj. II. Matt. 19. Christ counsels the youth to sell all things. Therefore He gave counsel diverse from precepts. Resp. He does not counsel, but orders. Instant. Why does He not order all Christians to sell all things? Resp. On the contrary indeed He orders, even if not all things, yet all people. Luke 12:33. But He thus orders the youth to sell, so that He may render him known to himself.

Obj. III. It is good not to touch a woman. 1 Cor. 7. It is counsel diverse from the Lord's precept, v. 25. Resp. Counsel is opposed there to precept not immediately. Because he says this counsel proceeds from God; but mediately, because he found nothing in Moses and the Prophets about this precept. But, if Paul contradistinguishes his precept from the precept of the Lord, v. 10 and 12, nevertheless this distinction does not import the minority of the Pauline precept. Because the precept of Paul is to be considered, not as of a mere man, but as of one speaking from divine inspiration, wherefore Paul glories, v. 25, that it was given to him through the mercy of God to be faithful, and v. 40, "But I seem also to have the Spirit of God." Instant. But this truly appears to be counsel. For whether you follow it or not, you do not sin. But if you do not follow a precept, you sin. Resp. The precepts of God are twofold, namely of command, and of indulgence; if a precept of command is neglected, we sin. We can do and not do [a precept] of indulgence, without sin. 1 Cor. 7. About widows and virgins.

ON THE CEREMONIAL LAW.

QUESTION I. Is the Ceremonial Law the doctrine of the Gospel, or does it constitute a peculiar species of law?

It is distinguished. The Ceremonial Law is considered in two ways: Either as it is from Ecclesiastical rites, pertaining to Ecclesiastical order; and in this way the Ceremonial Law received constitutes a peculiar species of law; or the Ceremonial Law is received concerning types of Christ of whatever kind, which obtained in the Old Testament; in this signification, the Ceremonial Law is the doctrine of the Gospel. Proof: I. Because it is manifestly called a shadow and copy of Christ, whence it follows that it taught about Christ, and about the benefits to be furnished through Him. If about Christ; Therefore about the doctrine of the Gospel. The minor

premise: Heb. 10:1. Socinus responds: Not all sacrifices were types, but only the anniversary sacrifice, with whose blood the priest entered the holy of holies. Resp. How therefore did the rest of the sacrifices expiate? Not really, Heb. 10:1, 2, 3, 4. Therefore significantly because they signified Christ and His expiation. II. Because if the Ceremonial Law exchanges the names of sacrifices from Christ, then the Ceremonial Law will teach about Christ, and consequently, will be the doctrine of the Gospel. But the former is true. Therefore also the latter. The consequence is clear. Because no reason can be given why the names of sacrifices are attributed to Christ, unless the Ceremonial Law taught about Christ. The minor premise: Christ is called the Lamb, execration, etc. Socinus responds: Those things are attributed to Christ, not insofar as He is considered in reality under this formality as a sacrifice, but insofar as He is considered as endowed with these or such things, see Isa. 53:7. Resp. Scripture teaches the contrary. 1 Cor. 5. Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us. Therefore sacrifices are considered as sacrifices, although we do not deny that in a certain way certain qualities were required in Christ, by which He was going to furnish the sacrifice, see Exod. 12. III. Heb. 11. Abel is said to have offered sacrifice by faith. Therefore this doctrine about sacrifice was the doctrine of the Gospel. Exception: Their good works are from faith, and yet the law commands them. Therefore, they say, that consequence is weak: From faith, Therefore it is the doctrine of the Gospel. Resp. It holds in this way: It is from faith, so that the moral law teaches nothing about it, Therefore it is the doctrine of the Gospel. For, it will pertain either to the law, or to the Gospel, not to the law, because the law does not teach about it. Therefore to the Gospel.

Objections of the Socinians. I. The doctrine of the Gospel was not in the Old Testament. Therefore the Ceremonial Law is not the doctrine of the Gospel. They prove the antecedent. Jer. 31:34. Because the remission of sins is only promised in the New Testament. Resp. The remission of sins is promised in the New Testament with greater clarity, not as to the thing. For sins were remitted also in the Old Testament. Rom. 4. Ps. 32. Instant. If sins were remitted then, Therefore Christ then died in the Old Testament. Resp. The reason of the meritorious cause is such that it has effect, before it exists, provided that it is known to have a certain and recognized [future] existence.

Obj. II. If the Ceremonial Law is the doctrine of the Gospel, it follows that it ought not to have been abrogated. But it was abrogated. Therefore. The reason for the consequence: because the doctrine of the Gospel ought to be perpetual. Resp. The way of teaching by which God teaches us is twofold, namely by types and by word; therefore it ceased as to the mode of teaching, which was by types, but not, which was by word. For types teach about a future thing, before they are exhibited, but the thing having been exhibited they cease. Instant. Types also teach about the doctrine of the Gospel which was by word, as the sacraments. Resp. So indeed, but those types teach us about a past thing, not a future one.

Obj. III. If the Ceremonial Law was the Gospel, why then does Christ say, Matt. 12:7, "I desire mercy, not sacrifice"? Resp. That is not to be taken simply and absolutely but comparatively, I do not want sacrifice as much as mercy. Indeed the precepts of the first table are to be preferred to the precepts of the second, namely as to internal worship. But as to external, by no means, because God Himself regards the heart, but the neighbor regards aid. Hence Christ wants the sabbath to be violated rather than not to help a neighbor in extracting an ox or donkey. Instant. If God hates sacrifices, how will they be able to be the worship of God? But He hates [them]. Isa. 66:3. Resp. He hates not sacrifices, but wicked men offering sacrifices. Isa. 1:11.

ON FORENSIC LAW.

QUESTION I. Ought no other laws to be observed among Christians in Political judgments than these very Mosaic laws?

The response is by denying. I. If those laws are most wise and most apposite for governing a republic, then they ought to be received. But the former is true. Therefore also the latter. The reason for the consequence: Because laws ought to be preserved for this reason, because [they are] most wise, most just, and most accommodated to things. Instant. Grant it, but nevertheless they are not most accommodated to any republic. Resp. This is the same as to say that the moral Mosaic laws are not accommodated to all republics, when the moral laws are the foundations of the forensic laws of Moses. II. God Himself in the Old Testament obliged the Magistrate to those laws, Therefore those laws alone ought to be observed. The reason for the consequence: Because if all controversial cases were able to be decided from these laws formerly, then it also ought to happen at another time, unless a reason for diversity is given. Instant. The times are now worse, nor do those laws suffice for settling all controversies. Resp. On the contrary indeed also then the times were worst, which do not yield to ours in malice; hence extraordinary punishments, such as were of the flood, [were] inflicted. III. If those laws do not suffice for governing all republics, and deciding all political controversies, then sacred Scripture is not perfect as to precepts of morals. But the latter is false; Therefore also the former. The reason for the consequence: Because Scripture is said to be perfect in this way, that it gives precepts to all states, namely present and future, how each one ought to conduct himself in his own state, at any time. Instant. If the matter has it thus, Therefore Scripture prescribes morals for butchers, shoemakers, etc., which is absurd. Resp. It certainly prescribes, even if not as to their morals, yet as to a pious life, Luke 3:10, 11, 12.

Jurists and Lutherans rise up. I. The forensic law is abrogated; Therefore now controversies cannot be determined according to it. Resp. Forensic law is either common or special. The forensic law is abrogated, not the common, but the special, which had its origin from a certain circumstance and peculiar state of the Israelite people; such was the law concerning the Jubilee year, concerning marrying a brother's wife. Instant. On the contrary, none remain, on account of the moral law, which alone was given in perpetuity, which also for that reason alone is cited in the New Testament. Resp. Not only. See Matt. 15:4. 2. If conscience and the law of nature show the equity of those laws in part, then it follows that they are not abrogated. But it does show; Therefore. The reason for the consequence, because the law of nature is perpetual. The minor premise: Because as homicide, so adultery among most nations and more cultured nations, is punished by death. Instant. On the contrary, it appears even from that that they are abrogated. For if the matter has it thus, then all would agree in the laws of nature. But they do not agree. Because in many places adulteries are not punished by death, elsewhere thieves are hanged, which is against the forensic laws divinely given. (For we do not delay here over that inept

reasoning of Brochmann, Professor at Copenhagen, "The wages of sin is death; Therefore thieves are to be hanged.") Resp. As the image of God in fallen man is left only as to remnants, so also the law of nature; so that it is not surprising if these or those men without the word of God do not altogether agree in the application of the natural laws to particular human actions.