

THEOLOGICAL DISPUTATION ON SUBSEQUENT GRACE.

Respondent: JOHN BEUKELMAN, of Amsterdam
March 3, 1669

1. Having acknowledged beforehand what subsequent grace is, we will set forth:
2. To the question of whether it exists, we will respond; and we will prove that subsequent grace exists and that it is necessary for every good work.

We presuppose: 1. That grace (Gr. charis/charima) is a supernatural gift, operation, and work of God. So that it may be distinguished from nature and from natural operation and gift as the author, preserver, and governor of all nature, especially human nature; to which He gives being, which He preserves in being, which He governs by His concurrence and precursive assistance in operating, as the prime cause of all motions and operations. Acts 27:28 "For in Him we live and move and have our being." And verse 25 "He himself gives to all life and breath and everything." Therefore, it is a gratuitous gift and most precious thing, which is not conferred in and with nature, nor has been conferred, nor arises or emanates from the principles of nature; but it is a work and gift superadded to nature and coming upon it from outside.

Corollary 1: The ancient and modern Pelagians are therefore wrong to confuse grace with nature, or to substitute nature for grace. And the Orthodox rightly distinguish grace from nature according to the usage of Scripture, namely Augustine in his book *On Nature and Grace*. And by Francis Junius in his *Collation on the Efficacy of Christ the Savior in all and each human being*, insofar as they are human. The author of the book was Francis Puccius, who attributes to reason what Scripture teaches should be attributed to grace.

Corollary 2: Likewise, the figment of some concerning a certain universal saving grace, whether of election, salvation, redemption or calling, is wrongly conceived.

Corollary 3: Rightly is distinguished in any good spiritual work the spirituality, supernaturality, moral goodness of that act from the naturality, vitality, and metaphysical goodness of the same act. The latter pertains to the realm of nature or potency, [coming] from God as the author and governor of nature and prime cause and primary mover. The former is from God in the realm of grace, as the Redeemer, Savior, and worker of salvation through the Holy Spirit. Philippians 2:13 "For it is God who works..." together with Ephesians 1:3-5, 2 Peter 1:3.

ON THE SALVIFIC OPERATION OF THE SPIRIT, IN THE ELECT AND THOSE TO BE SAVED

We have spoken above in the disputation on 1 Corinthians 2, concerning the spiritual man.

II. It is presupposed that the term grace and charisma sometimes analogically denotes a supernatural gift and endowment which does not have an infallible connection with salvation. Such as the gift of tongues, healing, and miracle-working faith; especially the grace of illumination and restraint, which is also given to some of the reprobate or those not to be saved. Matthew 7:21-22, 25:3, 11-12. Add 1 Timothy 1:19-20, Hebrews 6:4-5, 10:26-29. Concerning passing faith, Matthew 13:20-21. Concerning dead faith, or mere notional faith, James 2:14, 17, which is distinguished from living faith working through love, Galatians 5:6. Concerning restraining grace, 2 Peter 2:20. The effect of this illuminating and restraining grace differs in form and appearance from the effect of sanctifying grace, both the first and the second. We have previously indicated the signs and distinguishing marks in Part 2 of the Select Disputations, under the title On Simplicity and Hypocrisy, and On the Practice of Faith.

III. It is presupposed that grace sometimes denotes operative grace, the grace that gives, produces - that is, the gracious God; sometimes the termination, effect, product of the divine operation in man. Just as the word "spirit" sometimes denotes the termination, effect, product, work, John 3:6 "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit." The Apostle in 1 Corinthians 12:1, compared with verses 3-11, teaches to distinguish among the things signified. In the same way that the Schools sometimes distinguish the decree that decrees and the decreed decree, the naturing nature and the natured nature, the creating creation and the created creation - which is properly called creature, created thing.

IV. It is presupposed that among theologians grace is distinguished into prevenient and subsequent, into operative and co-operative, into first and second. The former is that which precedes every good and spiritual work of man; and to which nothing meritorious, whether condignly or congruously, of illuminating or sanctifying grace, or of disposing toward illuminating or sanctifying grace, or actively occasioning (if I may so speak) illuminating or sanctifying grace, nor any simultaneous concurrence and co-operation of man, in the way that two or three men together carry a burden or pull a ship, and many rowers together propel a ship, gives rise. But to the operation of this grace, or illuminating or sanctifying spirit, and its effect or work, man has himself purely passively, as the subject in which the Holy Spirit works, introduces, imprints such a work - that is, spiritual grace. You will gather this explanation of prevenient grace from Augustine's Epistle 107 to Vitalis, and Against Julian book 1 of the unfinished work, in the Enchiridion chapter 32, on Psalm 17 sermon 1, on Psalm 31 sermon 2, on Psalm 58 and very many other places. And from Prosper's Response to the 8th Excerpt of the Genevan, from the book Against the Collator chapter 39, from Fulgentius' book 1 to Monimus sections 13, 19, 31, the book On the Incarnation and Grace, and book 1 On the Truth of Predestination and Grace, where he expounds distinctly the effect of prevenient and subsequent grace. But concerning this irresistible prevenient grace of conversion, or effectual calling, or regeneration

and its proper and formal effect, it is treated fully elsewhere, and we have previously [treated it] in Part 2 of the Select Disputations, under the title On Regeneration.

Only this must be observed here, that the work which this prevenient grace produces in man and infuses into him is a quality, habit, power and faculty (if I may so speak) spiritual and supernatural; and so something inherent and permanent, to be conceived after the manner of a first act.

Subsequent grace is the action and motion of God in the heart of man, through the prevenient grace of God, now regenerated, changed, transformed, endowed and furnished with the infused, impressed, inherent, habitual grace, and informed by that new spiritual and supernatural form; by which He not only preserves him in that state, but also moves, excites, applies him effectively to whatever act of faith, whether general or specifically applicative, or to an act of love, or hope, or repentance, or to whatever other spiritually good act to be elicited and exercised here and now. This subsequent grace differs from prevenient [grace]:

In that the latter imprints, infuses, produces new qualities, which we conceive after the manner of habits and spiritual faculties informing and perfecting a man's intellect and will. But the former, by a transient action, touches, moves, excites, applies the regenerate and reformed intellect and will of man to spiritually move itself and elicit a spiritual act here and now.

Secondly, in that by the divine action of prevenient grace there is imprinted, implanted, created, bestowed in man a spiritual and supernatural active indwelling principle. But by the action of subsequent grace there is imprinted a touch, motion, impulse which the regenerate mind and will receives and terminates, being moved to move, acted to act, drawn to run. In short, the divine action or operation of subsequent grace within the mind of the regenerate man does not produce, create, implant new spiritual qualities, powers, dispositions, habits inherent and permanent in the mind and will there, just as the carrying of a burning lamp into a room at night concurs with and precedes the actual vision of someone existing in that room in reading a letter, but does not produce or leave behind a new power of seeing, first or second, in that man as an active principle of vision. And just as words pronounced in the ears of a listener excite and effect actual hearing in him, but do not immediately and directly produce or introduce a new power or faculty of hearing into him.

Thirdly, in that the action and motion of prevenient grace has as its termination, formal effect and immediate object the spiritual faculties, infused habits, first acts, active principles; not the spiritual actions or co-operations of that man, whether antecedent or concomitant. For man has himself purely passively and terminatively as the receiving subject, not as co-operating or pre-operating toward that effect, toward that created work. But the action or motion of subsequent grace impressed on the mind and will, or acting around and within the mind and will of the regenerate man, has as its termination and formal and immediate effect the spiritual action and operation of the regenerate man, just as the productive action by which God produces man, beast, tree, and whatever faculties are in them and with them, has no other termination and formal and immediate effect than substance and faculties, not the actions or

second acts of man or beast. But the concurrence and antecedent motion of the first cause, or the motion and application of the first mover in and with man or beast, has no other proper and immediate termination than the second acts, motions, and operations of that man or beast themselves. For God by a determining concurrence influences the cause (that is, man or beast) and the effect.

Similarly, in the raising of Lazarus (concerning which in John 11), the act of the divine omnipotence raising or vivifying (to which also corresponds the act of the omnipotent and efficacious prevenient grace) has no other termination and immediate and formal effect than the compound, or the soul of Lazarus united with the body, and life in the first act. But the concurrence, or rather the antecedent motion and omnipotence of God in and with the now living Lazarus, has no other proper termination and immediate effect than the vital actions of Lazarus - namely, hearing, rising up, and going forth from the tomb, not the impression of new faculties or active principles.

And these things indeed concerning the first and second moment of conversion, and of the then prevenient or first, then subsequent or second, grace that saves, effectively and irresistibly operating through the omnipotent facility and easy omnipotence in the elect and those to be saved.

First, by imprinting, introducing, infusing into the spiritually dead man the first grace, that is, the new creature, new life, or principle of new spiritual life. Concerning which hidden act of regeneration and vivification, one can scarcely think otherwise than as the philosophers [think] concerning the animation of the fetus, whose saying is this: "The soul is infused by being created, and created by being infused."

Second, moving, exciting, applying the now regenerated and vivified man to whatever truly and spiritually good work, influencing the cause and the effect, and making him act, making use of the first grace impressed in the first moment of conversion. In the way that Lazarus, now raised and vivified with the faculty of seeing, hearing, moving about, used [those faculties] through the actual antecedent motion and pre-motion of God, applied to those vital acts. With this special, or rather most special grace, both prevenient or first, and subsequent or second, having an infallible connection with salvation, can be compared the illuminating and restraining grace, both prevenient and subsequent, and its termination and effect of passing faith, with certain adjuncts, both in the first act and in the second act - the former of which is produced by the operation of a more common first grace, the latter by the pre-motion or excitation and concurrence of a more common second grace with the man now endowed with passing faith.

But that such a more common, illuminating and restraining grace can belong to some of the reprobate, has been proved elsewhere from the Scriptures, and by us in Part 2 of the Select Disputations under the title On Simplicity and Hypocrisy, where other most outstanding writers are also indicated. And the theology concerning the sin against the Holy Spirit, treated in so many fair treatises, so many academic theses, so many common places, most forcibly proves that such a grace of illumination is imparted to some of the reprobate.

These things had to be acknowledged beforehand, so that against the ancient and modern Pelagians or Naturalists we may clearly and distinctly understand and defend that the genuine sense of Scripture, the genuine real (as distinguished from verbal) interpretation of it, the genuine and true assent and faith in the truths and doctrines of the faith, the genuine persuasion and conviction concerning the truth of the principal and most necessary articles of faith, cannot be had through nature or reason or philosophy or grammar or knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek languages, as the principle and norm.

Concerning prevenient and subsequent grace, the following must be presupposed: On the part of God graciously willing and acting, or on the part of the act of God's willing and gracing, or according to the active attingency, there is no order, respect, and relation of prior and posterior or antecedent and consequent, of cause and caused, of means and end, of condition and conditioned, because just as the mind of God knows all knowable things by one simple and indivisible act, so also His will wills all willings, whatever it wills. Consequently there are not many diverse willings, nor is there priority, posteriority, dependence of one on another.

But on the part of the things willed, or according to the passive attingency, just as the willings are many, so a certain order among them and dependence of one upon another can be conceived - the order, that is, of antecedent and consequent, means and end, occasion and occasioned, cause without which not and caused, concause or instrument and instrumentated, aiding and aided, assistance and assisted, promoting and promoted, disposing and disposed. And thus that saying of Augustine is to be understood: "His mercy is the cause of the wretched man."

So the spirit or grace or gift of faith in us has itself to the grace, spirit, gift of confidence as instrument, means, cause without which not. Ephesians 3:12 "Through Him (Christ) we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of Him." And Acts 15:9 "Purifying their hearts by faith." Not only faith, but also love toward God and neighbor disposes, aids, promotes toward all virtues relating to God and neighbor. 2 Corinthians 5 "The love of Christ constrains us," etc. 1 Corinthians 13:1,4-7. And thus concerning all the other graces, gifts, and parts and acts of the new creature, we must judge according to all the delineations of the common topics, where they assign the causes and effects, antecedents and consequents, means and ends of the theme they are explaining, especially in the common topic on good works in general and in particular. Above all, the practical and moral theologians treat this expressly, when they allege the motives, means, signs of each virtue. See the Viridarium of the Jesuit Bussaeus, and Ames' Cases of Conscience. The first grace produced by prevenient grace in the elect has no spiritual gift prior to itself, no charisma, no spiritual principle by which, no disposition, no life in the unregenerate or dead in sins pre-existing. But the first grace infused and impressed by prevenient grace is the principle, cause, source, origin of all spiritual acts.

Therefore, the following concur to the production of a spiritual act:

1. God through the pre-motion, antecedent motion and concurrence of subsequent grace.
2. Man as regenerate, through the faculty, aptitude, fitness of the grace given and inherent in him, as the principle by which.
3. The external preaching, reading, hearing of the Word, and the internal consideration, meditation, recollection of the same Word, the consideration of the divine works in the realm of nature and in the realm of grace, both blessings and judgments. Especially extraordinary or rarer or miraculous works which are seen or heard, give occasion or move to the actual consideration of our ways, to actual repentance, to prayer, to thanksgiving, to the meditation of death and other last things.
4. Prayer premised before a spiritual work, or also accompanying the exercise of that work, or intermixed with the spiritual work, is the instrument of instruments and concause of producing any spiritual act and work. By concomitant and intermixed prayer I mean ejaculatory prayer, which we have explained in the Exercises of Piety, chapter 4. And such [prayers] have their place especially in the reception of the Eucharist, in hearing the Word, and in solitary reading and meditation on the Word. So these three spiritual charismata and gifts of God (namely faith, love, prayer) are as it were the general instruments disposing, moving, assisting, causes without which not of all other good works. And the remaining virtues and spiritual acts are mutually aids, means, instruments, motives, causes without which not for each other, so that concerning them it is permissible to say what the philosophers say concerning health and walking, that they are causes of each other.

We now come to the question of whether subsequent grace exists, and the determination of what it is, which is given for each good act and is necessary.

The proofs are these:

The first proof is from the clear texts of Scripture, Philippians 2:13: "For it is God who works in you both to will and to work for his good pleasure."

Add those places where God is said to work our good works, and to have freely given us to work, Philippians 1:29 "For to you it has been granted for Christ's sake, not only to believe in Him, but also to suffer for His sake." Romans 8:26 "The Spirit himself also helps our weakness...the Spirit himself intercedes for us with groanings too deep for words." Compare with Galatians 4:6 "And because you are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, 'Abba! Father!'"

1 Corinthians 12:6 "There are varieties of effects, but the same God who works all things in all persons."

Galatians 2:8 "(for He who effectually worked for Peter in his apostleship to the circumcised effectually worked for me also to the Gentiles)."

1 Corinthians 15:10 "But by the grace of God I am what I am, and His grace toward me did not prove vain; but I labored even more than all of them, yet not I, but the grace of God with me."

Hence that saying of Augustine concerning the reward of our good works: "God crowns His own gifts in us." And that often repeated in the books of the Confessions: "Grant what You command, and command what You will, and You shall not command in vain."

Ephesians 1:13 "In Him, you also, after listening to the message of truth, the gospel of your salvation -- having also believed, you were sealed in Him with the Holy Spirit of promise."

1 Corinthians 10:13 "No temptation has overtaken you but such as is common to man; and God is faithful, who will not allow you to be tempted beyond what you are able, but with the temptation will provide the way of escape also, so that you will be able to endure it."

Romans 8:37 "But in all these things we overwhelmingly conquer through Him who loved us."

Matthew 10:19-20 "But when they deliver you up, do not worry about how or what you should speak. For it will be given to you in that hour what you should speak; for it is not you who speak, but the Spirit of your Father who speaks in you."

2 Corinthians 1:21-22 "Now He who establishes us with you in Christ and has anointed us is God, who also has sealed us and given us the Spirit in our hearts as a guarantee."

The second proof is taken from the prayers and thanksgivings of the faithful. In their prayers, they do not ask for prevenient or first grace for themselves - they only give thanks. But they ask for themselves subsequent grace, that is, preserving, exciting, prevenient, effectual grace causing us to act. They ask for subsequent grace for other believers. For unbelievers they ask for prevenient grace. Concerning the petition for subsequent grace, or for the Holy Spirit preserving, exciting, illuminating, leading, comforting, raising us up from a fall:

Luke 11:9,13 "Ask, and it will be given to you...How much more will your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those who ask Him?"

Song of Songs 1:4 "Draw me, we will run after You."

Jeremiah 31:18 "Turn me, and I shall be turned."

Psalms 143:10 "Teach me to do Your will...Let Your good Spirit lead me on level ground."

Psalms 51:10,12 "Create in me a clean heart, O God...Sustain me with a willing spirit...Restore to me the joy of Your salvation and sustain me with a willing spirit...Then I will teach transgressors Your ways."

Psalms 119:12,18,27-36,58,64,66,68,73-76,77,83,88,94,102,108,116-117,

122,124-125,132-135,144-146,154,156,159,169 (Various petitions for God's teaching, enlightenment, direction according to His law).

For others we ask for both prevenient and subsequent grace:

Hebrews 13:20-21 "Now the God of peace...equip you in every good thing to do His will, working in us that which is pleasing in His sight."

Ephesians 6:18-19 "With all prayer...praying...for me, that utterance may be given to me..."

2 Thessalonians 2:16-17 "Now may our Lord Jesus Christ Himself and God our Father...comfort and strengthen your hearts in every good work and word."

2 Thessalonians 1:11 "To this end also we pray for you always, that our God will...fulfill every desire for goodness and the work of faith with power."

Similarly Philipians 1:3-12, Colossians 1:9-11, 2:1-2, 2 Timothy 2:7.

That we ask for subsequent grace for ourselves and other believers is taught by the petitions of the Lord's Prayer 1,2,3,6. See the interpreters on the Lord's Prayer, especially our Catechism. In accordance with this scriptural doctrine speak all the Christian liturgies and forms of prayer, both ancient and modern, all private prayer books published before the Reformation by Catholics, after the Reformation by Protestants and the Reformed - which commonly express this doctrine, that the assistance of subsequent grace is to be asked from God. I do not even except the corrupt liturgies and agenda of the Papists. Not to mention that in the very Colloquy at Regensburg, the Jesuits, when disputing against the operation of second grace or the Holy Spirit - by the recitation of that well-known hymn "Come, Creator Spirit, Visit the minds of your faithful, Fill with your heavenly grace The hearts you yourself have made" and other prayers, were asking for His assistance, grace, operation for accomplishing, carrying out, perfecting that work (in their judgment).

We conclude from the enjoined petition for subsequent grace that the possibility, necessity and indigence of subsequent grace for any spiritual acts can rightly be inferred, lest it be thought to be something imaginary or enthusiastic-fanatical, or absolutely impossible, or one of those entities multiplied without necessity.

Concerning thanksgiving for the bestowed assistance of subsequent grace and the particular illumination and leading of the Holy Spirit in this or that affair, it is evident from the experience of the faithful and pious, who do not forget the actual faith, confidence, perspicacity, prudence, fortitude, justice, victory given to them in internal or external temptation or any other spiritual business.

1 Timothy 1:12 "I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who has strengthened me..."

2 Corinthians 1:3-5 "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and God of all comfort, who comforts us in all our affliction so that we will be able to comfort those who are in any affliction with the comfort with which we ourselves are comforted by God. For just as the sufferings of Christ are ours in abundance, so also our comfort is abundant through Christ."

§. 5. The proofs are these:

The first proof is from the clear texts of Scripture, Philippians 2, verse 13: For it is God who worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.

Add those passages where God is said to work our good works, and to have freely given us to act, Philippians 1, verse 29: For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake. Romans 8, verse 26: Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities, etc. the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. Compared with Galatians 4, verse 6: And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.

1 Corinthians 12, verse 6: And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all.

Galatians 1, verse 8: For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles.

1 Corinthians 15, verse 10: But by the grace of God I am what I am: and his grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain; but I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me.

Hence that saying of Augustine concerning the reward of our good works: God crowns his own gifts in us. And often repeated in the books of Confessions: Give what thou commandest, and command what thou wilt, and thou shalt not command in vain.

Ephesians 1, verse 13: In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise.

1 Corinthians 10: But God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it.

Romans 8, verse 37: Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us.

Matthew 10, verses 19-20: But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.

2 Corinthians 1, verse 21: Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.

§. 6. The second proof is taken from the prayers and thanksgivings of the faithful. In their prayers they do not ask for prevenient or first grace for themselves; they only give thanks for it. But they ask for subsequent grace for themselves, that is, preserving, exciting, prevenient, or concurring grace, to make them act. They ask for subsequent grace for other believers. For unbelievers they ask for prevenient grace. Concerning the petition for subsequent grace, or the Holy Spirit preserving us, exciting us, illuminating us, leading us, comforting us, raising us up from falls:

Luke 11, verse 9: And I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you, etc. with verse 13: How much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?

Song of Songs 1, verse 4: Draw me, we will run after thee.

Jeremiah 31, verse 18: Turn thou me, and I shall be turned.

Psalms 143, verse 10: Teach me to do thy will; for thou art my God: thy spirit is good; lead me into the land of uprightness.

Psalms 51, verse 10: Make me to hear joy and gladness, etc. Verse 12: Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free spirit.

Psalms 119, verse 12: Teach me thy statutes. Verse 18: Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law. Verse 27: Make me to understand the way of thy precepts. Verse 28: Strengthen thou me according unto thy word. Verse 29: Remove from me the way of lying. Verse 32: I will run the way of thy commandments, when thou shalt enlarge my heart. Verse 33: Teach me, O Lord, the way of thy statutes, etc. Verse 34: Give me understanding, and I shall keep thy law, etc. Verse 35: Make me to go in the path of thy commandments, etc. Verse 36: Incline my heart unto thy testimonies, etc. Verse 58: Be merciful unto me according to thy word, etc. Verse 64: Teach me thy statutes. Verse 66: Teach me good judgment and knowledge: for I have believed thy commandments. Add verses 68, 73-76, 77, 83, 88, 94, 102, 108, 116, 117, 122, 124, 125, 132, 133-135, 144, 145, 146, 154, 156, 159, 169.

For others we ask for both prevenient and subsequent grace, Hebrews 13, verses 20-21: Now the God of peace, etc. make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is wellpleasing in his sight, etc.

Ephesians 6, verses 18-19: Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, etc. and for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, etc.

2 Thessalonians 2, verses 16-17: Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work.

And chapter 1, verse 11: Wherefore also we pray always for you, that our God would count you worthy of this calling, and fulfil all the good pleasure of his goodness, and the work of faith with power. Similarly Philippians 1, verses 3-12; Colossians 1, verses 9-10-11; and chapter 2, verses 1-2; 2 Timothy 2, verse 7.

That we ask for subsequent grace for ourselves and other believers, the petitions of the Lord's Prayer teach, 1, 2, 3, 6. See the interpreters on the Lord's Prayer, especially our Catechism. In conformity with this scriptural doctrine our Catechism speaks, question 116. All the Christian liturgies and forms of prayer, both ancient and modern, all the private prayer books published before the Reformation by the Papists, and after the Reformation by the Papists and Protestants and Reformed, commonly declare this doctrine, that the help of subsequent grace is to be asked

from God. I do not even except the corrupt liturgies and agendas of the Papists. Not to mention that in the very Colloquy at Ratisbon, the Jesuits disputing against the operation of second grace or the Holy Spirit, did yet ask for his help, grace, operation, for the performance of that good work (in their judgment), by the recitation of that well-known hymn (Come, Creator Spirit, Visit the minds of thy people, Fill with thy heavenly grace The breasts which thou hast created, etc. Kindle thy light in our senses, Pour forth thy love into our hearts, etc.) and other prayers. See those prayers in the Acts of that Colloquy. I survey the Ecclesiastical Hymn. Note where it says in verse 9: May the blessed Deity, the Spirit, grant this to us. And the hymn, Lo, now the night is rising, verse 9: May he grant this to us, etc. And the hymn, Now that the rising sun-star, verses 3, 4, and following. And the hymn, Come, Holy Spirit, now, throughout, and O best Creator of the light: and the remaining morning hymns.

Nay, even the Gentiles asked for the present help of God or the gods for every act, counsel, and work undertaken or to be undertaken, and the present-day Gentiles, Muhammadans, Jews, still ask: although they pray and worship what they know not. Well known is the Greek cry Προσευχη, and the invocations prefixed to the poets' poems, (e.g. Homer, Theognis, Aratus, Hesiod, Apollonius, Virgil, Statius, Ovid's Metamorphoses, etc.) And Epictetus in the Enchiridion, Lead me Jupiter, etc. And the prayers of the orators when coming to speak, such as that of Pericles; and the Bismillah, etc. of the Muhammadans. Concerning the sacrifices, offerings, anathemas, gifts, vows, prayers of the present-day Gentiles, read the more recent topographers and historians. Whence it appears that this opinion is implanted in all, that all men need God, and without the present favor and help of God or the gods, they can do nothing.

We conclude, from the petition for subsequent grace enjoined on the faithful, that the possibility, necessity, and need of subsequent grace for any spiritual acts can rightly be inferred; lest it be thought to be an arbitrary fiction, or an imaginary and enthusiastic-fanatical entity, or an absolute impossibility, or one of those entities multiplied without necessity.

Concerning the giving of thanks for the help of subsequent grace bestowed, and the particular illumination and guidance of the Holy Spirit in this or that matter, it is evident from the experience of the faithful and pious, who do not forget the actual faith, perseverance, perspicacity, prudence, confidence, fortitude, justice, victory given to them in inward or outward temptation, or in any other spiritual matter.

1 Timothy 1, verse 12: And I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who hath enabled me.

2 Corinthians 1, verses 3-4-5: Blessed be God, etc. who comforteth us in all our tribulation, etc.

Psalms 103, verses 1-5: Bless the Lord, O my soul, etc. who healeth all thy diseases, etc. and satisfieth thy mouth, etc. so that thy youth is renewed like the eagle's.

Which compare with Isaiah 40, verses 29-30-31.

Psalm 16, verse 7: I will bless the Lord, who hath given me counsel: my reins also instruct me in the night seasons. See Psalm 21 and 23 and many others of thanksgiving.

The sons of God, remembering the good they have done, their resistances and victories in various temptations, their rising up from falls, do not fear to say that of Isaiah 26, verse 12: Thou also hast wrought all our works in us.

§. 7. The third proof is taken from the promises of God, wherein he has promised to his people subsequent grace and the preserving, leading, working, exciting Spirit.

Zechariah 12, verse 10: And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications.

And this New Covenant made in Christ, Isaiah 59, verse 21: As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; My spirit that is upon thee, etc.

Jeremiah 31, verses 33-34, and 32, verses 38-39-40; Psalm 89, verses 29-36; 2 Timothy 2, verses 7 and 13; 1 Peter 1, verse 5; John 6, verses 44-45, with Acts 2, verses 16-17; Ephesians 5, verses 1 and 14; 2 Peter 1, verse 21; Matthew 13, verses 11-12.

THEOLOGICAL DISPUTATION ON SUBSEQUENT GRACE, PART TWO.

Respondent: ARNOLD BOSCHMAN, of Batavia. March 17, 1669.

§1. IV. Proof from the concurrence of God as the author, preserver and governor of nature: by which he flows into the cause and into the effect of every creature: even of every human being. If therefore, as to the naturalness of the act, God as the first cause and prime mover moves and acts by his predetermining and concurring power; and without it no motion of a creature would exist, not even of man: it follows that, as to the moral or spiritual goodness of human acts, God as the author, preserver, governor of grace, really attains, moves, applies and predetermines by his easy omnipotence and omnipotent facility, flowing not only into the effect, but also into the secondary cause itself; that is, into the regenerated, converted, renewed, spiritual man, or at least into the illuminated man and endowed with general faith, and cleansed by restraining grace from the pollutions of the world (2 Peter 2:20). Just as therefore entity, goodness, and natural perfection in creatures is not or cannot be independently of the first being, the first cause, the first goodness and perfection; that is, without the precourse and concurrence of God: so neither does spiritual or moral goodness and perfection in human acts exist or be able to exist independently of the first goodness, grace, perfection; that is, without his gratuitous precourse and concurrence, without his real and efficacious influx into the secondary cause

(namely, regenerated man, or at least illuminated man) and into the effect. This predetermining concurrence, which gives the creature to act, and which makes it act when it does not act, I here presuppose proved by the testimonies of Scripture and reasons by others. Among the Papists, those are to be consulted who professedly treat this, such as Francis Cumiel, Theologian of Salamanca, in various disputations Tom. 3, edition of 1605; De Rispolis the Dominican, on the State of the Controversy of Predefinitions and Predeterminations, etc., in the year 1609, in 8vo; Diego Alvarez on the Aids of Divine Grace, Book 2, Chapters 1 and 2; Francis Sylvius, in the Explanation of the Doctrine of St. Thomas, etc., on the Motion of the Prime Mover, in the year 1609, in 4to, who in the whole first part of that little book accumulates and applies testimonies from Thomas. In Part 2 he proves by 19 reasons that God works in every worker, so as to affect, move, premove, and predetermine the worker. Proof 18 has the authorities of the Fathers Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustine, Gregory the Great. Proof 19 has the assent of Alexander of Hales, Scotus, Bonaventure, the Ariminensian, Capreolus; the Louvainists, Tapper, Driedo, Lensaeus, Latomus, Cunerus, Helsselius, Titelanus, Jansenius, afterwards Bishop of Ghent; Finally, among the Jesuits, Toletus, Pererius, Canisius, Costerus, even Bellarmine. He notes there that Fonseca, Suarez, the Conimbricenses, who openly defend the simultaneous concurrence, compelled by the force and evidence of the truth (so to speak), admit or establish these conclusions: A natural agent applied to the passive is of itself indifferent to producing this or that individual form out of infinities: but it is determined by the concurrence of God. And, The action of a second cause is determined by itself first by God as to its singularity. And, Created agents by the finite concurrence of the determining first cause tend to singular existences per se. There on page 65 Sylvius thus concludes: "By which words do they not assert that the cause itself is attained, determined, and predefined by God? But if he determines and predefines the cause and the agents, how does he concur in the effect alone, and not in the cause? And while Suarez labors to find what is the determination of the cause which we have asserted from the Blessed Thomas, and what it places in the second cause: let him first seek and find what is that determination by which God determines fire to singularity and to the exercise of act, that here and now it produce this heat rather than another or at another time: which if he finds, let him satisfy his own mind; if not, let him believe, for we see that many things, even those which seem very small, are done by God, whose manner and order we do not hold or cannot." Lastly, to conclude this part with the Roman Catechism made and received by decree of the Council of Trent, we say: Not only does God by his providence cherish and administer all things that are, but even when they are moved and do anything he so impels them by his inmost power to motion and action, that, although he does not impede the efficiency of second causes, yet he prevents it, since his most hidden power extends to each thing, and as the Wise Man testifies, reacheth from one end to another mightily, and ordereth all things sweetly. Thus the Catechism Part 1, c.2, q.20. Which words, properly accepted (as they ought to be), signify that God prevents and impels, not to sin which is nothing, but to the act which is always substantially good.

The third part declares what the determination is; what it places in second causes: and whether the second cause itself is changed while it acts.

The fourth part dissolves the opposing arguments.

1. From the Scriptures.
2. From various authorities.
3. From the reason of free will.
4. From the cause of sin.

Among our writers, the following explain and defend the predetermining, not predetermined concurrence: Gail. Twisse in the *Vindiciae Gratiae*, Book 2, Digression 7 and 9. Samuel Rhetorfort in his *Scholastic Disputation on Divine Providence*, Chapters 25-26. Matthias Nethenus, Doctor of Philosophy and Theology, our late honored colleague, in his *Disputations on the Determining and Determinable Concurrence of God*: which I have often urged him to publish for the public good, and still urge.

V. Proof from the merit of Christ, by this argument: That grace which Christ merited for his sheep, is necessary and conferred on them for every good act. But the gift of subsequent grace Christ merited for his sheep. Therefore. I have proved the minor in the disputation *Whether Christ merited for the elect and those to be saved the special grace of regeneration and faith*. Hence here I only repeat that he merited for us sanctification, John 17; 2:19; Ephesians 5:25. But sanctification is not accomplished without subsequent grace, which preserves, excites, increases, renews the infused and inherent sanctity, and causes us to act.

VI. Proof from the faith, hope, and experience of truly faithful ones. As they pray that God may accompany and follow them with his grace; so also they believe, trust, hope with a hope that makes not ashamed, that God will be present with them by his grace, that they will not be forsaken: so that they may apply here the words of David, Psalm 23, last verse: Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life. And Psalm 138, last verse: The Lord will perfect that which concerneth me: thy mercy, O Lord, endureth for ever: forsake not the works of thine own hands. Here the last section of the Lord's Day of our Catechism is to be compared.

And the experience of truly faithful ones, and its confession among the godly and orthodox when occasion is given, especially in the agony of death, in the clear intervals of spiritual desertion, in the sudden illumination after profound and lasting darkness, in rare sayings, in overcoming grievous temptation, in the raising up from a fall; in the transition from night, sadness, insensibility, doubt, any spiritual calamity and affliction. See in the *Martyrology* the examples of the martyrs Robert Glover, who in the midst of the flames exclaimed that the Comforter Spirit had come; see there Jerome of Prague, Godfrey Guerin, John of Cahors, etc., the supportings, upholdings, raisings up of those falling or already fallen. Compare the examples of two emerging from profound temptation and wrestling with despair, which we have related from Bolton in the *Exercises of Piety*, c. 20, p. 541.

VII. Add the consensus:

1. Of the Ancients.
2. Of the writers of the Middle Ages.

3. Of the writers, both Ecclesiastical and Scholastic, under the novelty of the Papacy and witnesses of the truth, up to the year 1517.
4. Of the Papal writers from the year 1517 to the present day.
5. Of the Protestants and Reformed.

Among the Fathers, let Augustine lead the way, the hammer of the Manichees and Pelagians. Thus he in Epistle 107: "Whence we know that it pertains to the right and Catholic faith, that the greater grace of God is given for individual acts."

And there: "Wherefore, that we may believe in God and live piously, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy: not because we ought not to will and to run, but because he worketh in us both to will and to run."

The same in Epistle 95: "We are commanded to have understanding, where it is said: Be ye not as the horse or as the mule, which have no understanding; and yet we pray that we may have understanding, etc."

The same, On the Predestination of the Saints, ch. 11: "For he is asked to give what he commands: believers ask that faith may be increased to them; they ask for unbelievers that faith may be given to them, that both in its increments and in its beginnings faith may be the gift of God."

The same, Book 1 of Retractions, ch. 23: "That we will to believe is ours, it is true: but by that same rule, both are his, because he prepares the will; and both are ours, because it is not done unless we will."

Fulgentius to Maximus: "Therefore grace prevents the ungodly man, that he may become just; it follows the just man, that he may not become ungodly. It prevents the blind, that it may give the light, which he does not find: it follows him that sees, that it may preserve the light which it has bestowed. It prevents him that is cast down, that he may rise up; it follows him that is lifted up, that he fall not. It prevents by giving to man a good will; it follows the well-willer by working in him the power of a good work."

The same, in the book On the Truth of Predestination and Grace: "Then do we salutarily learn what we ought to do, when preventing mercy illuminates us, and heals us; that what we learn by that prevention, we may do by it following."

Council of Orange, Canon 3: "If anyone says that by human invocation the grace of God can be conferred, and does not rather confess that it is given to us to invoke it, he contradicts Isaiah, etc."

The same, Canon 6: "If anyone says that without the grace of God believing, willing, striving as we ought, can be given to us for the infusion of the Holy Spirit, and puts the aid of grace in

subjection to human humility or obedience, and does not agree that it is the gift of the grace itself that we are obedient and humble, he resists the Apostle, etc."

Council of Milevis, Canon 3: It pronounces anathema on those who deny that grace is given as an aid, that sins may not be committed.

Prosper, in the Book of Sentences from Augustine, ch. 22: "It is the gift of God, when we both think rightly and restrain our feet from falsehood and injustice. For as often as we do good, God works in us, and we with him, that we may work."

The same, in the book On the Ungrateful, at the end: "And yet when we turn our mind to the acts of the saints, when a chaste mind resists the desires of the flesh, etc. It is the grace of Christ; by which it runs, rejoices, endures, takes heed, chooses, insists, believes, hopes, loves, is cleansed, is justified. For if we do anything right, we do it by the Lord assisting, thou movest the hearts, thou grantest the desires of him that asketh, what thou wilt to give: preserving thy gifts, thou createst them. From merits thou addest merits, and crownest thy gifts."

§. 4. I will not here exhibit the testimonies of the Doctors of the Middle Ages, and under the novelty of the Papacy, as also of the witnesses of the truth, which a sheet would not contain. Among the Doctors under the Papacy from the time of the Reformation, I have indicated some above.

As to the Protestant and Reformed Doctors, I will here indicate at least some; of the writers of Common Places, Polanus Book 2, ch. 21, p. 170, and Book 6, ch. 37, p. 468b, folio edition.

Francis Junius in Common Places, Book 2, ch. 28.

Wendelin, Book 1 of Theology, ch. 26, thesis 4.

Pelargus in Compendium Theologicum, Locus 4, p. 41 and following.

Synopsis of Leiden, Disputation 34, §. 6 and following.

John Gerardi in Isagogical Disputations, Disputation 17, 24.

Chemnitz in Common Places, Part 1, Locus on the Holy Spirit, p. 109, and Part 2, Locus on Good Works, p. 1, 2.

Of Commentators, we indicate those who have commented on Romans 8, verses 14, 15, 26; Song of Songs 1:4; Jeremiah 32, verses 39, 40, and 31:18; especially Philipians 2:13: such as Zanchius, Tossanus, Piscator, Gomarus, Calvin. We add to the last two among others Thomas, whose words we here exhibit:

"Then when he says, For it is God, etc. He confirms confidence and excludes four false opinions. One, of men believing that man can be saved by free will without divine aid. Against this he says, For it is God, etc. John 14: The Father abiding in me, he doeth the works, etc. and 15: Without me ye can do nothing. Others entirely deny free will, saying that man is necessitated by fate or divine providence. And this he excludes when he says, In you, because

he moves the will inwardly by instinct to work well, Isaiah 26: Thou also hast wrought all our works in us.

"The third, of the Pelagians as well as the first, saying that the elections are in us but the pursuances of works are in God: because to will is from us, but to perfect is from God. And this he excludes by saying, Both to will and to do. Romans 9: It is not of him that willeth, that is, to will without the aid of God, nor of him that runneth, that is, to run, but of God that sheweth mercy.

"The fourth, that God does all good in us, and this by our merits. This he excludes when he says, According to his good pleasure, that is, not for our merits: because before the grace of God there is no merit of good in us."

Cajetan there: "God by his gratuitous good will towards you works in you both to will inwardly and to do outwardly."

Of polemical writers, we indicate John Hoornbeek, in Tom. 1 of Socinianism Confuted, ch. 5, p. 65, and all the writers against the Socinians, Remonstrants, Hypothetical Doctors in the Papacy, denying the operation, influx, premotion of subsequent grace. We have cited above Twisse and Rhetorfort. We here add only one of the most celebrated antagonists of Remonstrantism, James Trigland, in the Antapologia, ch. 33, p. 442 and following, and in the Preface *** 3, from which we exhibit these words to our students:

"Neither (says the Prefacer to the Remonstrants' Apology) does the Calvinist remove the difficulties when he makes that Judge to be the Holy Spirit speaking inwardly in the hearts of the elect (whom he calls), but he greatly increases them. But (I say) the Calvinist (that is, the Reformed Doctor) does not make that inwardly speaking Judge other than the Scripture (for no other speech than the outward Scripture ought to be attributed to it). And indeed, whoever does not acknowledge that inward Judge, the Holy Spirit, shows himself to be only a carnal man, void of the Spirit of God. So the little trifler Prefacer sophistically and slanderously speaks, as is his wont. Nor does the Reformed Doctor use that testimony of the Holy Spirit as an argument by which to persuade another of the authority of Holy Scripture: he elicits other ineffable things from the Scriptures by which he may effect this. Just as the Holy Scripture provides the outward teaching, by which those things are taught which would otherwise be hidden, and those things which are covered are revealed; so the Holy Spirit illuminates the inward eyes of the mind, that those things which would otherwise remain unknown, even when revealed, may be understood, and that they may not, when not understood, be contemned or neglected. Wherefore, just as for the bodily vision of things a twofold light is required, first the outward light in the air, etc., then also the intrinsic light, etc., so for the inward understanding of spiritual things a twofold light is required, the outward light of the divine Word or Scripture revealing and manifesting the mysteries of God, and the inward light of the Holy Spirit, inwardly opening the mind to the understanding of those things. And the Apostle conjoins these two together in 1 Corinthians 2, verses 12-13-14-15. But that Spirit of God, whether he speaks outwardly in the Word, or inwardly in the mind of the man either reading or hearing that Word, is always consistent with

himself, because he is one and the same Spirit. Let that twofold light, both inward and outward, be considered, and both most fitly agreeing with each other, as proceeding from one and the same divine and heavenly light; and all those things will vanish which that same Prefacer idly and ineptly utters concerning the fanatics, who derive things from another source than from that light."

More may be indicated in these and other polemical writers of the Socinians, Remonstrants, Papists, appositely to the particular question concerning the supreme, absolute, infallible interpreter of Scripture and judge of controversies.

§. 5. Let us now briefly touch upon the objections.

I. Objection: If subsequent grace or the Holy Spirit acts in every good work by precourse, flowing into the cause, and by concurrence, flowing into the effect: it follows that man does nothing; but that the first cause does that good work in the presence of that man; just as God alone works miracles, and as the direct and physical cause produces something by a physical operation, e.g. the healing of the lame man in Acts 3, in the presence of, at the prayer and declaration of Peter and John; he raises the dead, in the presence of Elijah, or Elisha, or Peter in Acts 9, or Paul in Acts 20. Response: The consequence is denied. Because he works and causes both to will and to do in believers; not that they may not work, not will, not do, but that they may work. Philippians 2:12-13; Song of Songs 1:4. He leads that we may go; he moves that we may move: just as the carpenter predetermines, applies, agitates the saw, not that it may be at rest, but that it may actually saw here and now.

Instance 1: Therefore that good work is to be attributed to God or the Holy Spirit; not to the regenerated man. Response: It is attributed to God, absolutely as the first, absolute, independent agent: yet the effect itself, or the whole work, is not attributed to him totally, adequately, and exclusively of all causality and operation of faithful men: it is attributed to him as the first cause, as the effective principle; not as the formal principle. For the Holy Spirit does not formally grieve over sins, nor groan, pray, cry, Abba Father: but he causes that we should grieve, pray, cry. See Zechariah 12; Acts 5 and 11; 2 Timothy 2, last verse; and Galatians 4:6, compared with Romans 8:15, 23, 26, 27.

Instance 2: Therefore the good work subjectively (grief over sin, groaning, desire for grace, etc.) ought to be called God's grief, God's groaning, God's desire, God's prayer; and not man's. Response: It is denied. Because that subjective denomination is attributed to the second, particular, proper cause; not to the first, universal, common cause. Just as in natural things, the course of the horse or the hare is not subjectively attributed to the first cause and prime mover: because formally God does not run, since the prime mover is immovable.

THEOLOGICAL DISPUTATION ON SUBSEQUENT GRACE, PART THREE.

Respondent: GERARD DE VRIES, of Utrecht. March 24, 1669.

I. Objection: If man is moved and applied to act here and now and in this way by subsequent grace, then he does not act freely. But the latter is absurd, therefore so is the former. Response: The consequence is denied. Because he determines himself, moves himself to the predetermination and premotion of God, not by coercion or physical necessity, but freely: being moved, drawn, he moves, runs freely. 2 Corinthians 8:16-17: But thanks be to God, which put the same earnest care into the heart of Titus for you. For indeed he accepted the exhortation; but being more forward, of his own accord he went unto you. Titus studied and undertook and perfected this work of charity of his own accord, freely, willingly; although God had put this zeal in his heart. 2 Chronicles 30:12: Also in Judah the hand of God was to give them one heart to do the commandment, etc. Compare with verse 19: That prepareth his heart to seek God, etc. God is said by his hand, that is, by his power, or powerfully to have moved and determined the hearts of the people to the good work: And nevertheless, the people are said to have prepared their heart to seek the Lord. And in 2 Corinthians 9, the godly among the Corinthians willed and gave freely, liberally, and cheerfully: and yet that liberality, that readiness of mind was the grace and gift of God in the godly, verses 13, 14, 15.

Instance 1: But where there is predetermination and premotion, by which being posited, it moves and determines the heart of man; there is no liberty of determining oneself to either of the opposites: but mere necessity. Response: It is denied that there is mere necessity: but only according to a hypothesis, or in a certain respect. That such does not conflict with liberty, that is, the natural, intrinsic and inseparable faculty of the will, is evident from this; That when the will determines itself to that part, the act is already said necessarily to will (for everything, when it is, necessarily is): the intrinsic faculty and liberty to the opposite remaining. The supreme and most perfect divine will and liberty is, in the sign of reason, e.g. to preserve that man in life, or not to preserve him, in God: but the determination and predefinition of the divine will concerning his death being posited, God now freely, and yet necessarily with a necessity according to a hypothesis, delivers him to death.

Next, as to man's liberty, it is not independent, absolute, supreme; since in his free actions and determinations it presupposes and includes the free divine will, concurring, preproving.

Finally, that every determination of the will to something does not remove the nature of will and liberty, is evident from the blessed in heaven, who freely will the good, and freely do not will evil, whom the Scholastics say are determined by the light of glory to the love of God as the highest good. The same we say of the elect angels, and of Christ in human nature.

Instance 2: Liberty is that which, all things required for acting being posited, can act and not act. But if the required efficacious motion and premotion is posited (according to our view), it cannot act or not act. Response: Distinguish the prerequisites for acting which are prior in time, from those prior in nature. If you mean prerequisites prior in time, we concede it: but if prerequisites prior in nature, we deny it; and consequently deny that definition of natural liberty, which is not commonly fabricated or received by Philosophers and Theologians, nor founded on the determination of Scripture or solid reason. For certain things are so required by nature first, that they cannot be separated from the act of the human will. And to apply this to the premotion of the first cause or the Holy Spirit to a good work: hence that the will, any prevenient grace being posited, could still act either well or ill: and if it rather acts well and produces something good, it will be from itself, and not from grace; which is absurd, and contrary to the Scriptures alleged above in Part 1. Augustine, Book 2 On the Merits of Sins, ch. 18: "If we have a certain free will from God, which can still be either good or evil, but a good will is from ourselves, then that which is from us is better than that which is from God: which if it is most absurdly said, they ought to confess that we also attain a good will from God."

III. Objection: If God thus really operates in and around man by subsequent grace, then the effect would always follow. But the effect does not always follow. Therefore. The minor is proved from Matthew 23:37. Response: To the proof of the minor, with Augustine in the Enchiridion, ch. 97: Carnal Jerusalem was unwilling that her children should be gathered together by Christ, but he, though she was unwilling, gathered together those children of hers whom he willed. Therefore the Ecclesiastical and Political ancestors representing Jerusalem were unwilling: but those whom God willed to gather together were gathered. See verse 13. Instance: The Lord says, Zechariah 1, Joel 2:12, Return unto me with all your heart, and circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskins of your heart. Jeremiah 4:4. Therefore subsequent grace which works in us is not necessary. Response: The same objection could be formed against prevenient grace: the consequence is denied. What if a similar consequence should be fabricated: God creates a new heart, Psalm 51. God converts us, Jeremiah 32. He gives a new spirit and a heart of flesh, Ezekiel 11:19-20. He circumcises the heart: Deuteronomy 30:6. He worketh in us both to will and to do, Philippians 2:13. Therefore we do not convert ourselves, do not circumcise our heart, do not work out our salvation; nor ought we to repent, work, etc. To whatever they respond concerning this argument, let them consider it a response also to their objection. The precepts and admonitions with God's motives are the moral instruments of conversion: with which if the operation of prevenient and subsequent grace in the heart of man is joined; then man converts himself, circumcises, etc. Augustine, Book 2 Against the Second Epistle of Pelagius, ch. 9: For although unless he assist us, without whom we can do nothing, we cannot open our mouth, yet it is we who strive by his aid and our own work: but that he accomplishes without our work. Thus he concerning prevenient grace. The same, cited book, ch. 10: Nor does man ever begin to be changed from evil to good by the beginning of faith, unless the undue and gratuitous mercy of God work this in him. There he concludes that in the Holy Scriptures nothing is commanded by the Lord to man which is not found to be given by his goodness, or asked for, that the aid of grace may be shown.

Instance: Therefore the precepts, admonitions with motives are proposed to man in vain: if indeed prevenient grace, or subsequent grace, does not accompany the proposition and subministration of the precepts and admonitions. Response: It is denied. For if according to God's intention they are not proposed for the actual conversion and obedience of any reprobate; yet at least they are proposed for his conviction (ανάπολογησίαν). As the Apostle speaks concerning the revelation of natural theology, which fell to the reprobate while in Gentilism, Romans 1:19-20. Compare John 15:22: If I had not come, etc.

V. Objection: Every determination of subsequent grace conflicts with the nature and liberty of the will: because the will would then not differ from a natural cause; which is determined to one thing. Response: It is denied that every determination conflicts. For determination to exercise does not conflict. Then, according to the view of Thomas and his followers, the will is determined by practical judgment. According to their view also, even that of the Hypothetical Doctors, the will is determined to volition of the last end, or highest good; and by the light of glory it is determined to the love of God; at least it necessarily loves God. See Becanus' Scholastic Theology Part 2, Part 1, Tract 1, ch. 1, questions 8 and 9. But whatever may be objected from human wit against the efficacious determination of subsequent grace, yet Scripture expressly affirms it, Proverbs 21:1, Psalm 33:15, and 119:36, Song of Songs 1:4, John 6:44.

Exception: These passages can be understood of moral attraction, persuasion, and impulse: by which being posited, the will is still left indifferent to either of the opposites. Response: They cannot be understood of moral attraction. Because all who are drawn, who are morally drawn and allured, do not come: but all who are drawn by this (physical, that is, direct) drawing, and by the causality of the efficient cause, do come.

VI. Objection: If subsequent grace thus applies and determines the will to a good work: then it would follow that the will is not determined, or does not determine itself, nor is the mistress of its own act. But the latter is absurd, therefore so is the former. Response: The will has the power of its act, but dependent and subordinate to the first cause in being and in operating: not independent, or most full: such as the divine will has.

Next, it can determine itself, but under the determination of the first cause and first will; just as befits a second being, cause, and agent.

Thirdly, the will is said to be determined by itself, and to determine itself, because it is not determined by any cause of the same order, or by an extraneous cause: but by the first cause, which inflows most inwardly into the second cause, and into its action or the same effect. Because the dependence of the creature on God in being and operating is essential.

Lastly, the determination of God and the human will is numerically one action: yet inasmuch as it is produced by God, it is prior in the order of nature, nor is it in the power of the will; but considered as proceeding from the human will, it is in the power of the will.

Let us now respond to some questions concerning subsequent grace.

I. Question: Whether in a good work pleasing to God performed by a regenerated man, there are any efficient causes besides God or the Holy Spirit, and the regenerated man. Response: I distinguish:

1. God or the Holy Spirit, as the fountain, origin, author, giver of all grace, is the principal first and independent cause.
2. God's good pleasure, mercy, unmerited and free grace, is the antecedent cause: if I may apply this term here.
3. The obedience of Christ the Mediator, rendered for his own, is the sole or only procatartick and meritorious cause of this subsequent grace.
4. The regenerated and converted man is the principal cause. For compared to God, the principal first cause, he is an inferior and second cause: and analogically called an instrument: and compared to the same God as the universal cause, he is the sole and only proper and particular cause, and also the sole or only formal principle (i.e. the principle Which). The same regenerated man, compared to less principal second causes, is the sole and only principal cause of that work. But if some good work is produced collectively by many godly persons (as when a declaration, profession, defense of heavenly truth is decreed by many assembled in a Synod), there those partial causes stand as one in the whole concurrence.
5. The principle by which, is the new creature, or indwelling habitual grace, infused and impressed through prevenient grace and regeneration.
6. The less principal or impulsive or instrumental causes are various.

First, the outward and proximate moral instruments, and at the same time motives, are the word, sacraments, examples and admonitions of the godly; to which add the occasions of God's blessings and judgments, in us or others; which are accustomed to furnish motives, compulsions, excitements, and stimuli.

Then faith; which being specifically distinct from the other theological and moral virtues is an internal, proximate, directive, auxiliary instrumental cause; also by reason of its Evangelical object, to which it tends, it is for the regenerated man an impulsive cause, and powerful motive. Add also the love of Christ, which tightly constrains us to good works, and powerfully impels us, 2 Corinthians 5:14: For the love of Christ constraineth us, etc.

Finally, prayer, which is the common and powerful directory, preparatory, and inciting cause of good works in respect to us; and also (rightly understood) in respect to God, is a motive by which we entreat the aid of subsequent grace or the Holy Spirit; according to Christ's promise, Luke 11:13.

II. Question: What is the predetermination or premotion, or application by which God applies second causes and their active virtues to operation? Response: Thomas 1,1, q. 16, art. 1, explaining the use of the will, says thus: The use of anything implies the application of that thing to some operation: whence the operation to which we apply a thing is called the use thereof, as the using of a horse is called riding, and the using of a staff is called striking. But to operation we apply both inward principles of action. If this is applied to this predetermination or application of subsequent grace, by which the converted man is applied to spiritual acts and operations: a distinction must be observed:

First, That the artisan using an instrument, and the striker using a staff, does not immediately touch the cause and effect: but God, being infinite, touches them immediately (for God is here present everywhere powerfully).

Second, That the instrument of the artisan does not act by its own virtue, and intrinsic principle. But the converted man, when determined by subsequent grace or by the Holy Spirit, has himself passively and actively. For he is not a mere instrument which the principal cause uses, as e.g. a staff: but is a free cause acting freely, which is so moved by God, that it also moves itself: as is gathered from the texts now cited several times, Song of Songs 1, Philippians 2, Jeremiah 32, etc.

That the regenerated and converted man, in producing supernatural acts, is not properly and formally a bare or mere instrument, but is likened to an instrument, namely in comparison to the first cause: but is also a principal cause, as we have reminded above; and concerning this Francis Cumiel disputes accurately and solidly against Suarez, Tom. 3 of Various Disputations, pp. 121-122, folio edition.

III. Question: Whether the motion of God has itself in the manner of a principle, or in the manner of an action. Response: Since God acts and inflows into the second cause and into the effect: this motion, compared to the second cause which is moved, has itself in the manner of a principle; because that motion moving the second cause, is otherwise God himself moving: But compared to the first cause as tending to the effect, it has itself in the manner of an action; because it is that use of the action by which God uses the second cause to operate, and is the very reason by which the first cause is said to act in and through the second cause: so that the proximate terminus of the motion of the first cause, or determination of the Holy Spirit, is the second cause (namely, the regenerated man) which is first affected; and the ultimate terminus is the effect produced through it.

IV. Question: Whether the predetermination is a thing distinct from the action of the second cause. Response: With a distinction: if you understand the predetermination as it is an immanent action of God, it is something distinct from the action of the creature: But if you consider the predetermination as it is a virtually transient action of God, by which the second cause is determined and acts, it is not a thing distinct from the action of the creature. Just as to strike is the use of a staff, nor does it really differ from the striking; and to cut is the use of a

knife, nor does it really differ from the cutting: so for the second cause to operate is the use of the second cause; nor does it really differ from its action.

But it may be objected, then the converted man could be said to determine himself. But this is absurd: Therefore. Response: The minor is denied. For he predetermines himself under divine predetermination: that is, if you have respect to priority to the effect or terminus of the action: for naturally the action is prior to the terminus, i.e. the action received in the passive subject. Just as every action identified with the determination of the creature, if you consider it under the formal ratio of action, can be said prior to that same thing considered under the ratio of passion; and just as the motion of the mover is naturally prior to the motion of the thing moved, and the terminus of motion, although they do not really differ.

V. Question: Whether subsequent grace or the Holy Spirit, and the converted man operate by numerically the same action? Response: Affirmatively. For that action or work and effect proceeds from two causes, namely, the converted man and the preceding and concurring Holy Spirit. Just as in natural things, fire with heat heats by one and the same numerical heating; and the artisan through the axe cuts by one and the same numerical action. Just as in every concurrence of the first and second cause, each operates through numerically the same action. See this explained by Thomas with the commentators in I, q. 105, art. 5, ad 3, compared with his Book 3 Against the Gentiles c. 70, and there by Ferrariensis.

VI. Question: Whether a second cause, when determined by God, and especially the regenerated man when moved and determined by the Holy Spirit to a good work, receives anything, and what? Response:

First Conclusion: It does not receive an inherent quality, or form, or power, or virtue, or permanent active principle.

Second Conclusion: It receives to be an actually causing cause (whereas before that determination and reception it was a potential cause), it receives to act, operate, and produce the effect. And that act does not really differ from the action. In short, the first cause by its predetermination and concurrence imprints nothing else in the second than motion.

Objection: A transient action is in the patient, and is received in the passive subject. Therefore when a second cause is determined to a transient action, it does not receive the action.

Response: The consequence is denied. A transient action, insofar as to its full being and subjective terminus it is received, is in the patient: Yet the same originally, causally, and as a transient virtue, is in the agent, as in the elicitive principle. It therefore begins from the agent, and terminates in the passive subject. But since the physicists and metaphysicians dispute this professionally, I refer the philosophy-lovers there.

VII. Question: Whether a second cause can become active or actually acting, without some mutation of itself? Response: No. For when it is moved by God to act, it receives some perfection. The action between the agent and patient is a certain perfection of the agent.

Because it is moved to perform a new action, he who is moved to a new motion is changed by some mutation. For every motion is a mutation.

VIII. Question: Whether subsequent grace moves, premoves, determines, applies the regenerated man efficaciously, irresistibly or invincibly? Response: Affirmatively. The regenerated man cannot but receive its inflow, touch, influx; and accordingly act, move himself, when and while it powerfully moves and acts in him with easy omnipotence and omnipotent facility. So that when the Holy Spirit imprints a new motion, the regenerated man cannot but be moved and move. If concerning prevenient grace we say with Augustine that it is not rejected by any hard heart: why not concerning subsequent grace, which moves the regenerated man?

Objection: It can be rejected: because in practical handbooks, and in forms of prayer, there occasionally occur complaints of the Holy Spirit's convictions, motions, drawings, knockings neglected or rejected. Response: If anyone says this concerning bare illumination, or some outward moral attraction and impulse, we do not dissent. But concerning the special or most special grace of the Holy Spirit inwardly (within the mind and will of the regenerated man) drawing, moving, applying directly, physically, efficaciously, this cannot be said. The Jews resisted the Holy Spirit, Acts 7:51, with 6:10, and Zechariah 7:12; and those sinning against the Holy Spirit speak against the Holy Spirit, by whom they were inwardly illuminated and convicted of the truth of the faith.

IX. Question: Whether subsequent grace is given to elect, to be saved, regenerated or sanctified infants in the womb, for eliciting acts of faith, hope, love, spiritual knowledge, and other good acts. Response: No. Because then they can neither do nor be able to do good or evil, Romans 9:11, not even actually know, Deuteronomy 1:39.

What is related concerning John the Baptist in Luke 1:41 is extraordinary and miraculous.

THEOLOGICAL DISPUTATION ON SUBSEQUENT GRACE, PART FOUR.

Respondent: JOHN VERWIEL, of Sprang, Batavia. March 31, 1669.

Thus far we have explained in general the necessity and efficacy of subsequent grace for every good act. It remains to prove briefly, specifically and appositely to the spiritual discernment, perception, understanding, judgment, faith of Holy Scripture and saving doctrine, the efficacy and necessity of that same grace.

§. 1. I lay down these hypotheses: I. That the knowledge of Scripture and divine things from Scripture, and according to the Scriptures, is necessary, and indeed with the necessity of means. Which is most fully proved and defended elsewhere and in its place, against the

affected ignorance of the Papists and others. Here we only indicate John 17:3 and 5:39; 2 Thessalonians 1:8; and 1 Corinthians 10:15. And the reasons taken from the necessity of applicative fiducial faith, and divine hope, as also of love, fear, honor and worship of God; none of which can exist without this knowledge, or general faith.

II. That that general knowledge or faith is a good work and our duty prescribed in the first precept of the Decalogue: according to the explanation of our Catechism, question 94.

III. That in that true spiritual knowledge, assent, faith, there cannot underlie anything false: Because it proceeds from the efficacy of subsequent grace, or the persuasion, operation, illumination of the Holy Spirit.

§. 2. We prove the necessity, efficacy, operation of subsequent grace or the Holy Spirit, in the regenerated and truly faithful, to the true knowledge, understanding of Scripture and divine things:

1. From Matthew 13:11: Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, etc.

Philippians 1:29: For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, etc., with Ephesians 1:9; Colossians 2:2: That their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgement of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ.

Philippians 2:13: For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do. Hence we argue, If the Holy Spirit works in the hearts of the faithful the willing of understanding, and true wisdom (James 1:5-6), he works also to perform, and this is, he works the being wise, or spiritual understanding and wisdom. And to argue ad hominem: If he works the willing, therefore also the judging concerning the sense of Scripture, concerning divine things. (Since to judge and judgment is in the will and is an act of the will; according to the paradoxical Philosophers: which yet we have not seen demonstrated.)

1 Corinthians 12:7: But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal, with 1 John 2:20.

Proof II: From the prayers by which we ask for ourselves and other believers understanding of Scripture, and of divine things; or the illumination and direction, and efficacious operation of the Holy Spirit, Psalm 119:8, 12, 33-34, 66, etc.; Ephesians 1:17: That he may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation, etc. And 3:14, 16: For this cause I bow my knees, etc. that he would grant you, etc. to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man, etc. And chapter 6:18-19: Praying, etc. and for me, that utterance may be given unto me, etc. 2 Timothy 2:7: The Lord give thee understanding in all things. James 1:5-7: Let him ask of God, etc.

Add the explanation of the first petition of the Lord's Prayer, in our Catechism question 122, and of the sixth petition, question 116; and in the liturgy the prayers to be offered before the sermon and catechism instruction.

Add here all the morning prayers, and forms of prayer both ancient and modern, all the prayers which in consistorial meetings, in synods, in colloquies and conferences on religion, in theological schools and colleges, in the exercises of theological lectures, disputations, declamations, and also in ecclesiastical whether public or private catechizations, and private studies in the study, are accustomed to be premised.

Nay, even wretched Gentiles had some sparks still left, that they knew knowledge and understanding to be given by God, and to be asked from him. Which shines forth especially in the invocations of the poets: which the Latins used to prefix to their propositions, as Virgil at the beginning of the Aeneid and Georgics, Ovid Book 1 of the Metamorphoses, Manilius, Claudian, Statius Book 1 of the Thebaid verse 54, with 81. The Greeks premised them, Hesiod, Homer, Theognis, Apollonius, Aratus, Pindar Nemean Ode 11. Of the Latins, the Epicurean Lucretius prefixes an invocation. In Hesiod and Homer it is to be noted, that they ask for those things which they themselves intended to accomplish by their genius: so firmly was the persuasion implanted in their minds of the necessity of divine aid for accomplishing anything by their genius, that they asked the gods or goddesses to accomplish that work. Thus Ovid, Ye gods, etc.:

Be present, and lead on a never-ending song
In order from the world's first opening.

And Homer: "Vouchsafe her aid, O ever honor'd maid," etc. And: "Some God assist, to breathe the novel strain," etc. And Apollonius verse 1: "Of thee, God of day, I first invoke the aid," with verse 22: "May the maids be present to inspire the lays," that is, may they be present as patronesses of the lay. So that in composing a poem ingeniously and accurately, they thought they must do what Epictetus advises in the Enchiridion, ch. 77: "In every undertaking," he says, "these things must be invoked, Lead me, O Jupiter, and thou O Destiny." Simplicius the Gentile Philosopher, in the epilogue to his commentary on Epictetus, supplicates the lord and father of our reason, that he may be an aid to us for the accurate correction of our reason, and conjunction with the things that truly are, through the true light. "And the third savior," he says there, "I suppliantly pray may entirely wipe away the darkness from the eyes of our minds, that, as it is in Homer,

We may discern aright both god and man."

In Plato's Timaeus, Socrates assigns to Timaeus the part of discoursing on Nature, in these words: "It will therefore be your business, O Timaeus, to speak next, after invoking the gods according to the law." To whom Timaeus replies: "Well then, Socrates, we must all pay obedience to this law: for it would indeed be unseemly in men conversant with nature and the universe, if, whilst the authors of most approved works assure us that they compose their

respective productions with an actual inspiration from the gods, we ourselves, who are entering on the highest of all studies concerning the universe, should through indolence shun the invocation of Divinity. Therefore let us invoke the favor of the gods and goddesses, fervently supplicating that, taking their own work for the contemplation of our discourse, they would exhibit to our understanding whatever may wear the semblance of truth." And so let the invocation of the gods be set forth. And for ourselves, we must intreat that while you, indeed, may easily follow the discourse proposed, I, on my part, may so conceive whatever is likely to give perspicuous and consistent views on such momentous subjects."

§. 3. From these things now laid down, it follows that God is, and is rightly said to be the interpreter of Scripture, and the judge of controversies which arise concerning Scripture or saving doctrine; I say the supreme, absolute, independent, infallible judge: interpreting and judging objectively and externally by the Scripture; and inwardly and subjectively in the hearts of men by the operation of the Holy Spirit. This determination and assertion is common to the whole of Reformed Christendom: as this may be proved by an induction of all Protestant and Reformed writers, who touch upon this subject: and we have indicated a good part of the authors in the appendix to the disputation on the Judge and Rule of Faith; which we have lately given to be reprinted together with Select Disputations Part 5. See above p. 430 and following.

Moreover, this assertion and determination is and is commonly held by the Reformed to be a chief point, opposed to the chief error of the Papists, Libertines, Sceptics, Socinians. For when this question is determined in the wrong way, the axe is laid to the root of the tree: no less than in the question of the Manichees concerning the genuine books of Scripture, and the question of the Atheists, Epicureans, Deists, Enthusiasts, and other heretics concerning the authority, canonical sufficiency and perfection of Scripture.

The truth of this assertion has been constantly taught and defended in the Reformed Academies, also the Dutch ones, and this one of ours. The Enthusiastic-Libertines, Papists, and Socinians have opposed it: the former attributing the supreme and infallible judgment to their private spirit, the latter to the Pope or a Council, these to reason. Recently some Anonymous person, feigning to be a philosopher, has attacked this common view of Reformed Christendom concerning the interpreter and rule of interpretation. Though he has been sufficiently refuted by some most learned Theologians; yet because we sometimes hear some of his own or the Socinians' or Papists' reasons or exceptions thrown out by the unlearned: we shall not seem to act absurdly, if in this Academic exercise we briefly exhibit their refutation to our students, and fortify them against these stratagems of Sceptico-Libertinism and Pelagianism.

But we premise these admonitions: I. That in these discussions they may always be mindful, that the Reformed do not dispute concerning a judge or interpreter in general: but concerning the supreme, independent, absolute, infallible judgment and judge; And that God alone is posited as such.

II. When some Orthodox say that Scripture is the only principle of our faith and theology, and is the supreme and infallible interpreter and judge, that is to be taken metonymically. For sacred

Scripture is the judgment, sentence, declaration of the supreme and independent interpreter and judge.

III. When they say that God, or the Holy Spirit immediately interprets Scripture, makes known, persuades, inculcates the truths of Scripture from Scripture and through Scripture: they do not mean a singular and private spirit, or its singular and peculiar operation; but the common spirit of faith or illumination, or the grace commonly given to all believers or illuminated ones. For we have the same spirit of faith, etc. we also believe, etc. 2 Corinthians 4:13, with 1 Corinthians 2:1, 7, 16, and 1 John 2:1, 20: But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things.

Now follow the objections and exceptions which are formed, or could be formed.

1. Against the interpretation and judgment of the Holy Spirit.
2. Against the judgment and rule of Scripture.
3. For the judgment of the Roman Pope.
4. For the interpretation, judgment, rule of Reason, or Cartesian Philosophy.

I. Objection: A judge ought to judge and speak; and say to the diffident parties, Thou erreſt, and Thou judgſt rightly. But the Holy Spirit does not ſpeak. Nay, he cannot ſpeak, and judge by Scripture: for this would imply a contradiction.

Thus in the Colloquy at Ratisbon in the year 1601, pp. 251, 254, 255, the Jeſuit collocutors clamored, "Let the Holy Spirit ſpeak. Thou, Greiſere, erreſt," etc.

And Tanner in a writing published after the Colloquy had been held, diſputes that it is ſimply impoſſible for the Holy Spirit to judge by Scripture, e.g. Tanner: becauſe the name of Tanner does not exiſt in Scripture, nor is it anywhere written, Tanner, denying the judges, the Holy Spirit and the Scriptures, errs.

On the contrary, Hunnius and Heilbrunner in their Anti-Tanner published in 8vo in the year 1602 ſhow that the Holy Spirit judges by Scripture, from 1 Corinthians 14, where unbelievers are ſaid by the Prophets to be judged and convinced.

I add, in Acts 5:8 and 10, that the Holy Spirit actively argued, judged and convicted the adverſaries through Stephen; though they did not receive or acknowledge it. And the Spirit ſtrove through Noah with the ungodly world, Genesis 6:3, compared with 2 Peter 2:7, 5. Therefore the judgment of the Holy Spirit by Scripture is not to be denied, though men reſiſt that judgment, or do not receive it, Acts 5:10, with ch. 7:51. Chriſt while in the fleſh judged, teſtified: though many did not receive his judgment and teſtimony, nor ſubmit themſelves to it, John 3:35.

Therefore the judgment of a judge does not include in its formal ratio the acknowledgement, aſſent, acquieſcence, ſubmiſſion of him who is judged. Tanner aſſerts that the Pope can judge (which he denies the Holy Spirit can do). But he has judged and determined ex cathedra againſt

Luther, Henry King of Navarre, Elizabeth Queen of England, the Republic of Venice, and many others: but they did not acquiesce, nor submit themselves.

But it is excepted:

1. Exception: He does not speak nor judge or be able to judge anyone by Scripture; because the name e.g. of Tanner, Gretser is not found in Scripture. Thus Tanner. Response: A ridiculous trifling in a serious matter. And the name e.g. of Pope Alexander VI, or Julius II, or Paul III, is not found in Scripture: therefore the Popes, supreme and infallible judges on earth, or heads of the Church, are not to be had nor judged. Nor could thieves, robbers, etc. be judged sinners liable to eternal condemnation from Scripture and by Scripture; nor could any Arian or Manichee be argued against and judged a heretic, because his name is not found in Scripture, nor does Scripture say, Thou Arius, thou Manes, thou Photinus, etc. erreth.

Response 2: The Holy Spirit speaks in Scripture and by Scripture: nor is Scripture mute, and as it were a dumb image: as the adversaries scoffingly call it. For it is expressly said to speak, Hebrews 12:5; to testify, John 5:39; to judge, accuse, condemn; and the word of God is called living, efficacious, sharper than any two-edged sword, etc. and discerns the thoughts and intents of the heart, Hebrews 4:12. And Scripture is profitable, for doctrine, for reproof, etc. 2 Timothy 3.

In short, the written words are words, and Scripture is the word of Christ which dwells richly in believers, Colossians 3:16. See our disputation on the Judge and Rule of Faith (which is inserted in Part 5 of Select Disputations, §3, p. 424), where besides the texts of Scripture some sayings of Augustine and Optatus are cited.

Exception 2: Against the internal illumination, interpretation, persuasion, judgment of the Holy Spirit: That this certainly cannot be perceived, known, discerned, nor distinguished from the phantasm and deception of one's own reason (Jeremiah 17:9, with James 1:26) or from diabolical illusion. Response: If you mean the knowledge of others, we say they cannot nor even ought directly, immediately, by themselves and with the certainty of faith, to know and discern the internal coruscation of the light of the Holy Spirit, the internal inloquy, motion, influx, precourse, concourse in the heart of another. But if someone says he is persuaded and fully assured by the Holy Spirit, the seat of truth of faith, because we cannot nor ought to look into another's heart (1 Corinthians 2:7, 11), we must go to Scripture, and that spirit is to be proved by and from it: For the Spirit testifies that he is the Spirit of truth, nor can he inwardly speak anything, inscribe anything, persuade anything into our heart, which is repugnant to Scripture or his Word.

As for him who has been persuaded by the Holy Spirit, and now certainly holds the truth of faith, he knows by reflexive cognition that it is the Spirit of Christ, who has touched his heart, who has made him certain, who has persuaded that scriptural truth in and with and through Scripture; he certainly knows, by comparing that his fullest assurance with the truths of Scripture.

Nor is a circle committed here, as the Papists so often refuted by ours keep babbling. See above pp. 16-17.

Certainly Scripture teaches such a process from the effect and a posteriori. See James 2:18 and Romans 8:16: The Spirit itself beareth witness, etc. That witnessing Spirit is known to be the Holy Spirit leading us into that truth, and certainly persuading us of that truth concerning our sonship, from his operations and effects in us, verses 13-14-15. Hence our Catechism accurately, in question 1: How the Holy Spirit assures me of eternal life, and that I may henceforth live unto him, etc.

As in special and applicative faith, everyone persuaded and made certain by the testimony, the inloquy, the persuasion of the Holy Spirit, can say with the Apostle in 2 Timothy 1:12: For I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day. Just as in natural things, to know is to know a thing through its cause, and that this is the cause of that thing, and that it cannot be otherwise. So in spiritual things, we certainly know or believe a thing through the testimony of the Holy Spirit in the Word and in our heart; and that the testimony of the Holy Spirit is the cause of that thing, and that it cannot be otherwise.

Instance: But the heart of man is deceitful and desperately wicked, Jeremiah 17, James 1. So one could imagine to himself an illumination, an outpouring of light, a persuasion, a touch, a drawing of the Holy Spirit; and be deceived in that.

And the Papists and Remonstrants suggest to us that saying of Calvin's, That the heart of man is so full of ambiguities and deceptions, etc.

Response: He who has not received and does not have that internal persuasion, sealing, earnest of the Holy Spirit, and yet thinks he has it; he is necessarily and always deceived. But he who has it, is not deceived. "Each one," says Augustine, "who has faith, sees and holds it with most certain knowledge, and with a crying conscience." These things we cast in the teeth of the Papists and others supporting doubt concerning special faith and fullest assurance. Which are to be applied to the general faith of the truths of faith from Scripture indited to believers by the Spirit.

II. Objection: From the absurd consequent. That from that interpretation and judgment of the Holy Spirit by internal illumination and persuasion in our hearts, there seems to be posited the fanaticism of the Enthusiasts, who vaunt their own private spirit.

Response 1: Nothing more indoctrinated and absurd can be said. First the Papists sang this song of fools; to whom abundant response has been made by the Antagonists. Today some renew it. To whom we respond, the necessity and efficacy of subsequent grace or the Holy Spirit being posited in every spiritual work, the same cannot but be posited in every act of spiritual intelligence, and true faith both general and special or applicative.

But this spirit is not peculiar, extraordinarily given to anyone, but is the ordinary and common spirit of faith, given to all elect believers, for the operation of willing and performing every spiritual work. Among which spiritual works are to be numbered the acts of wisdom, understanding, knowledge, judgment, spiritual prudence, and divine faith. But the peculiar fanatical and fantastic spirit, which the Enthusiasts affect and vaunt, is a spirit which without Scripture, nay contrary to the dead letter of Scripture (as they call it), is thought to inspire peculiar and absurd novelties, unheard-of curiosities: in respect to which the remaining godly Christians and Scriptural Theologians (whom the Jesuit John of Gouda of Utrecht in his trifling pamphlets, and the Libertines are accustomed to call Biblical Brothers and Biblical Sisters) are considered blind, in darkness and the shadow of death: the illuminated, spiritual and free Libertines meanwhile triumphing as sons of light (forsooth), and phosphori: like the intelligent ones of Epicurus; of whom Lucretius sings in Book 1:

He first, a man of Greece...
Dared to lift up his venerable countenance
Against their threats...
Her victorious head o'er superstition rais'd.

If anyone today should hear such a panegyric sung to the Sceptico-Epicurean Libertines, he might dream of the impending golden age of the Epicureans and Libertines.

To respond to the stupid and trite consequence, I exhibit the common caution of the Belgian Churches in the National Synod of Dort adjoined to the assertion concerning second grace and the operation of the Holy Spirit in believers, ch. 5, §10: "But therefore this certainty is not from any peculiar revelation, apart from or outside the Word made, but from faith in the promises which he has most abundantly revealed in his Word for our consolation: from the testimony of the Holy Spirit testifying with our spirit that we are the sons of God and heirs, Romans 8:16." Apply this to the certainty and internal persuasion of the truth of faith; and add from §11: "That God after grievous temptation concerning fullest assurance and certainty of perseverance, again excites the certainty of perseverance in them by the Holy Spirit."

Response 2: If anything is to be retorted, we say that the Papists, blaspheming the Scriptures along with the Enthusiasts as the dead letter, and fleeing to the inward word written in the heart of the Church (that is, the Pope) as the supreme and infallible interpreter and judge; are more allied to them. The same could be said in its way concerning those who make their own private spirit, their reason (that is, their genius and wit) the infallible rule and interpreter: according to that saying of certain Libertines and Enthusiasts:

God is within us, by his inbreathing we grow warm,
That Spirit comes from the ethereal seats.

THEOLOGICAL DISPUTATION ON SUBSEQUENT GRACE, PART FIVE.

Respondent: EMILIUS À CUYLENBURG, of Wageningen, Gelderland. April 6, 1669.

We proceed in refuting the objections and exceptions against the necessity of the efficacious operation of God, or the Holy Spirit, for every understanding, reception, judging of Scripture and spiritual things.

I. Objection: From the absurd consequent: If the Holy Spirit interprets and judges, then this ought to be done by an oracle. But this is absurd: Therefore.

Response: To the major, distinguishing. The word "oracle" strictly taken denotes an immediate, extraordinary, peculiar outward speaking, or inward inloquy.

Concerning the former, see Matthew 3:17 and 17:5, John 12:28-29, Acts 9:4. Concerning the latter, Numbers 12:6-7-8: If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, etc. with him will I speak mouth to mouth, etc. Matthew 1:20, Luke 1:41-42 and 2:26-27. Concerning both the supposed and counterfeit oracle, 2 Thessalonians 2:2. But broadly taken it denotes any outward speaking or inward inloquy; even common and mediate. Concerning the outward common and ordinary speaking see Hebrews 12:5: which speaketh unto you as unto children, with Job 5:39 and 45, and 17:17, Romans 3:2: That unto them were committed the oracles of God.

Concerning the inward common and ordinary inloquy and inward revelation of the spirit, Romans 8:16, with John 6:44-45; 1 Corinthians 2:10, 12; Ephesians 1:9, with 15-16-17.

But if they take the word "oracle" strictly: we deny the consequence of the major: but if broadly, we deny the minor. But those who so depict and feign Pseudographs, falsely presuppose with the Papists that there is no speaking of God, except by an outward, extraordinary and audible oracle to the diffident parties: hence it is that the Jesuit in the Colloquy at Ratisbon in the year 1601 clamored, "Let the Holy Spirit speak, and say Thou, Gretser, erreſt," etc.

Or they presuppose that there cannot be an inward inloquy, judgment, light, testimony, persuasion of the Holy Spirit concerning the truth of an article of faith, or the sense of Scripture, except peculiar, proper, extraordinary, immediate, without the light, revelation, speech and address of Scripture, or without agreement with it. Such an inward Spirit, and its agitation and inloquy, the Enthusiasts feign to themselves. Whom we refute from the given and bestowed common and ordinary spirit of faith (whether general and prevenient, or special and justifying), and its internal illumination, operation, persuasion in the hearts of believers or illuminated ones. Which we have proved above in Part 4 from the Scriptures. And in Parts 1 and 2, where we

treated of the necessity and efficacy of subsequent grace, which is given for every act, according to Augustine Epistle 107: "We know that it pertains to the right and Catholic faith, that the greater grace of God is given for individual acts." And On Nature and Grace ch. 26: "As the corporeal eye, though most sound, unless aided by the brightness of light, cannot see: so man, though most perfectly justified, unless divinely aided by that eternal light of justice, cannot rightly live."

These two testimonies, by the judgment of the Zuid-Hollanders on the third and fourth articles of the Remonstrants, conceived and written by me by delegation of the Reverend colleagues at that time, were chiefly inserted, and subjected to the determination concerning subsequent grace and the cited texts of Scripture, in Part 2 of the Acts of the National Synod, p. 148, folio edition.

The exceptions to the passages of Scripture and arguments, which have been or could be brought forward for the illumination, notification, persuasion, interpretation, internal judgment of the Holy Spirit, are these:

1. Exception: That light of the Holy Spirit leading us into the truth could be understood of the light of the spirit, which radiates in Scripture, which is the work of the Holy Spirit as principal cause, 2 Timothy 3:16, with 2 Peter 1:19-20-21, where Scripture is called a shining lamp, compared with Psalm 119:105 and Psalm 19:9. Response: Not all the texts brought forward for subsequent grace can be restricted to the objective outward light of Scripture itself and of teachers, who are said to hold forth and in their own way to illuminate and open the eyes, Acts 26:18, and are called lights, Matthew 5:7, 14-15-16, John 5:35. Because that outward light and its radiation is expressly distinguished from the internal light and radiation and operation of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of men, Acts 16:14: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul. And 1 Corinthians 3:6-7: I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth any thing, etc. But God that giveth the increase. John 6:45: Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me. Compare 2 Timothy 2:24-25-26.

II. Exception: All the texts and arguments brought forward hitherto can be understood of the operation of prevenient grace, and the preservation of the new creature or permanent new light introduced through it; at least of the preservation of a sound reason and mind, from melancholic delirium, craziness, maniacal or frenzied madness, and every sickness of thought.

Response 1: To the first, it is denied: Because of believers or illuminated it is said that God worketh in them both to will and to do, Philippians 2; that the grace of God laboured more in them, etc. 1 Corinthians 15:10-11; that God gives to the heart of a certain believer this or that willing, doing, 2 Corinthians 8:16; that he illuminates the mind of a regenerated or illuminated person, and gives him wisdom, Ephesians 1:17-18; that he strengthens him by grace, 2 Timothy 2:1, with chapter 4:17; that he comforts the faithful, and stablishes them in every word and good work, 2 Thessalonians 2:16; that God gives understanding in all things to the truly converted, believing, illuminated, 2 Timothy 2:7.

Response 2: To the second, it is denied. Because in this way, with Durandus, the special providence or governance of God would be denied. Which is repugnant to Acts 17:28: For in him we live, and move, etc. And worketh all things in all, 1 Corinthians 12:6; Who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will, Ephesians 1:11. See above Part 2, where we treated of the necessity of the concurrence of the first cause with second causes.

Response 3: To the third, it is denied that the removal of this or any other impediment from a depraved affection, or any prejudice of the object, by which our mind is hindered from rightly understanding; or from truly, clearly, distinctly perceiving some truth, is sufficient. Those phrases, to work, draw, powerfully effect or fulfill, illuminate, give, energize, "the energy of powerful force", to renew an upright spirit, to convert (Jeremiah 31), to incline, to bend, form the heart of all men whichever way he wills (Psalm 33:15, where in Hebrew it is "yatzar"), to lead the faithful by the Holy Spirit (Psalm 143:10), to create a clean heart, etc. denote a direct and positive operation.

But this is disputed more fully in the question concerning the concurrence or special providence and governance of God.

III. Exception: What if we expound those passages, which are said to infer God's positive and efficacious operation, concerning permission, namely that God does not hinder it? Response: Thus inspired by Pelagianism, or if you prefer Epicureanism, they wish to expound very many passages of Scripture concerning mere and simple permission, that they may eliminate the truth concerning God's efficacious and just providence in evil from Theology. But in vain. For likewise the "making" and "working" of God in creation, preservation, governance and ordination in the kingdom of nature, could be expounded in six hundred passages of Scripture concerning mere permission or non-hindrance: as also in all those where men, angels, devils, good or evil, are said to have done something; that "permitting" may be substituted for "making".

It would have to be evinced why in Philippians 2:13 and other passages the "working", and in Hebrews 13:21 the "making perfect" of the faithful, and the "working that which is wellpleasing" in them, ought to be expounded by "permitting"; that is, not hindering.

IV. Exception: All that positive, efficacious, and physical operation of God in and around man, which is said to be asserted by so many texts of Scripture, could be expounded concerning mild persuasion, moral attraction, sufficient and indifferent grace; which proposes, commands, advises, exhorts, adds motives, especially the promises of eternal life.

Response: It is denied. Because those texts denote more than moral persuasion, or a moral cause and causality, Ephesians 1:19: And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, etc. And chapter 2:10: For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.

2 Thessalonians 1:11: And fulfill all the good pleasure of his goodness, and the work of faith with power.

The giving and the working of something in someone, and indeed dynamically, Ephesians 3:7 and 20, denotes not only the moral efficiency or providence of God, but the physical efficiency and providence of God, and an action with victory, irresistible, invincible. John 6:44-45: All that the Father giveth me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. But all who are only morally drawn, allured, by mild persuasion, counsel and benign exhortation (as Prosper speaks) do not come; nay, on the contrary, they resist, Acts 7, so that benign exhortation, that mild whisper of the Gospel, is to them a savor of death unto death.

Moreover, it would follow hence that there is no other mode, or other efficacy of divine grace operating conversion in us, and willing and performing, than the mode of operation of Satan for the seduction of men: Which the Orthodox in the Conference at The Hague rightly infer, Argument 4 against the 3rd and 4th Articles of the Remonstrants. Amesius solidly refutes the exceptions of the Remonstrants against this reason in the Coronid to the Hague Conference, on Article 4, ch. 5, p. 225, 8vo edition. Compare his refutation of the Anti-Synodals on Articles 3 and 4. And Trigland's Antapologia ch. 34, p. 233.

V. Exception: The Holy Spirit illuminates our mind or reason, that the believing or illuminated man may judge: Therefore the Holy Spirit does not judge, does not interpret, nor can he be called the interpreter or judge.

Response: The consequence is denied. Because the actual knowledge or faith of scriptural truth, the actual interpretation, the actual perception of the genuine sense of Scripture, the actual judgment concerning that truth, concerning some controversy, is from the Holy Spirit as the first cause, preceding and concurring prime mover, preproving and co-moving. For he makes that we make, he moves that we move, he causes us to know that we may know, he causes us to judge that we may judge.

Instance 1: But the Holy Spirit cannot be said to judge, or to be the judge: because he is not the formal principle of that actual judgment, nor is he the particular and proper cause of it.

Response: The consequence is denied. If he is not the formal principle, or proper and particular cause of that singular and actual judgment, or understanding, or interpretation: yet he is the first, universal cause: as was explained in Parts 2 and 3 of this disputation: according to Philipians 2:12-13; 1 Corinthians 12:6: And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all.

Instance 2: Yet it seems that here is posited or follows from this the peculiar and private spirit of the Enthusiasts, dwelling or residing in the regenerated or believing man, or at least in the deified and perfect man (according to the Enthusiasts), or into which that man (e.g. Henry Nicholas, father of the Family of Love) is thought to be transformed. The Anonymous author in the Paradoxical Exercise on Philosophy the Interpreter of the Scriptures, and the Infallible Rule of Interpreting Scripture, ch. 14, p. 91, impinges on the view of the Reformed Theologians the

Fanatical Spirit of the Enthusiasts, or something most like it. But the ignorance, or calumny of the man, and of the Papists who prefigured this for the more recent writers, has been sufficiently and more than sufficiently castigated by learned men, and we have touched upon it above.

Instance 3: This cannot otherwise be conceived, than that God is said to act in the presence of the believing man, and in the believing man: but the man himself has himself passively: such a thing as some Enthusiasts of the past century dreamed. Response: The consequence is denied. This can and ought to be explained and conceived as in all actions of creatures, to which the first cause concurs: as this is explained by Philosophers and Theologians: where the causality of the second cause is not taken away by the causality of the first, nor vice versa. There were some on one side who denied the action and causality of the second cause: and there were some on the other side, who withdrew man or man's reason and will from divine providence.

In the Ascetic or Exercises of Piety ch. 4, which is on Meditation, I relate the opinion of certain contemplatives in the Papacy, who were so elevated in it, that they no longer acted with their mind, but only suffered. Which opinion the more recent writers, among whom Suarez there cited, refute. Whether those who deny action to the intellect, leaving it only passion, would be in some way more allied to this absurd and enthusiastic opinion, I leave to others to inquire.

VI. Exception: God is not the best interpreter, or witness, or judge of his own words, or Scripture, either by Scripture, or by the internal illumination of the Spirit. The reason is, because he would be a witness, judge, interpreter in his own cause: and a man appealing to the witness, judge, Holy Spirit, would do no more than if he appealed to his own particular spirit.

Response 1: God is the best interpreter of his Word, and judge, even in his own cause, John 5:30 and 8:16. Because he is the first truth, the first and absolute perfection, nor has he a superior truth, veracity, witness, judge, Hebrews 6:13.

Response 2: That a believer may convince one dissenting from him, he does not demonstrate from the illumination and testimony of the Holy Spirit in his heart: but from the word and judgment of the Holy Spirit set forth in Scripture. Thus far none have come forth who made the Philosophy of Descartes the judge in a published book. Otherwise it is not absolutely unlawful to appeal to the testimony and judgment of God, by the example of David in Psalm 26:2 with 139:23-24, Job 16:7, 19: My witness is in heaven, etc., Paul in 2 Corinthians 1:23, Romans 9:1-2.

§3. Now follow the objections against the judgment of Scripture, or against Scripture as the infallible norm of judgment and interpretation.

I. Objection: Because Scripture is imperfect: therefore it is not a correct and sufficient norm.

Response: The antecedent is denied: and the contrary has been proved by our Theologians against the Papists, which I do not repeat here.

II. Objection: Because Scripture is obscure. Therefore.

Response: The antecedent is denied. Because it is called a light, a lamp, 2 Peter 1:19, with Psalm 119:105. It is blasphemously called by the Papists outer darkness, and the dead or killing letter. And it is compared by them and the Libertines to the Lesbian rule, etc.

All the objections against its perspicuity may be taken away by distinguishing that which is perspicuous absolutely and considered in itself; and that which is perspicuous to this or that man. Against which it is excepted:

Exception: Perspicuity is a relation, whose correlative is the mind of man, and consequently, there is no light, no perspicuity that is or can be said, except to every knower.

Response: Those things are not relations, whose whole essence and ratio is to be referred to another. Indeed they can be called relations of being said, as the qualities of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd species, which are as it were referred to their objects, as knowledge and the knowable, sense and the sensible, the visible light or color and sight, sound and hearing, etc. Genesis 1:2-3 and verse 14, 19, there was light, not darkness; and yet there was no sight, no eye to which it was or could be clear.

III. Objection: Because Scripture cannot interpret itself, or be the infallible norm of interpreting itself. For it is that about which the question and controversy arises.

Response: Among Christians the question and controversy is not concerning the whole body of Scripture, whether it is divine, whether it is inspired by God, whether it is the Word of God: but concerning the sense of some statement or some statements, or some section, etc. Which question can be explained and determined from Scripture and through Scripture, by the antecedents and consequences of that phrase or text (concerning whose genuine sense the question arises), and by other chapters, sections, texts of Scripture. Not otherwise than some phrase, some assertion or negation, or some paragraph obscure or controversial in a body of law, is explained by collating the body of law through the antecedents and consequences, and other laws, rescripts, etc. See the rules of interpreting the Scriptures among the Papists and our writers of Common Places, Theological Precognita, and on the Method of Theological Study, and the commentators on Scripture, the writers of Ecclesiastical Rhetoric. The celebrated Philosopher Keckermann (praised by the Paradoxical and Heterodox writer in ch. 6, p. 77) indicates the general rules or aids of interpretation in Book 2 of his Logical System, sect. 2.

IV. Objection: Scripture does not speak, it is mute. Therefore interpretation and judgment of controversies cannot be attributed to it. Thus Gretser with his fellows in the Colloquy at Ratisbon.

Response: Nay, it speaks, according to the phrase of Scripture, Hebrews 12, John 5, etc., as has been shown above. Does not the written sentence of the judges delivered and read to Titius speak to him? And do not the mandates, edicts, rescripts, indults, benefices, collations of

princes written and sealed, or printed, speak to those to whom they are exhibited? What? Do not the determinations and declarations and judgments ex cathedra of the Popes, in briefs, bulls, motuproprios, constitutions (which are insinuated to the subjects of the Papacy written by hand or printed) speak? Would not the Jansenists in the cause of Augustinian truth, the Dominicans in the cause of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, the Jesuits in the cause of the abrogation of the Jesuitesses, say, Pope Urban VIII does not speak in the bull of Urban VIII; Let the Pope speak, let the bull speak, and say Thou Jesuit, thou Father Rector erreest, thou dost ill to counsel and promote this order of Jesuitesses; and Thou Bertha, Margaret, Catharine, etc. erreest and sinnest in entering this order?

Instance: But judgment ought to be indicated to the diffident parties and others whom it concerns by an outward voice or oracle of living voice. Which is not done, nor can be done, by Scripture. Such a speech, which the diffident and disputing parties could hear there face to face, was demanded by the Jesuit in the Colloquy at Ratisbon, and to it he promised he would straightway submit himself. But neither the Holy Spirit nor Scripture so spoke, nor clamored with an audible and clear voice, that the Roman people might hear this in the vocative case, Thou Gretser erreest, etc.

Response: Here they presuppose that the Holy Spirit or Scripture (if indeed judgment is to be attributed to them, if indeed it is the judge), ought to judge just as human judges, who explicitly and by name notify the sentence pronounced to each litigant, saying, The cause which Maevius upholds is adjudged from him: but the cause which Titius upholds against Maevius is adjudged to him. But they absurdly and gratuitously presuppose and assume this, which ought to be proved.

Then granting that such a notification of judgment is made particularly and outwardly to each litigant among men: Yet it does not follow that it is made by a voice audible to the litigants there present: As if all judgments of judges were pronounced in the presence of the litigants, and to the litigants standing before the tribunal: as is customary in the daily judgments of the Turks; where the said Kadi or judge, having heard the reasons and witnesses of the litigants, pronounces the adjudication or rejection of the cause in their presence. Not to mention that the pronounced audible voice is not only the signifying and interpreting voice, and the sign of things done; but also the written visible voice: as is known from the elements of logic. So that the Jesuits clamored rashly and profanely, Let the Holy Spirit speak, let Scripture speak, namely by an audible voice. Nay, the Pope himself when he determines ex cathedra does not pronounce the sentence by an oracle of living voice in the presence of each and every one of the diffident and litigating parties: nor could he even do so.

V. Objection: If the objective and outward light of the Holy Spirit radiating in Scripture and the preaching of the Word, without the inward light of the Spirit radiating in hearts, is nothing, 1 Corinthians 3:6-7; therefore either the inward light is given to all to whom the outward is given, that in that light they may know the light: or the outward is given in vain.

Response: To those to whom the outward is given, without the inward, it is not given in vain: because it is given for the glory of God; and if not for their salvation, yet at least for their conviction; and for other ends. Which see in the Hague Conference against the 3rd and 4th Articles of the Remonstrants. And there in the Coronid of Amesius.

Now follow the objections and exceptions for the supreme, universal, and infallible judgment of the Pope: but since these in the controversies concerning the Ecumenical Pontiff, concerning the primacy and power of the Pope, concerning the head of the Church, have been so thoroughly trodden down by very many of ours, and some or at least one of those writers is in the hands of students, I do not think I will do a worthwhile work on this occasion if I would exhibit here an epitome or outline of those concepts.

It will suffice to persuade our students, that just as the Papists are accustomed to raise doubts and questions against the judgment of the Holy Spirit and Scripture, we in turn may raise the same or similar ones against the judgment of the Pope; whom, having repudiated the Holy Spirit and Scripture, they appoint the genuine, supreme, and infallible judge. Therefore let these questions be made:

When the see is vacant, who then will be the judge, who has that peculiar Papal spirit hidden in the shrine of his breast? Into whom will it then migrate?

Whence shall I certainly know that this Alexander, or Innocent, or Urban, etc. is the legitimate Pope, canonically elected by the Holy Spirit?

Whence will they prove that this conclave, for the election of this Pope, was infallibly inspired and led by the Holy Spirit?

Whence will Papists certainly and infallibly know, that it is the genuine oracle of living voice published by the Pope, which a Cardinal, or bishop, or secretary, or one of his kinsmen, reports from his mouth, and appeals to it? As Baronius, in defense of his cause against the double ecclesiastical monarchy, alleged the oracle of the Pope in these words, "Peter said to me."

Whence will the Papist be certain that this is the judgment and determination of the Pope as determining ex cathedra, and not as Doctor or Teacher?

Whence will they certainly know that the Bulls, Briefs, Edicts, Thunders of Excommunication are the infallible word of the Pope; since those writings are by his ministers and delivered to the Printer, printed by the Printer, corrected at the press by some of the Pope's ministers: they were written by Amanuenses, secretaries, posted at Rome by the couriers of the sacred palace, printed copies sent into all parts of the Papal world by nuncios, sailors, coachmen?

That nothing in them has been changed, nothing corrupted, that there are no supposititious, spurious, falsified copies?

Whence shall I be certain, that this is the infallible and genuine word and judgment of the Pope, which has come to us only through fallible men?

I will add only this, that since in a judge there ought to be a twofold salt, of knowledge and conscience (as Bartolus, if I am not mistaken, requires): and it is certain that the salt of Theological knowledge is not in the present-day Popes; how shall we certainly believe those Popes to be fit, supreme, and infallible judges? The Pontifical Theologian Louis de St. Amour, sent to Rome by the Bishops of France to treat the cause controverted between the Molinists and Jansenists, published a Journal; where in Part 3, ch. 12, he relates that when he solicited Pope Innocent X to decide that controversy, and to that end offered him a paper, asking him to read it, "the Pope was unwilling to receive and read it: because, he said, this would further oblige him to a great labor, such as he knew the discussion of this matter required, for those who had applied themselves to this study through their whole life; but it would cost him greater labor and trouble, than others. It is not my profession, besides that I am an old man. I have never studied Theology." To me some years ago by a generous and illustrious man it was related, that Pope Innocent answered a well-known Theologian: "I have lately read in the English Preacher Matthew Poole's Nullity of the Roman Faith, etc. In the year 1667, in the appendix pp. 34 and 35," the oracle of Innocent X from which this is extracted (for that cited book of de St. Amour is not at hand with me), by reason of which I have not immediately exhibited this rare narrative concerning the supreme and infallible Judge Innocent X.

§5. Fourthly, there follow the objections and exceptions for Reason as the supreme and only interpreter of Scripture, or the infallible norm and judge of interpretation.

Which the antagonists of Socinianism have more than sufficiently refuted. See the New Theological Elench of the most celebrated Theologian Henry Alting, and of our late most closely conjoined colleague John Hoornbeek, Tom. 1 of Socinianism Confuted, chs. 5, 6, 7.

Their reasons and exceptions the anonymous author of the paradoxical book entitled "Philosophy the Interpreter of Holy Scripture, etc. In which it is apodictically demonstrated that true Philosophy is the infallible norm of interpreting Holy Scripture," etc. interposed.

Such a great and insolent hiatus has offended not only the Reformed, but also other Christians. Various theologians have obstructed this hiatus, among whom our Reverend colleague Dr. Essenius, and Dr. Regn. Vogelsangh, Professor of Sacred Theology in the Illustrious School of Sylva-Ducis: to whom I refer our philosophy-loving students. Almost all come down to 1. the hypothesis or the great presupposition of the Socinians and Remonstrants. Socinian Catechism p. 212: "Is not the inward gift of the Holy Spirit necessary for believing the Gospel? By no means: for we do not read in the Sacred Scriptures that this gift is conferred on anyone except a believer." And Ostorodus Institutions ch. 1.

Episcopius in his disputation on the Perspicuity of Scripture 1615, proposed in the Leiden Academy on November 21, Respondent Abraham Jacobi F. Delphus of Batavia.

But now in this month of April 1669 (when this disputation is reprinted) we have thought fit to insert here the very words, that readers may see all the better how far the modern philosophers or reason as the interpreter of Scripture agree or do not agree with Episcopius.

Thus then Episcopius: "The perspicuity of Scripture is the evident, clear and open setting forth of all those senses, which to each and every one for the obtaining of eternal salvation are necessary to be known, believed, hoped, done, in such a way that without labor of examination, without aid of laborious investigation, by its own immediate light and evidence, it can be understood and perceived by anyone, provided only he has the use of reason and judgment.

Therefore when we speak of perspicuity, we do not properly or only understand that which is said to belong to the senses themselves, in and through themselves, inasmuch as in themselves they are sufficiently lucid and perspicuous, i.e. by the truth inborn in them sufficiently apt and fit to move the understanding, when only capacious, and by a singular preparation and disposition fitted to elicit understanding: But also that which is such in respect to us, and to all those who apply mind and work to reading or hearing these senses, and to whom they have been given and written by God to be read, heard, believed, hoped, done.

Therefore by those who read and hear, to whom Scripture is perspicuous, we do not only posit those who are illuminated by some peculiar and immediate inward light, or who alone seem to themselves to be endowed and furnished with such a light and judgment, but all in general, whosoever and whatsoever they may finally be, men of highest, middle, feeble, strong capacity, in whom either the dictate of natural reason and judgment is not at all obliterated, or at least not enormously vitiated, or in whom dull or voluntary negligence, manifest inadvertence, prejudiced opinion, or willful malice has no place.

For we acknowledge that there can be given a twofold impediment, by which Scripture is commonly rendered obscure to us. One which is opposed to natural power, when vid. our mind, either from the temperament of the body which it informs, or from disease, or from some other intrinsic or extrinsic defect, is rendered inapt to form conceptions of things agreeing with the objects, and connections of conceptions, which we call a defect of reason and judgment:

The other which is opposed to the will, or at least which depends either entirely or in some measure from the will, by which not properly the very power or potency of understanding is impeded, but either the will of understanding or even the understanding itself.

And of this impediment four kinds can be posited:

The first is Negligence, by which it happens, that we do not study to perceive the senses as they are enunciated and set forth in the Scriptures, or to render familiar to us the phrases peculiar and proper to that language in which the senses are written, nay oftentimes we scarcely deign to do so, which negligence is accustomed to arise, either because we judge that this care does not pertain to us, or because applying some care, we apply it too diluted and thin, or too perfunctory, which is easily and by a light impulse dispelled or distracted by the observation of

other things which occur everywhere in the Scriptures, either difficult or not equally plausible to us, whether histories or sentences or phrases, so that the mind cannot fix itself in understanding: or finally because terrified or broken and fatigued by the weariness of labor in reading, we easily despond, so that at length we care not at all what is contained in the Scriptures.

The second impediment is Prejudice, by which it happens that we mordaciously and pertinaciously cling to some preconceived sentence, authority or opinion, that is, either excogitated or conceived by ourselves, or handed down and received from others whom we highly esteem, nor do we ourselves study or will to understand or perceive anything else, than what precisely agrees with that judgment of ours. From this source it arises, that the sense of Scripture, otherwise plain and perspicuous, is so variously, so monstrously often twisted, and followed after like the Lesbian rule in diverse ways, nay is even involved and implicated in endless subtleties and sophisms, so that it can and ought by no means to seem wonderful that the sense of Scripture commonly appears obscure and tenebrous to such men.

The third impediment is Affection, by which it happens that out of favor to persons or things which we love or hate, we as it were expose our mind as venal, and easily surrender it to any ignorance or error, that is, we so conduct ourselves in reading and hearing the senses of Scripture, that either through hope of favor, or fear of offense, we do not greatly care to understand them, but rather desire, or easily and willingly persuade ourselves that the senses are such as those hold and judge them to be, whose favor we court and whose hatred we fear, and that for this reason, lest we may not enjoy that thing whose love and desire we are held by and wellnigh inflamed with.

The last impediment is Malice or Perversity, which causes that we endeavor to render obscure by cavillings, sophistries, sophisms, questiunculae, collections of varied readings, and other like fomentations of malice, even those things which are most clear and most manifest, for nothing can be so rightly and perspicuously said, as not to be obnoxious to some cavil, and in which a detractor cannot find something to carp at, and traduce with some censure, especially in Sacred Scripture in which not a few occasions are found, which depraved and profane wits can easily abuse for their own ruin, which the Spirit of God does not seem to have willed to remove, that there might be something by which the proven might be discerned and distinguished from the unproven, and the pious from profane men. For while pious souls intent on greater cares are accustomed easily to pass by such minutiae, profane wits are accustomed for the most part to dwell upon and carp at them, and like wasps to dwell upon them that they may suck out fomentations for their impiety or profanity.

In whom these impediments and obstacles are not, that is, who are not torpid by negligence, nor blind by prejudice, nor corrupted by affection, nor perverse and distorted by malice, to all such we say Divine Scripture is clear and perspicuous; so indeed, that the senses comprehended in it are expressed in such words that none more evident and significant could easily be given.

Moreover by senses we only understand those necessary ones, whose ignorance is not only noxious, but conjoined with peril and damage of eternal salvation: Therefore we determine that the literal or grammatical senses, as they call them, distinct from the remaining three, Allegorical, Moral, and Anagogical, are not to be held necessary precisely because they are obscure and difficult to understand.

But by literal or grammatical senses we do not only understand those which are taken word for word slavishly, but those which are understood according to the intention and meaning of the writer or enunciator, that is, just as he understood and willed who ordered the letter to be written: under which senses we comprehend not only those which are expressed properly and immediately, but also those which in a certain figurative manner obvious to no one are expressed, which from this most certain criterion can be discerned and observed, vid. if the words which are uttered and sound cannot truly agree to that subject person or thing, to which they are attributed.

Besides these we do not deny that many others are contained in the Sacred Scriptures, whose understanding cannot be obtained except with great labor, because either by reason of their antiquity they are unknown, or by reason of their sublimity inaccessible, or by reason of their subtlety difficult. Many also which can only be known through special revelation, which either lie hidden under types and shadows, and are not found unfolded or revealed by Christ or the Apostles, or are concealed as it were in wrappings under obscure predictions of things very far in the future, or under certain allegorical or parabolical descriptions of persons, things, or places.

Finally we acknowledge that not a few are also found, which though absolutely indeed unnecessary, yet are very useful for engendering a more solid and firm understanding and faith of necessary things, which in various and diverse places God willed to occur now a little more plainly now more obscurely, that there might be something which man might always scrutinize with labor and study, might seek assiduously with prayers, and might learn incessantly without weariness, for the instruction and confirmation of himself and others in understanding and faith."

The summary of Episcopius' words is, that anyone, provided only he has the use of reason, can most easily, without any peculiar or inward illumination of light, understand and perceive all the senses of Scripture which are necessary for obtaining eternal salvation to be known, believed, hoped, done.

The same author, in Private Theses Disputation 46, subjoins this corollary: "Whether any immediate action of the Spirit in the will or mind is necessary, or promised in the Scriptures, for this, that anyone may be able to believe the word outwardly proposed? We will maintain the negative."

From this crass error, into which the Remonstrants after the Conference at The Hague in 1611, day by day teaching the day, have lapsed, they were still free when in that said Conference they asserted that the mind of man is irresistibly illuminated by the Holy Spirit. But this horrible

assertion of the Socinians and Remonstrants we have more than sufficiently refuted above; when we proved the necessity of subsequent grace.

2. The sum of the reasonings and objections comes down to this, that we have need of the use of reason, and that we understand by reason, and without reason we cannot investigate, perceive, understand the sense of Scripture: and that the Reformed acknowledge that reason has some use in interpreting the Scriptures, and judging controversies.

Response: It is certain that our reason is subjectively and formally the cognizant, interpreting, judging faculty, and that its use is in the knowledge, interpretation of Scripture and things of faith. For our Theology is rational: and we inculcate this so often in this disputation of ours, as also in Part 1 of Select Disputations, title on human reason in matters of faith. But from this it only follows that reason is the subject of spiritual understanding and judgment. And that illuminated and renewed reason as such, in respect to God or the Holy Spirit the supreme and infallible judge, is the instrument of judgment and interpretation: by no means however is it the supreme and infallible judge or infallible norm of interpreting. Sight and hearing together, or at least one or the other, are necessary requisites and organs of understanding, interpretation of the Scriptures, and judgment concerning controversies: but therefore they are not the supreme, infallible judge, nor the infallible norm of interpreting Scripture; as the Paradoxical Anonymous in the title-page of his pamphlet "Philosophy the Interpreter of Scripture" attributes this. Such an insolent title we do not remember ever to have been prefixed by any heretic or fanatic of our time. For although there are some who make Reason the norm and judge (as the Socinians), yet they have not made Philosophy the judge; much less Cartesian Philosophy as the Paradoxical Anonymous seems to wish. For reason or the rational intellect, that is, the natural faculty or power of man, and Philosophy whether said to be in the mind or in a book, are not really the same thing.

In the mind it is a habit, or first act, which inheres in the intellect; and second, which is elicited from the intellect. Neither act is the natural power which is called the intellect. But Philosophy in a book or in the mouth of a preceptor teaching and dictating Philosophy, is a system of precepts and theorems, necessary for ingendering Philosophy in the mind. And it is the object of the intellect or reason, and the medium and aid for producing the habit and act of Philosophy in the mind. The Paradoxical Anonymous in the title of his book says that true Philosophy is the infallible norm of interpreting Holy Scripture, in the body of the book he shows sufficiently, that he means neither the Platonic, nor the Aristotelian, nor the modern eclectic and common Philosophy of the Schools in Christendom, and especially in the Reformed Schools, to be that true Philosophy the norm of interpretation: but that of which he speaks in ch. 6, p. 46 thus: "After these, all the Christians who defected from the Roman See followed in their footsteps, though not so closely, until finally the light of Cartesian Philosophy dawned on certain Theologians in this age, to whom the interpretations of Holy Scripture which did not come forth illustrated by the rays of this light began to seem sordid." Wonderful and unheard of things which he relates, if he would further explain, we might perhaps understand, why we sometimes hear it denied, that Philosophy is ancillary to the explication and defense of Scripture, or Christian Theology: and asserted, that Cartesian Philosophy conduces best or at least better to learning, teaching,

explicating, defending Reformed Theology; than the common Philosophy traditionally taught in the Reformed Schools: concerning whose logic and physics they peremptorily pronounce, that they are useless.