(The quote from Frederick Wolfeshausen I’m not sure how far it extends pg 20-21)

(Italicized text is an edit by me or a section translated by Chatgpt or Claude Sonnet because the Opus translation token would be wasted on a few lines sometimes it will put what is in the manuscript as Voetius as Vedelius and if you see an error or a part you aren’t sure is accurate you can tell me and I will retranslate it additionally there are parts that say (Greek Text) or something similar this is done by the AI Translated by Onkuu on Discord or OnkuOh on Twitter, please credit me if you cite my translation somewhere or share it.)

ON THE NATURE AND OPERATIONS OF DEMONS. 1
ON SPECTERS. 50
ON THE ENERGUMENS. 79
ON THE ENERGUMENS, SECOND PART. 96
ON THE USES OF SINS PER ACCIDENS. 111
ON THE PROPAGATION OF ORIGINAL SIN 128
A METHOD OF RESPONDING to excerpts and slanders concerning God the author of sin, etc. 159
Some additions, which then when the press was running did not come into mind; or in various confused schedules were noted, were passed over; or from books afterward by chance inspected, or even at last published were observed. 174

ON THE NATURE AND OPERATIONS OF DEMONS.

Resp. TO HENRICUS BORNIUS of Utrecht. On the 17th of February.
We spread this disputation on the Demons as a foundation to the Disputations on Specters, Energumens, Magic, Exorcism previously published.

1. The evil angel in the old testament is called. 1. Satan 1 Chron. 21. 1. Zech. 3. 1. 2. (although R. Aben Ezra with R. D. Kimchi expounds it of Sanballat and his associates, Ar. Montanus of Antiochus Epiphanes) Job 1. & 2. The Septuagint translate &alibi when it is used not of a spirit but of a human adversary, they translate iißaλ 1 Sam. 29. 4. and Zaray 1 Kings 11. 14. 23. 25. The Chaldean Paraphrast retains Job 1. 2. Satan, but Zech. 3. translates chattaah i.e. sinner, sox namely in the way it is used in the N.T. II. Deut. 32. 17. with Ps. 106. 35. where the Septuagint translate daspórior: The Targum, priD massik Ps. 135. but Deut. 32. and elsewhere retains Schedin, Which the Syrian also has Ps. 106. The Arabic Interpreter transfers שיטאן Saitan, which word also the impure Mohammed uses everywhere in his Koran. III. Sagnir Levit.

17. 7. The Targum and Rabbis expound by Schedim; R. Aben Ezra adds the etymology, that they appeared to men in the form of a hairy animal or goat, and under that image were worshipped by the Gentiles, and thus by the Israelites in Egypt. The Septuagint transfer h.e. idol. The Arab Saitan. IV. By the Rabbis it is said in the plural, which Aruch brings forward from Bereshit Rabba sect. 7. In the new testament three Hebrew names occur, of which the first two are common, or appellative Satan, (once Satan. 2 Cor. 12. 7.) and Belial 2 Cor. 6. which is brought from the Old Testament where however it is used only of men Deut. 13. 13. Judg. 19. 22. etc. The third is proper, Beelzebul, Matt. 10. 25. & 12. 24. etc. by which a certain demon, namely the prince of the others is denoted. Moreover we do not doubt that it is derived from the God váy or v of Ekron 2 Kings 1. v. 2, nor nevertheless do we concede that the critical sickle is sent into the Greek text, and according to the example of the Vulgate and Syriac version it is written Beelzebub. For everywhere, that is seven times, the Greek copies constantly have Beelzebul, which the Arab follows and most of the fathers. Thus it denotes the Lord of dung, or the dung-like: (in the way idols are called gilloulim i.e. dung-like Ezek. 22. 3. 14. 4.) by an elegant paronomastic detorsion not unusual to the Holy Spirit, as Drusius shows on the place Matt. 10. and the most learned Selden syntagma 2. on the Syrian Gods c. 5. And Scultetus book 2 of the Evangelical exercises c. 57. who are to be seen by those, who follow sacred philology and antiquities. Besides that it is not unusual for proper names translated into other dialects, to be written and pronounced otherwise: nay even in the same language; thus e.g. Nebuchadnezzar 2 Kings 24. 1 Dan. 1. 1. etc. is written Jer. 21. 1. Ezek. 29. 18. Nebuchadrezzar nor nevertheless do we say that the text is corrupted. Moreover that Selden confesses with Origen that he is ignorant for what reason the name Beelzebub is used to denote the prince of demons: we, with due respect to the judgment of others, think that the name was not first imposed on the demon then on the idol, but vice versa from the idol of the Gentiles the name was transferred by the people of God, and thus from the manner of speaking by the Holy Spirit himself, to signify the devil; and this on the foundation, that the idols of the Gentiles were interpretatively nothing other than demons 1 Cor. 10. 20. About Beelzebub the prince of demons, see below part 2. last thesis. The Greek names in the N.T. are these 1. Coλ@ Matt. 4. Acts 13. etc. which the Syrian translates Np Ochelkartso i.e. accuser, promulgating calumny. The remaining names he nearly expounds by his own & dajavo, whose origin they trace to the Hebrew i.e. face, kite. II. dapévsor & daar Matt. 7. 22. 83. 1. which word is otherwise taken in a good sense among Plato and other profane authors, nay it even denotes God himself, in the Cratylus. III. & vngès Matt. 6 & µakna s rovnesas Eph. 6. IV, µ àxàJær Luke 4. 39. & Eph. 2. 2. Acts 23. 8. Luke 8. 29. & 9. 39. & wvs µg mongor Luke 7. 21. V. ¿ àpxwv & FxóCµs & Fav TVpar John 12. 31. 2 Cor. 4. 4. a'pyù , iž×Cia, ngoµónça'oup , apxar & sex Cias durauis Eph. 6. 12. & 2. 2. Rom. 8. 38. VI. aabsolute Rom. 8. 38. 1 Cor. 6. 3. & with the addition & a Cala 2 Cor. 12. 7. ' [sFalis Matt. 25. 41. VII. Serpent 2 Cor. 11. 3. & great dragon, ancient serpent Apoc. 12. 9. & 32. 9. VIII. 1. There are those who add from Apoc. 9. 11. the names of the Angel of the abyss, Avheb. Abaddon, to whom Selden loc. cit. thinks the Ashmadai of the Hebrews very congruous from the root Shamad he exterminated, destroyed. But we prefer to understand Antichrist by those, namely the firstborn of the devil. And these sacred names. Among profane writers the word evil genius is usual. Of the Demon, demonium: let Plato be seen in the Cratylus, Macrobius Saturnalia book 1. c. 23. Philostratus everywhere in the life of Apollonius of Tyana; Avraλa occurs in Plutarch in Dion. In the same in the symposium, to the

question Bingo Resp. Thales says they are só; & to qu tici he says: "of the hortatory (namely demonium) all the poets fully know it to be from the good." Moreover Eugubinus collects many things about the name of demon from the Gentile writers book 8. on perennial philosophy chap. 19. 20. 33. 34. From which it is also agreed that evil demons were not unknown to them. Although this opinion was disapproved by some, as Augustine seems to intimate book 9. chap. 1. About which soon below thesis 2. But others also sometimes confounded God or the Gods with the demons: others distinguished them; as is clear from Augustine's cited place, & c. 2. 3. Hence the variety and confusion of opinions: as some divided the Gods into good and evil or envious; others denied that any Gods or demons were evil. Compare what we note below thesis 2. about this confusion. The rest are nearly usual either of individuals, or of species, so to speak, among the Rabbis, Cabalists, philosophers, Magi and the common people: about which in the last thesis. Moreover the philological consideration of those names is to be sought from the common lexicographers, and also the scholia on scripture: lest we be too prolix here. Consectary. I. Ridiculously and ignorantly R. Menasseh Ben Israel probl. 22. on the Creation derives Sched i.e. demon from ài.e. field. II. It is not probable, that Ketebh Ps. 91. 6. or Sagnir Is. 13. 21. 34. 14. denotes the devil; whatever may be the case concerning the exposition of the Vulgate interpreter, the Septuagint, Targum, Rabbis, and certain more recent authors. III. It is much more foolish to understand the devil by Behemoth & Leviathan Job 42. & 41. with the fathers & Pontifical commentators. IV. Nor would we want the passages Ps. 78. 49. & 109. 6. to be drawn here: lest by such weak proofs we prostitute our Theology: when those texts admit another & congruous interpretation. V. It is by far most absurd, what R. Sel Iarchi says about Lilith Is. 34. 14. i.e. it is the name of a she-devil; and recently R. Menasseh loc. cit. Spirits of the female sex. From which charming interpretation was born the Rabbinic mythology about the Mother of devils, who was the first wife of Adam (see below thesis 4.) More rightly Aben Ezra & David Kimchi in their scholia ibid. expound it as a bird flying by night. VI. Laish Job 4. 11. which the Septuagint translate μvgunnodśwn the Vulgate tiger, does not denote the devil, as Eulogius wants in Photius in the Myrobiblon 280. VII. Mammon Matt. 6. v. 24. is not the name of a demon, as Lombard wants book 2. dist. 7. VIII. With the ridiculous etymology of demon as if dimon, from the Latin word divitiis and the Syriac Mammon omitted; and of the devil from dia i.e. two and bolus i.e. morsel, because he bites two namely body and soul, as from the Catholic and Gem of gems some Scholastics, among them William, and Themesvar. It is asked what Isidore had respect to book 8. c. 11. "The Devil in Hebrew is said to be flowing down etc. falling down by the weight of pride he fell etc." whom Bonaventure follows on 2. dist. qu. 1. and Gerson tract. 8. on the Magnificat. The most learned Matthias Martinius in the Onomasticon conjectures that he although wrongly says the word is Hebrew, had respect to bonl, which is turned Is. 64. 4. ixpver to flow down: or rather the Arabic language, dabala to become flaccid, to waste away, whence debon that is marasmus. But Isidore does not say the word alsoλes is of Hebrew origin, nor if he had said it do I think there was so great a knowledge of Hebrew and Arabic in him, that he thought about those roots. Therefore it must simply be said, that Isidore compared the Hebrew synonym, which was according to his opinion from the root naphal that is, he fell, cast himself down, failed, fell: Gen. 6. 4. Where otherwise the giants are to be understood, whom very many of the ancients believed to be begotten by devils, some to be begotten by them from the devils. About which below.

2. With the word explained let us approach the questions Whether it is, What it is, why it is. The first indeed that there are evil angels or demons, is clear I. from innumerable testimonies of scripture, some of which we cite in these theses. II. From specters; which cannot be referred to natural causes, nor to God or the good angels, on account of their lying and wicked effects. From this argument the ancient Gentiles, and the moderns, and other outsiders, as the Mohammedans, collected this truth. See the disputation on Specters. To this class of arguments I refer the portents and prodigies. The force of which argument as the Gentiles saw, so not even Machiavelli himself could decline book 1. of discourses chap. 56. p. 231. "I believe the causes of such things can be explained by those, who are distinguished in the knowledge of natural and supernatural things: from which I confess I am alien: unless perhaps with certain philosophers we should think it proper to pronounce, that the air is full of spirits and intelligences, who foreseeing future things, and condoling human misfortunes, pre-announce them to men through signs of this kind, so that they may be able to prepare and fortify themselves against them more opportunely. However the matter may be, Experience certainly has found, that such signs are accustomed to follow certain great motions." III. From the Oracles which were given from the caverns of the earth, from trees, from statues. Which by the same consequence, as the preceding argument is to be urged. See the disputation on Prophecy. IV. From energumens, through the same consequence. Compare the disputation on Energumens. V. From the effects & evils of magic, through the same consequence. Compare the disputation on Magic. VI. Then, if it may avail anything among the Atheists & Libertine-Sceptics, let the consensus of all the wise of whatever sect accede, namely of the Jews, Mohammedans, Gentiles. See the testimonies of the last in Eugubinus book 8 on perennial Philosophy. We therefore reject. I. The errors of the Sadducees who denied demons Acts 23. 8. Epiphanius book 1. vol. 1. 14. Nazianzen oration 6. which is on the Holy Spirit. II. Of certain among the Gentiles, who thought that the nature of demons was entirely averse to every evil. But they confounded the good and evil angels, and the Gods with the demons. In which way Hesiod sings about the men of the golden race, "To μθμ δεσμδες εἶχ. Διὸς μεγάλες Διαβολάς, Εσθλοί, ἐπιχθόνιοι , φύλακες θνητών ανθρωπων. etc." About which see Theodoret cure sermon 5. p. 111. Compare also Eugubinus book 8. chap. 31. 33. And Heinsius introduction to the works and days of Hesiod chap. 10. p. 239. where he thus explains this theology of the Gentiles "Therefore of these are two genera to be constituted: of whom the one were dissolved; the others were converted into the appearance royal, and constituted something more noble and aerial. In all life the Platonists place three things; ßtov, Jávalov, ¿ñğιv, as Proclus speaks or as we would prefer, Sior, Textur , μsigar that is, life, the end of life, and what follows the end of life. Therefore of the men of the first age as many as were more noble, after their own time was completed λῆξιν Δαιμονίαν , ευελὲς Δαίμονας τοὺς ἐπιχθονίες constitute the Second Tod's woxJovies. The Third without l perished. The Fourth Heroes. The Fifth &vxlu`ävpwirlw, whom Hierocles in the book on fate and providence calls we yua ga, where he makes them third after & ovevia, whom we call Gods: whom rà aifesa follow whom we call Demons.ὧν τα μπαρ πρώτα , he says κρανιά τε νὶ θεοὺς καλεῖς οἱ δὲ μετεκεῖνο το Εύσημα ἔχειν έλαχε χώρα, λογικά αιθέρια τε καὶ ἀγαθοὺς δαίμονας όνομαξε(ε , ὅ τε ζυμφερόντων ανθρώποις ἑρμζωίας τε ν ἀγέλοις γενομένες , τὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπειο ῖ τελος ταίαν τάξιν ἐπέχειν . οὗς τρι για ξῶα καὶ ἀνθρωπίνας ψυχάς , καὶ ὡς ἀνέιποι Πλατων) αθανάτες ὀνομάξεως ανθρώποις." And a little after, with the passage of Plato having been adduced, thus he proceeds: "That we may constitute something from the words those ages make twofold men the

one by a certain perpetual series constituted the human race: but those who were purer and more outstanding Ang obtained the divine, and were referred among the Demons. And this is the cause, why from those ages ng constitute the Poet, and idu rozexá e from all which he applies one only to his purpose. But that is rovar Aaμóvar. For he repeats these things a little afterwards about the same.
Τρὶς δ μύριοι εἰς ἐν ἐπὶ Χθονὶ πολυβοτείρη Αθάνατοι Ζωός, φύλα κες θνητών ανθρώπων."

III. The Fanatic Enthusiasts of David George, who transforms devils into the corruption of the human will, or evil motions of the mind, or confounds them with these: who finally would have existed after the fall of Adam, as is convicted from the book of Wonders part 2. chapters 28, 29, 30, 117. and evidently and compendiously from his own Apology to Anna Oldenburg Countess of Emden chap. 5. Nor did the newest of all masked Defenders Andreas Hugelmumfonus dare to deny this heresy of his; whom Ubbo Emmius the historian & Professor, while he was living, of Groningen detected & refuted. IV. Of Aristotle, and whoever without the mixture of the Christian faith follow him in all things (of which sort especially are Avicenna, Averroes & the Averroists of the previous century in Italy); whom it is certain either to judge all the effects of demons fabulous or to reduce them to natural causes, to those, who have only inspected his writings. See Pomponazzi disputing about this ex professo on Enchantments chap. 9. & 10. Who in whatever forms he may have turned himself, was not able to excuse Aristotle: which he himself confesses. The same happened to Eugubinus lib. 8. c. 27. & Scaliger Exercise 155. although he does not so confess. V. Of Plato in the Cratylus & Epinomis, & of the followers Plotinus, Proclus, Porphyry, Iamblichus, Alcinous who attribute goodness to demons & benign offices towards men, and thus confound the good angels with the evil, as is clear from Augustine lib. 10 of the City of God chap. 11. Eugubinus l. cit. c. 22. 23. 24. Psellus reheated that pseudo-philosophy refuted by Delrio disquisition on Magic lib. 3. And the Magical Doctors Agrippa, Trithemius etc. eagerly seized it as the primary foundation & allurement of Magic. Nor do Pomponazzi, Cardanus loc. cit. & if there are any philosophers of that ilk show themselves sufficiently alien to it. For now they affirm, now they deny. But this will best be agreed, if Psellus himself recently published in Greek & Latin with notes by Gilbert Gaulmin be seen, & compared with him Iamblichus on the mysteries of the Egyptians. VI. The disputation of Timothy Bright, which he has in the animadversions to the Physics of Scribonius against the division of angels into good & evil, we think is not Theological heterodoxy, but mere dialectical Τολογία, about the technologeme of Division.
3. What a demon is this description will explain: It is an angel created in integrity, who on account of his own defection, is subject to immutable malice & misery, serves the providence and glory of God even unwilling. We make the Genus Angel that is a spiritual substance. About the essence and its properties, as also about the existence & personality nothing is to be said here; those things are presupposed from the treatise on Angels in general. The specific Difference, by which it is distinguished from the good, we make immutable malice & misery: The causes of which are subjoined. We reject here the errors 1. Of Plato, who in the Epinomis makes demons material, and indeed comprehends them in the number of animals, attributing to some bodies more tenuous from air, to others from ether. II. Of Porphyry in 2. on Abstinence, where he not only raves with other Gentiles that demons are delighted by the odors & blood of victims but also that their aerial little bodies grow fat by them. To which I wonder Eugubinus

subjoins chap. 30. "Which things perhaps are true, so that they therefore adhere to more humid places. But to me those things are especially traced, which confirmed by the testimonies of many, may be known as truer." Thus walking, through dry places, & without humors, & water, they do not have where they may rest. Those things which occur in Justin, Athenagoras, Minucius, Chrysostom serm. on S. Romanus. Tertullian chap. 22. Origen against Celsus nearly at the end, manifestly too much evince this λαxvsíav attributed to demons. See how Theodoret from the Pythian confounds Porphyry contradicting himself & plastering these things in the cure sermon 12. p. 138. III. Of the Thalmudists & Cabalists, who state them to be corporeal & to be affected by corporeal things, to feed on foods, to generate, to die like men. Which rancid trifles R. Menasseh ben Israel ambitiously sells problem on creation 22. where he also tries to prove from Ps. 104. v. 4. that their bodies are composed from fire & air. But they fluctuate about the origin, essence & nature of demons, & are split into various opinions: which, lest I be prolix, by citing the words of the individual authors, Munster for the most part compendiously reviews in his notes on Leviticus 17. "About these aerial demons the Hebrews have wonderful opinions. For they say: just as God from the beginning made certain corporeal creatures from the four elements, so also he made certain ones from only two elements, namely from fire & air: & these cannot be perceived by the exterior senses, just as neither the soul of a beast, because they have a body in a certain way spiritual. And just as bodies composed from the four elements, can be dissolved through death, & resolved into the elements, so also the mentioned subtle creatures can die, & that insensible body can return into its elements. And those demons have three properties of the ministering angels, & three properties of the sons of men. For they have wings like angels, (I report the opinions sparingly) they fly most swiftly like angels, they foreknow future things like angels, they eat & drink like men, they give effort to generation like men, they die like men. They move themselves swiftly from place to place, because they are destitute of all heaviness. For if a bird, which has something of earth & water, can move itself so swiftly, how will not those aerial demons be moved more swiftly through the air, who are burdened by no heavy matter? Their food & refreshment is as they lick the liquidity of the air, & draw in the odor of fire. Whence also they can easily be had at will by necromancers with the suffumigation of smoke. And what they are said to foreknow future things, they do not have this from their nature, but when they fly around in the ethereal parts, they learn many things from the rectors of the celestial orbs, which they then reveal to others, to whom they wish. Nevertheless they cannot know those things, which will be future after many years, but what the present heaven threatens. To these no authority or power is entrusted, so that they can neither harm nor profit man. There are again others, who have another opinion about demons, namely that they lack every elementary body, but are bare souls, created from the beginning of the world before bodies were formed for them. For when the sabbath had already dawned, & they had not yet received bodies from the Lord, they were left naked spirits without a body. And the Hebrews say this to be implied by these words, which are written in the beginning of Genesis: Which God created to make. Moreover they are called by the proper name because they lay waste & change the influences of superiors: which also the magi are said to do, relying on their aid. They sometimes put on a body so that seeing they may shake with horror. There are again others, who have a still more absurd opinion, namely that these cacodemones are born from the seminal semen of a man, or at least assume a body especially if a carnal & base imagination or illusion may hover over one sleeping: & they call these id est harmful demons, which plot

against man for so long, until he will have been taken from the world. Whence the wise of the Hebrews are said to have ordained that when some funeral is to be sent into the sepulcher, seven circulations ought to be made around it: for the demons flee from them, & then the body must suddenly be cast into the pit before the demon returns & infects and pollutes the corpse, whence he himself was made. You will find wonders about these prodigies in Rabbi Abraham the author of the bundle of myrrh." IV. Of the Heretics, who said that the devil was either born from the thirtieth zone, as the Valentinians, Archontics; or corporeal as the Messalians; or that angels had intercourse with women to procreate men, as the Sethians. About whom Epiphanius, Augustine, & the other writers of heresies are to be seen. Nor are those writers entirely immune from this opinion, who having abused the passage Gen. 6. v. 2. thought that angels generated giants from women, or demons and on that account were cast down from heaven as Philo on the Giants, Justin 17th oration to the Roman senate, Clement Stromata 3, Tertullian on the apparel of women, Lactantius book 2 chapter 15. Others having abused the same passage Gen. 6. thought that they were demons, (called sons of God, because they are such by nature), who being corporeal, like men generated, as Francis George vol. 1. problem 74. Others took the same passage thus, that they think that demons first as succubi received the most valid semen from the most powerful men, which then the same incubi transfused into the most valid women, from which giants were born; as Burgensis on Gen. 6. & Valesius sacred philosophy c. 8. V. Of Mohammed who Surat 65. says that men were created from a shadow, the devil from a flame of fire. VI. Whose madnesses the delirium of a certain idiotic & fantastic recent Enthusiast John Boehme surpasses, who says that the devil was created from the substance of God. & is part of the divine essence. Apology 1 in German against Balthazar Tylcken sect. 521. VII. Of the Gentiles, who thought that the souls of the wicked were transformed, into ghosts, lemurs, & larvae wandering around, terrifying, & infesting. Thus Isidore testifies book 8 of origins. "They say that larvae made in men are demons, who will have been of evil merit." But see Apuleius himself on the God of Socrates & apology part 1. And Philostratus on the life of Apollonius of Tyana book 3 chapter 2. Of this opinion were also the Jews, as is clear from Josephus book 7 of the Jewish war chapter 33. From the Christians Athenagoras in the legation affirms that the angels Gen. 6. 2. generated giants, whose dead souls were changed into demons, & wander around the world. Of the Fathers of whom some following the Gentiles & Platonists made demons gluttonous, who were allured by the odors & blood of victims, as Athenagoras: some insisting on the theogonies & genealogical fables of the Gentiles, Jews, & heretics, attributed luxury & congress with women to devils, which sort are those whom we cite below. Others & indeed very many with the Platonists that they are corporeal & affected by corporeals; as Justin Martyr question of the Greeks confuted. Origen acid in the prologue. Tertullian on the flesh of Christ c. 6. & against Marcion book 3. c. 9. (although Pamelius excuses him in the paradoxes of Tertullian, by saying that he took the word body broadly for substance); Lactantius book 2 chapter 15. Caesarius Dialogue 1. Macarius homily 4. Claudianus on the state of the soul book 3. Gennadius on Ecclesiastical dogma c. 12. Augustine on the city of God book 8. c. 16. literal meaning of Genesis book 3. c. 10. Epistle 111. & 115. Retractations book 1. c. 26. to question 47. So that even from here the Papists may see (who today rigidly & by common faith reject this opinion) how dexterously the interpretation & practice of the fathers is established as the cynosure of theology. What also about the acts of the Councils, to which they are accustomed so promptly to take refuge: Since in the Second

Council of Nicaea act 5. John Bishop of Thessalonica says: "thus the catholic church teaches." But more on this against the Papists in the disputation on the fathers. From the more recent theologians & philosophers of the Papists Cajetan favors the same opinion on Gen. 4. & on Eph. 1. And Niphus treatise 3. on demons chap. 34. But whether demons are affected by corporeal things we inquire below thesis 9. VIII. Among the more recent a man of vast reading & erudition Gerard Joh. Vossius treatise on Idolatry (which published after the first edition of this disputation, I now conveniently compare) book 1. c. 6. thus judges about the discrepancy of opinions: "But although I will draw the rope of contention with no one, who attributes bodies to angels, this word having been taken more broadly: nevertheless assent must not be given to the Thalmudists who trifle that they were produced from the left side of the mass or to the Platonists, who do not fear to define, that they have round bodies, & to these ethereal, to those aerial, or of another element. But we place it beyond controversy, that although they more often assume human bodies; nevertheless they must be said to be least corporeal, insofar as they are perfect substances through themselves, nor do they have a natural order to the body: contrary to what happens in human souls, which indeed without the organs of the body, but only subsist imperfectly: for instance as a perfect constitutive part of substance; whence they pertain to the series of substances only indirectly & reductively." We remain in the opinion of the scholastics as safer, & which has nothing absurd. In which they followed the Fathers, who make demons dowμals, The Author under the name of Justin question of the Greeks confuted q. 2. Cyril on John book 2. c. 10: Nazianzen oration 2. on Theology & 38. on the nativity of Christ, Chrysostom oration 1. on Providence, Theodoret on the cure of Greek affections sermon 3. And on Genesis question 36. Add to them the Pseudo-Areopagite, & Damascene.

4. The efficient cause of the devil, insofar as he is a creature or according to that which God made him, is God alone as is taught in the common place on the Angels: but insofar as he is considered as the devil or formally evil, & according to that which he made himself, no other efficient (or rather deficient) cause is to be sought outside himself. Therefore of his obstinate malice, which followed his fall, if it is considered as fault, the devil alone is the physical efficient cause: but if it is considered as punishment, the same alone is the meritorious moral cause. Moreover of the fall or of his first sin he alone is the physical cause, for here no meritorious cause has place. Finally of all misery & punishment as such inflicted by God & further to be inflicted, the devil is the meritorious cause, but God through his just & efficacious providence the physical cause by operating & ceasing from action, withdrawing, permitting. Moreover the truth of this our assertion is proven 1. because God created all things very good Gen. 1. 31. 2. because God is or can be in no way the author of the evil of fault; which proven elsewhere ex professo, we here presuppose: but God is the author of the evil of punishment, which since it is the good of justice can be from no other than from him as the highest lord, ruler, & judge; as is to be demonstrated in its place. 3. Because scripture expressly makes the devil the author of his own fall & malice 2 Pet. 2. 4. Jude v. 6. John 8. 44. 4. Because if God were the author of diabolical sin, it would be through some action, which is ascribed to God about this sin. But through none of them is he. Not through foreknowledge & the decree both of permitting and of ordaining to good: because they are immanent actions. Not through creation, because he created them good, & angels of light John 8. 44. Jude v. 6. Not through permission, because falling he did not inhibit or sustain them, because permission is not action, but cessation from action or non-action. Not through actual ordination, by which he converts this fall to something

good, namely to the glory both of Justice towards the devils & the wicked who are tormented by them; and of paternal chastisement of the elect, who are exercised by them; and of general providence in this universe, where he knows how to use their ministry; and immediately of grace both towards the elect angels, & of mercy towards fallen man for this whole emanating ordination or governance, follows the fall, and presupposes it, therefore it is not the cause. In addition it most validly proves that God is the cause not of evil but of good, seeing that he brings forth light from the very darkness and uses the most desperate evil against & beyond its own nature & against or beyond the intention of the evildoer for good. Furthermore if anyone asks whether & how this fall was possible (about which the Scholastics dispute on Thomas 1. qu. 63. art. 1. And Thomas himself against the Gentiles book 3. qu. 109. & 110.) we respond simply to the question whether it is, that this is clear from the event as from the posterior. To the question why it is or how, nothing can be so responded but that there always remains something ngrúanuton to our little intellect in this life, not less than about that mode by which the devil deceived Eve 2 Cor. 11. 3. On the part of the devil it was not impossible that he should fail, his mutable state persuades: for neither was his will of acting rightly the law and norm, nor was truth & justice essential to him, nor was he absolutely and through essence good (which is proper to God alone) but all those things were in him ixie, by participation, accidentally, and thus mutably. On the part of God it was possible and not unfitting that he should permit the fall, the highest wisdom itself teaches from the event & from the posterior, perfect goodness, & the highest and absolute right and dominion over all creatures, according to which he so willed; of which will the cause must not be sought, nor can it be assigned by us. We leave the other reasons, which they call congruities, which are usually brought forward by Augustine, the Scholastics, the Metaphysicians against outsiders from the faith, in their place; only let them not be established as the adequate reason & a priori, or the necessary cause why God rather permitted evil to enter the world first through the angels, then through men; than confirmed both or either in good, when according to his highest & free power and potency he could have. We therefore reject 1. The opinion of the Jews, & of certain Christians (whom we note above thesis 3.) about the origin of demons from the congress of angels with men. 2. The opinion of the same Jews about the origin of demons from the conjugation of Adam with his former wife, with whom they fable that Adam was coupled before Eve, and they call her Lilith: who is to them the mother of demons. About which fable the book of Ben Sira is to be seen, as it was published in Hebrew by the Jews themselves. 3. The opinion of the same about very many male demons generated by Adam from commingling with female demons for the whole 130 years, in which on account of grief from the death of Abel he abstained from congress with his wife Eve; and very many female demons, which Eve brought forth in the same 130 years from commingling with male demons. Bereshit Rabba sect. 20. & 24. And R. Solomon on psalm 89. v. 33. who in the same place a little otherwise, that they were generated from the flux of nocturnal semen, while he was separated from Eve. The same the Thalmud following, says that this separation was made through the excommunication of God, on account of the tasted forbidden fruit. Therefore R. Abraham the Spaniard varies from them in Munster in the scholia on Matthew in Hebrew c. 14. 4. Other opinions of the Jews, as also of the Gentiles & Christians both heretical, and orthodox about the origin of demons we have touched on in the preceding thesis. Compare below thesis 8. at the end.

Consectary. The Scholastics on 1. qu. 63. art. 1. & on 1. 2. qu. 58. art. 2. & qu. 77. art. 2. & on the Master 2. dist. 22. 23. dispute, Whether God can create an angel or rational creature which may be impeccable by nature, either against the natural end & precepts, or against the supernatural: And whether a created intellect can be given with that natural perfection, that it may clearly & intuitively see God. We with the false hypothesis rejected about the first instant of the aevum or delay of the angels, in which they were without grace in pure naturals, as they call them; with Thomas p. 3. qu. 16. art. 1. & 1. 2. qu. 4. art. 4. against Durandus & Scotus state that a creature can be made impeccable through the grace of union, or through the clear vision of God, or through a certain peculiar assistance or confirmation: Besides, the affirmative opinion at least about impeccability around the end & matter of supernatural virtue prejudices the doctrine about the necessity of grace. To whom there is leisure to see them fighting about the natural precepts whether innate by nature or positive superadded, let him go to Cajetan, or rather Vasquez who treats of it diffusely on 1. qu. 63. art. 1. or Becanus Scholastic Theology part 1. treatise 3. c. 4. who compendiously

5. Moreover that we may perceive the defection of the demons so much the better, these things are to be considered 1. Whence they fell. 2. who & what sort fell. 3. how many fell. 4. What was the order or process. 5. What the place. 6. what the time. 7. What kind of sin. 8. How great the sin is. 9. What the consequents of this sin. 1. They fell from the state of integrity in which they were created: which state we constitute not only in pure naturals (as from the Scholastics Bonaventure, Henry, Scotus with his own etc. are accustomed to distinguish here) but in the grace of the divine image, which can be called both natural & supernatural in a diverse respect, in the way our Theologians determine against the Papists about the image of God in Adam. We think that to be denoted by the word of truth John 8. 29. just as the image of God in man by the word of rectitude Eccl. 7. Vasquez defends this our opinion & refutes the contrary one in p. 1. disputation 217. c. 4. 4. II. They were from the celestial angels, who fell. Here the Scholastics ask, whether from one order, or indeed from all some fell: And the latter Lombard with his own affirms 2 book dist. 6. From the more recent Becanus c. 4. qu. 3. says it to be proven from Eph. 6. 12. & from the fathers; whom nevertheless he adduces none there. Themesvar Rosary book 2. under the word Demon, brings forward two reasons. The former is, because someone from the highest order fell, namely Lucifer, therefore much more strongly some fell from the inferior orders. The other, because to the individual orders of the angels some men will be assumed, from whom the ruin of the angels will be repaired; Therefore. Which reasons Thomas also intimates 1. q. 63. art. 4. But to have detected those inanities supported by false or uncertain hypotheses is to have refuted them. III. The number of the fallen is not defined in scripture. Therefore it is enough for us to know this indefinitely, that there were many; which is gathered a posteriori from the multitude of demons. But what the Scholastics with Thomas art. cit. define from 2 Kings 6. 16. that more angels remained in grace than sinned; has little solidity. What Rusca has book 5. on hell & the state of demons chap. 3 has more vanity. "This can be stated certainly etc. the theologians confess this with one mouth." Even more of rash curiosity has the determination of William of Paris on the Universe part 3. c. 8. "The Theologians of the Christians," says the Parisian, "betray that only the tenth order fell, thus understanding, not according to the plain of the letter, because the tenth order never was: but according to equality, which is to say, because as many fell as one order contains, they fell I say according to them, so that from each one of the orders some, so that from all aggregated together the sum of one is

comprised." To these words of the Parisian Rusca thus comments loc. cit. "Since therefore according to the mind of this author (part 2. on the Universe chap. 94. 95.) there are so many legions in each order of the abstract substances, as there are angels in one legion, moreover the number of a legion is six thousand six hundred sixty six, it appears evidently, if we may so speak to the number of a whole order of the Angels, that the multitude of the sinning demons amounts to: six thousand, & six hundred sixty six legions of evil Angels fell, which constitute the number 4443 5556. of demons. A thing entirely uncertain, which, as has been said, the sacred letters, & the ancient masters of our religion have been silent about, content to know, What God knows, who are his. In my opinion, the number of demons is far greater, as those things intimate, which we said at the beginning of the chapter. I add that a demon always assists each one of men, nay sometimes to one, an infinite multitude of them. If it were the custom, I would show it frequently by examples. Truly fifteen thousand demons were present at the death of a certain Cuno notable in probity of life, as Caesarius of Heisterbach is witness, A Demon himself, as the same Caesarius writes, reported to a certain Walter, that in a very large forest there were not so many leaves of trees, as demons were present to a certain dying Abbess, who had lived most holily." To these, as I do not rashly refuse faith, so I seem to myself to conjecture not imprudently, that an almost infinite number of evil spirits, dwells in this vast universality of the whole world, to deceive mortals, and far exceeds the sum defined by the Parisian.

IV. The Scholastics describe the order & process of defection without the scriptures thus from the opinion of certain fathers (whom Vasquez cites), That first some one (whom they call the prince of the Angels & Lucifer) fell; and the same impelled all the others to fall by his persuasion & example. Nor do some of ours seem to abhor from that opinion (excepted the fable about Lucifer), among whom some most outstanding of today's Theologians, & before him Danaeus Isagoge part 2. c. 19. drawn by the passage Matt. 25. 41. Apoc. 12. 9. 20. 2. But that consequence does not seem solid enough, because now among the demons someone is preeminent, therefore in the fall to have been a predecessor. We prefer therefore here to profess learned ignorance. But if someone insists, Now among the demons there is one worse than all the others, & sustains graver punishments: therefore from the beginning there was some angel the prince of all, who first in time sinned, whose sin was most grave on account of causality, because he seduced by no one, seduced all the others. Resp. the consequence is weak. For he could have become worse by increase of malice, & from the beginning through the first sin not to have been such. Then the antecedent is false as to the former member; & plainly uncertain, as to the latter member. For that several demons (& not one) are worse than others is clear from Luke 11. v. & Matt. 17. v. But about the greatest punishment of one above all others scripture has nothing. Moreover that comment about the principality of Lucifer, which after the Scholastics Bellarmine props up with five arguments about the Pope book 1. c. 9. see refuted by Chamier, Whitaker etc. We leave the other disputation about the instant & delay between the sin of lucifer & of the others, & between condemnation and fall from heaven as curious & uncertain to Bonaventure & the Scotists. V. That the place, where they fell, was the heaven of the blessed scripture teaches Jude v. 6. Therefore we think bold enough the opinions of those, who want some angels to have been created in the air, or starry heaven, or lower world. See Pererius on Gen. 1. & Cornelius a Lapide on the epistle of Jude. VI. The time of the fall scripture does not define. This at least is clear indefinitely, that it preceded the fall of Adam; therefore there was not a longer delay of integrity than from the first creation of the world, up to the fall of Adam

exclusive. We leave to them the opinion of Eugubinus, that they sinned in the first instant of their creation, & the disputations of the Scholastics about the three delays or instants, in the second or third of which at last grace would have been superadded to pure naturals, &, whether they could sin in the first instant of creation, since not a few things partly absurd partly uncertain occur. This at least we accept, that a distinction must be made between the delay or instant of the way & the instant of the term (in which the demons fell & were condemned). Let him consult those who will on 2. dist. 5 & Thomas 1. q. 63. ar. 6. from the more recent especially Vasquez on Thomas, & Rhadam part 2. contr. 11. art. 1. & 3. VII. The Scholastics with not a few fathers (whom Vasquez cites) define the kind of sin to the Master dist. cit. & Thomas q. 63. a. 2. & the more recent Papists in the commentaries on 2 Pet. 2. & Jude v. 6. to have been pride. Upon which uncertain foundation, but most certain to them, they also build these Disputations: Whether the object of angelic pride was divinity through essence? or indeed the hypostatic union? or his own natural blessedness? or dominion & prelation, so that namely he wished to be over the angels, or men, or both? All which we reject with the same facility, with which they are brought forward without the scriptures. 2. Others say it was envy from Wisdom 2. 24. thus Cyprian on zeal & envy. The Scholastics conjoin it with pride, & here depart into two opinions. There are those who say this sin was committed by them when they were still in the way. On the contrary others when they were in the term & in the state of damnation, for then they envied man the glory which they themselves had lost. 3. Others, as Occam; Biel, Themesvar describe the sins thus more fully, that they were successively three capital ones, to which they add nine other accessory & indeed mortal ones. The sin or fall of the devil is considered either as to its beginning, & thus it was the pride of presumption & swelling, which ingratitude accompanied, too much self-love & the sin of omission, because he did not inhibit that presumption: As to the middle it was the pride of ambition; which rapine & appetite accompanied, he desired glory in an undue mode, namely without merits; finally because he quickly desired it namely when he was still a wayfarer. As to consummation & confirmation it was the aversion of hatred, for since he could not obtain what he desired, he began to hate God. Which envy, obstinacy, despair accompanied. 4. Others, Lying from John 8. 44. 5. Others, luxury, from Gen. 6. 2. For not only the opinion of Josephus & Philo attribute it to them; but also of the fathers Athenagoras, Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Lactantius. It is not that we should pursue here the absurdity of this opinion. Let the Commentators on Genesis 6 be seen. & Eugubinus perenn. philosophy lib. 8. chap. 42. 6. Others, Remission & less attention about the contemplation of God: for now they were beginning to turn the sight of the mind from God to themselves & to admire their own excellence. Thus from our men a certain excellent Theologian Disp. on the Angels: who in the same place denies that pride was the sin of the angels. But, to confess the truth, I do not see how he does not relapse into the opinion of the scholastics, which he rejects. For when it is asked about the fall of the first parents or of the demons, the first beginning of thought or appetite is not understood, but the species of the complete & consummated sin. We will defend that here most certain is learned ignorance: none of all the opinions certain, although that about pride seems more probable than the rest. VIII. About the Magnitude of the sin the Scholastics ask, whether the sin of all was equal? whether all sinned from deliberate malice? or indeed some from error, ignorance, or actual inadvertence & inconsideration of a certain circumstance to be added to their act? Here the Scotists fight with the Thomists. We will be only spectators of the fight, leaving all those things in the middle, lest we may know above what is written. We say

the same about the questions, why their sin is irremissible? why they cannot repent? Whether God can infuse a good will into them? And if not; what is the impediment? Why did God fix for them so brief a time for obtaining mercy? Which are laboriously aired by Bonaventure, Occam etc., and their compiler Themesvar. Some from our men also (among whom those cited above) seem to attribute too much to the fathers & Scholastics, in assigning the reasons why grace was made to fallen men, not to devils. But we think that no demonstrative & compelling reason can be brought forward here, besides the free good pleasure of God Matt. 11. 27. Rom. 9. v. 15. 11. 35. Eph. 1. 11. the rest of the reasons are to be abstained from, lest we may seem to sell to the faithful chaff for the doctrine of the scriptures, & to the adversaries our conjectures for solid responses; And lest we may seem to pave the way to some analogical merit of congruity, on account of which liberation befell men more, than demons. The admonition of Aquinas is golden p. 1. quest. 32. a. 1. "When someone induces reasons to prove the Christian faith, which are not compelling: he yields to the derision of the infidels. For they believe, that we rely on reasons of this kind, & believe on account of them." Which would that it were applied to six hundred other conjectures, congruities, & aitiologies which to nearly each counsel, saying, deed, of God or of Christ the savior, & their order & circumstances are accustomed to be brought forward idly by many commentators & Postillists. Furthermore those reasons (most of which Bonaventure on 2. dist. 7. confesses to be of congruity not of necessity) among the more recent Papists Vasquez on 1. qu. 73. art. 2. disp. 249. c. 7 still obtrudes from the fathers. And Cornelius à Lapide commentary on 2 Peter 2. where let those see them, to whom there is leisure. IX. The consequents of the sin of the demons were partly in themselves, partly in men. In themselves; is the threefold fall from the state of grace, which they had, from the state of glory which they would have had, & from heaven their domicile; Hence the continuity & obstinacy in sinning (about which thesis 7.) & perpetual misery (about which the penultimate thesis). In men is the fall, to which it incited them.

We reject 1. Porphyry, who (in Augustine on the City of God book 10. c. 11.) stated that certain Demons were naturally evil. II. The Manicheans & Priscillianists (in Augustine on heresies c. 46.) who deny that the devil is an angel, but contend that he is a certain nature of evil & of another God, which was vanquished by himself. III. Those who in Daneau (Isagoge part 2. c. 20.) want the demons not to be the celestial angels, who deserted their first origin; but to have been other angels besides those evil. IV. The recent Jewish writer R. Menasseh Ben Israel, who in 22 problems on the Creation, not obscurely intimates that the evil demons were created by God, in & with hell. Although he himself in familiar conversation, which he had with me here through occasion, affirmed, that he did not know whether there are devils: indeed about the angels it is certain from scripture, but about the devils not likewise. V. The more ancient Thalmudists & Cabalists, who pretend that the devils have origin through generation from Adam, & Lilith his former wife, the mother of demons. See them in Buxtorf Synagogue chap. 2. p. 7. 76. 77. R. Abraham the Spaniard in Munster in the scholia on Matthew in Hebrew c. 14. Compare what we note above thesis 4. VI. The Platonists, & other Gentiles (whom we cite disputation on the Energumens thesis 6.) who dreamed that the devils drew their origin from the souls of the wicked transformed into them after death. VII. Some fathers cited in the same place who contaminated the purity of faith & the simplicity of scripture with this Thalmudic Platonic delirium. With whom agree those, in Photius Myrobiblon num. 232. who in addition added that the Giants begotten from angels & women copulating with brutes generated prodigious men & demons, in

both male and female form. VIII. Josephus, Philo, & the fathers just cited who thought that the angels were corporeal, & first sinned through luxury Gen. 6. 2. and thus were made devils & cast down from heaven. As if the devil had not already sinned from the beginning 1 John 3. 8. & John 8. 44, & seduced man to sin Gen. 3. 18. Alexander Ales, Lombard, Henry, Bonaventure, Scotus with his own, who deny that the Demons were created in grace. X. The curiosity of Thomas with his followers p. 1. qu. 64. art. 2. & against the Gentiles l. 4. chap. 9. where he disputes, That the devils could have done penance, if God had granted them time & the aid of grace. Durandus, Scotus, Richard, Gabriel, Major etc. defend the contrary. XI. The curiosity of Bonaventure, Occam, & Themesvar, who define, That the Devil just as from the beginning, so also now desires the equality of God; although then with the hope of obtaining it, but now without that hope. XII. That the trifling nugae of the same Occam & from him of Themesvar are curious, when they determine, that that fall of the demons from heaven into the air was a motion of a moderate & as it were imperceptible time, from Luke 10. v. 18. But Cornelius à Lapide in the commentaries confesses that the sense of the cited text is not literal, but rather mystical: where he cites not a few from the fathers & Papists, who felt the same here as the Scholastics just cited.

Probl. 1. whether it is certain that the first sin of the demons was against the Holy Spirit strictly & properly so called &; and by that distinguished from the sin of men, & irremissible? Neg. 2. In what place are to be had what occur in Homer, Empedocles, Plutarch etc. about the fall of the demons (see Eugub. lib. 8. chap. 39. Resp. They did not flow from certain reason or natural theology; but from rumor & tradition spread among the Orientals, & thence carried to the Greeks; then transformed into mythologies: which nevertheless can be opposed to the Gentiles insulting our faith as arguments to the man (as they call them): so that namely they may ridicule in Christian theology those things the like of which in their authors & theology with applause & admiration at least without offense they have hitherto read.

The final causes of the devil, as such no causes ought to be assigned, because evil does not have an end. Although however no end may be of the work (as they call it) in itself & per se; there is nevertheless of God operating, who all things for himself Prov. 16. 4. For with a certain end both he created him in the state of integrity, & permitted the defection, & abandoned him in the fall, & ordained his malice to manifold good. Therefore the ultimate end is the glory of God; the subordinate use of the devil as an instrument of divine providence, in this life to vex men, the pious only for exercise, the impious for vengeance & victory: after this life to torment the impious: Thus God in both erects the trophy & glory of his blameless justice. The Scholastics dispute on 4. dist. 47. whether also after the judgment the demons will torture the impious. I see no reason why the affirmative cannot be admitted: although from thence we would not want a dogma of faith to be constructed. For since the devil has the empire of death Heb. 2. 14. And God now uses him to torment the impious in this world, & in hell, notwithstanding, that he himself is condemned & tormented John 16. 11. Matt. 8. 29. James 2. 19: Why could it not be said that the same after the last judgment will be the torturer of the impious? At least it cannot be proven from scripture, that this will not be, or to imply anything absurd & contradictory. But if anyone outside the faith gnaws at this most wise governance of God, to him we oppose these reasons First, it is not absurd if God employs evil spirits; because he absolutely presides over all creatures, & makes them serve him, although they have corrupted themselves. For neither is it just that the malice of the creature should make the dominion of the creator & the governance of

the world cease. Second, the most perfect wisdom, goodness & power of God thence shines forth more, that he uses such evil instruments for good. Third, In a great house there are vessels deputed to the vilest ministries, for which we do not want to use the most excellent Thus divine providence could not use angels permitting evil & ordaining it to good to instigate tyrants & false prophets 1 Kings 22. 22. 23. & similar crimes. Fourth, As to the greater glory of God, so to the greater praise & consolation of the faithful, that instructed by God with faith & spiritual panoply they at last conquer such powerful & wicked adversaries. Rom. 16. 20. 2 Cor. 12. 9. James 4. 7. Hence in place of a consectary we elicit practical uses: lest anyone think this Theology to be merely speculative. The first, is of reprehension. That men are so secure & slothful in the work of salvation, in this course & contest of life. When nevertheless they have so ancient, so dava & versatile, so wicked, so angry, so powerful an adversary: And God sometimes afflicts men in such horrendous ways through him. The second is, of Excitation, to the meditation & admiration of the virtue in our lord Jesus Christ, who despoiled & triumphed over this enemy Col. 2. 13. 1 John 3. 8. The third of exhortation to the invocation of God, spiritual watchfulness, caution & constancy in this contest etc. Eph. 6. 13, 1 Pet. 5. James 4. 7. Compare Chrysostom on Eph. 6. homily 22. The fourth of consolation, from this that so great an adversary, has hitherto through the special & paternal providence of God been so restrained, that he has not only not prevailed against us, as to eternal salvation, but to most has brought no harm, to others little harm in body or external goods hitherto Therefore let us well hope for the future, & bravely oppose ourselves to his assaults, since without the will of our father, he cannot harm even the pigs, much less our bodies or health Matt. 8. 31. Ps 103. 31.
Probl. 2. Whether the tempting devil having been repulsed, is relegated to hell, nor can again tempt, at least not the same one, or to the same vice. Resp. There are those who thought so referring to Thomas q. 114. art. 5. & the Master himself seems to have been among them book 2. dist. 9. last chap. & Origen cited by him, which Themesvar acknowledges. Here Durandus, Bonaventure, Richard, Thomas himself fluctuate (I believe, so that they may consult the honor of the Master), For all these seem to want to concede this: that the demon at least in some way, (as Themesvar speaks) or for some time (as Thomas) ceases from temptation. Themesvar says that the devil (namely Lucifer) who first tempted Adam, then Christ, by whom having been conquered, now ceases & is bound up to the time of Antichrist Apoc. 20. *We reject all those things as means of peace*

7. Now having explained the nature & properties of demons, we must further treat of their effects or operations, which are to be considered both negatively & positively.
But we premise certain hypotheses, which we presuppose from the general doctrine partly about Created Being, partly about Spirits and here only indicate; of which the First is, The Devil is not omnipotent either intensively or extensively: but his power is defined according to the measure of his own nature. Second, he is not æèível, much less that he is infinite. Third, he does not contain in himself the whole nature of things, not even the inferior or elementary. Fourth, He does not have in himself the faculties of other things, nay not even of one specifically distinct from himself; he does not have them, I say, either formally, because he does not have the form of that thing, nor is he that thing or nature; nor eminently, because he is not the universal & first cause. Fifth, He cannot act outside himself immediately, not by immediacy of power if he acts by local motion, not by immediacy either of power or of suppositum, if he acts

by some other kind of motion. Sixth, things are not subjected to his power by natural receptive potency except mediately, namely by means of the active potency of other natural things, which he uses, (excepted local motion, which he performs immediately by his own power). But they are subjected to him by obediential potency, in the same way, as wood to art or to the artificer who introduces into it the form of a statue, or of a table. Now let us look at the Operations of demons negatively, what they do not operate: and that either in general or in particular. In general they cannot 1. create by mediate or immediate creation: for this is proper to God Is. 44. 23, with Rom. 1. v. 19. 20. II. Consequently, nor annihilate. III. They cannot destroy this world either per se, or by means of the powers of other bodies e.g. fire, water etc. For this is reserved to God alone 2 Pet. 3. It is added, that no part ought to have an inclination or power to subvert the whole? Compare Augustine lib. 2. on the Trinity, Thomas quest. 16. on Evil art. 9. against the Gentiles book 3. c. 102. IV. Consequently they cannot invert the laws & order of the universe, nor mix the upper with the lower, nor move the heaven or whole elements from their place or expel the containing whole parts of the world, or stop the course, light, influences of heaven & the stars or induce a vacuum even in the least space of air, because the order of the universe demands that all things be contiguous for its conservation. About which we must now treat more distinctly. V. They cannot produce any new species, or entirely abolish any one of the species of creatures created by God. VI. They cannot properly & univocally so-called perform natural, animal, human actions: whatever they may imitate & feign, for they do not contain in themselves the principles of those actions, namely the required powers. VII. They cannot work miracles. We say how their wonders differ from true miracles in the Disputation on Miracles. VIII. They cannot act in distance by local motion nor anywhere, where they are not locally present according to substance. IX. They cannot be moved immediately from term to distant term, much less carry bodies, so that they do not pass through the intermediate space. Thus rightly with Bonaventure, Scotus & the Scotists on 2. dist. 2. qu. 12. from the more recent Rhadam part 2. controv. 7. art. 5. and that against Thomas p. 1. q. 3. art. 2. X. Although many can be locally in one place or space, (for there would not be penetration of dimensions, where there is not quantity or body) nevertheless one cannot be in diverse places not continuous or contiguous: which is gathered from the local motion of angels & change of presence to operate something here or there Luke 2. 9. 13. 15. John 1. 51. Matt. 28. 2. XI. They cannot move in an instant neither themselves, nor natural bodies from place to place distant, and consequently when they act their wonders, although often in a very brief, nevertheless they require some time for it.
12. Let us now note in particular, what the demon cannot effect. Moreover we distribute these according to the objects, which are either intellectual or purely natural. For the sake of doctrine we will constitute those 1. Christ. 2. angels. 3. separate souls. 4. men on earth. And first 1. about Christ 1, he now does nothing by his local motion, since he is in glory beyond all passion & vexation. 2. He also could not so much against him, when he was on earth, John 14. 30. so that the work of redemption was impeded. II. About the angels 1. he operates nothing by which he conquers them or impedes them in their office, or from which they are affected by some real passion. For intentional passion does not properly affect the subject, but only terminates the action of the agent. 2. He also cannot move them locally. Here the Scholastics raise the question, whether if the angels will, he can move them. To us it seems vain enough. III. About separate souls I. he cannot so much that he may evoke at least the souls of the faithful from heaven & their rest, move them at his pleasure, lead them around, infest them, or abuse them to

infest others. Compare disputation on Specters last thesis. We therefore reject the contrary opinion of Justin Martyr in Dialogue with Trypho, where he also attributes to demons the power of recalling the souls of the just, Which R. la Torre also did not do before tract. 2. on the Power of casting out Demons dispute 4. Nor can he come to them, or mix himself with them: since he has been cast out of heaven 2 Pet. 2. Jude v. 6. with Eph. 2. 7. & 6. 12 Whence we think it safer if Job 1. v. 6. 7. & 1 Kings 22. we take it as a parabolic hypotyposis the matter is described. Contrary to what one of today's Theologians feels. 3. We concede that the souls of the impious in hell are moved, vexed & tormented by him; but that they are led by him from there into the lands & led back into hell is by no means to be believed: nor are the mystical axioms of the Magi about 24 to be established without any necessity of reason. Rightly R. la Torre tract. 2. on the Power of the Church of restraining Demons disp. 4. "Although having attempted their natural power they could move separate souls locally where they wished nevertheless they are prohibited by God: which he also applies to the souls of the impious" p. 207. IV. About man let us first consider his operations in general about any; then in particular about the elect & faithful. In general it is usually asked what he does either more about the whole composite, or more about the soul and its internal faculties. About the whole composite it is asked 1. as to origin, whether devils produce men. 2. As to act & the course of life, Whether they transform them into wolves, cats, & other beasts, & vice versa. Likewise, whether they procure μrix finally, Whether through ecstasy they separate the soul for a time from the body. 3. As to defect & death, Whether from a lethal disease to health, from old age to youthful age or rather complexion, from mutilation of members to integrity, from privation of external sense to habit, as e.g. from blindness to sight, Finally from death to life they reduce. To the first question, it must be noted that a threefold mode of production of men can be thought, namely by creation, by equivocal generation from putrid matter, by univocal generation. The first mode is simply impossible for the devil, because God alone is the creator, as we just said. The second mode is impossible; because he cannot so miraculously intensify the powers of nature, that man so perfect an animal, be raised from putrid matter, like insects & the like: although that could happen naturally was defended by the celebrated philosophers Andrew Caesalpinus, & Cardanus. Him Taurellus rightly exagitates in Caesalpibus book 4. qu. 1. The latter Scaliger Exercise 193. The third mode is likewise impossible, because he lacks the faculty, matter, & instruments required for this. But there still remains a difficulty, & with varying opinions it is sharply contended among Theologians & Philosophers, Whether the devil can be at least the instrument of the generation of men by applying natural agents to passives: so that he may bring the plastic power and its vehicle the male semen from elsewhere, & by the swiftest local motion, & through bodies & instruments fabricated for that purpose transfer & apply it to the female body, so that conception may follow from it: so that the father may be he from whose semen that man would be generated, but the mother she who received it & with things to be posited having been posited, & having conferred from her part, what according to the laws of nature are to be conferred, conceived, carried, gave birth. Not a few histories are usually brought forward, which give occasion to this disputation besides that it is necessary for the genuine exposition of Gen. 6. 2. to be defended against philosophers, heretics, fathers, & some more recent authors. The Heroes or demigods of the Gentiles, (among whom the Sileni, believed to be mortal; since; whose sepulchers were shown, if indeed Pausanias speaks the truth in the Later Eliacs) generated from man & God or Goddess (that is demon) antiquity boasted. The poets confound or draw those things elsewhere by their

fables & commentaries, & the Platonic-Cabalists to Plato's Cratylus. If such were truly generated, this must be referred to the demons. Many things also from the confessions of Magi & witches, about incubus & succubus demons report the ICC. & Theologians, who have treated those causes: There is added the celebrated history of that Merlin the Englishman born, as they say, in the year 440, & of that girl whom in Marthonian Scotland they report to have conceived from the devil Hector Boethius Scotch history, book 8. & what Ludovic Vives refers to Augustine book 15. chap. 23. & Delrio book 2. qu. 15 What shall we say here? Either all things are to be rejected as fictitious: but perhaps this seems too hard; although I would dare to establish this about most. Or those whom they say were generated, from the devil were not men but demons in human form: Thus Timpler Metaphys. l. 4. c. 4. qu. 26. Or it must be said, that the women having copulated with a demon truly or imaginarily, & afterwards having been so affected by him as carrying the womb; & at the time of birth an infant having been substituted from elsewhere. Which is the response of some who defend the negative opinion: among whom Hyperius Method. Theol. l. 2. p. 304. & Paul Fris. But to me it seems inexplicable diavon how in those cases, which are recounted, the women giving birth could be so deceived with the midwives & others who were present (so that we now leave the deception of the imaginary coitus in the middle.) Besides that it was hardly possible always to substitute recently born infants snatched from elsewhere at the very point of birth. Therefore nothing remains, but that with intercourse having been conceded, we profess learned ignorance about the conception & generation of a man from a succubus or incubus demon. As for the affirmative opinion, I scarcely satisfy myself in that doubt: How that semen is prolific & the genital spirit is conserved in it, which the devil cannot transfer from elsewhere without some little delay of time & the philosophemes about the Generation of man stand Physico-Medically in Aristotle on the Generation of Animals book 2. c. 3. & in all the Anatomists. Not to say anything about the law of nature, by which God decreed, that from the congress of man & woman men are born Gen. 1. 2. Above which God alone from a virgin once caused a man to be born, namely our Immanuel. The Scholastic Theologians & Papists almost all hold the Affirmative on 2. dist. 8. & Thomas p. 1. qu. 51. 4. 3. And the commentators on Gen. 6. & the writers on Magical Things among whom the most recent & as it were of all (where others are cited) Delr. l. 2. qu. 15. with whom compare Serrarius on Tobit 6. qu. 2. 3. 4. 5. Excepted Pererius on Gen. 6. & Themesvar n. 74. who doubt, & Eustachius of S. Paul, who in his Physics part 3. tract. 2. qu. 3 thinks it only probable. Besides by some philosophers & ICC., Nic. Remigius, Brodaeus, Cardanus, Baptista Porta, Ulrich Molitor etc. With these few excepted the rest of the Physicians, Philosophers, Philologists, ICC., Canonists agree with the Theologians: nevertheless they want the children born from such coitus to be of that man, from whom the semen was excreted, not of the demon. William of Paris on the Universe part. ult. adds that those born from such coitus are monstrous, with thick bellies, minute members, great goiters, for whose suckling & nourishing five women may not suffice. But I do not see by what experience this can be proven, so that it may be exempted from the number of fables. From our men Zanchius on the Works of Creation part. 1. book 4. c. 16. th. 1 accedes to the opinion. Although he does not have it for a dogma so necessary, that it is impious to feel the contrary. Hemmingius tract. on Magic, Danaeus tract. on Sorcerers; Zepperus on the Mosaic laws book 4. c. 11. n. 463. Casmann Angelography lib. 2. c. 21. qu. 5. 6. does not deny the common opinion about Incubi & succubi: He says nevertheless that he is doubtful: Moreover he not obscurely rejects the generation of man from such coitus. Rivetus

Exercise 50. on Genesis & Willet on Gen. 6. concede about Incubi about succubi; but they deny about the conception existing from thence. The Negative opinion is embraced by not a few Theologians, Philosophers & ICC. from our men. Timpler Metaphys. lib. 4. cap. 4. quest. 26. 27. who says to affirm the contrary is impious. Weyer on Prestiges, Godelmann on Lamias, Reginald Scot book 3. c. ult. Whose book nevertheless as it was burned in England, so his other paradoxical opinions were refuted by the English Theologians Raynol. & Perkins. Hyperius place cit. Paul Eristus cited by Casmann in Angelography. Who all not only deny the nativity of man from that nefarious concubitus, but also relegate the horrendous tragedies of the incubi & succubi either to fables, or to the disease Ephialtes & to mere illusion & deception of the phantasy. We concede that the nefarious congress can happen; but we permit the generation by others to be discussed: although we prefer to incline to the Negative; which is undoubtedly also safer. As for the conception, generation, & birth of virgins without coitus, which is pretended, from male semen injected insensibly into the uterus by the demon, we absolutely deny it as impossible & contradictory and also the asylum of all impurities, incests, adulteries. Compare disputation on Creation part 10. thesis 3. problem 2. & 6. I cannot but ascribe here the words of Cyril c. Antropomorphitas book 1. c. 17. p. 78. where, he denies that the giants were generated by demons: from the edition of B. Vulcanius in 4th. "But it is foolish to think, that incorporeal demons can perform the duties of the body, and effect what is alien to their nature. For none of those things which exist in the nature of things can perform anything beyond its own nature; but each one as it was made, so it remains, God prescribing to each one its own duty. For he himself is the author and Lord of all origin, by whose nod and will each one of those things which are, is what it is." To the second question about transformation & in particular about Lycanthropy we respond, that it never happened nor can happen: The reason is, because then the devil could create, & work miracles. But scripture & reason deny this. But whatever from the light of facts & experience is usually brought forward in the inquisitors of Magical things, likewise Augustine lib. 18. on the City of God c. 16. 17. Pliny lib. 8. c. 22. & lib. 10.c. 44. if that itself is not fabulous or to be imputed to disease, which the physicians call lupine melancholy or lycanthropic madness, & make a species of Melancholy: Aegineta l. 3. c. 16. Aetius l. 6. c. 11. Codronchus on venefic diseases l. 3. c. 7. Sennert Institutes of Medicine l. 1. part 2. sect. 1. c. 7. Or to corruption of the phantasy by the devil, by which it happens that men falsely imagine themselves to be beasts & to do this or that. Pomponazzi on Enchantments c. 12. speaks rather harshly: "by changing their minds." 3. If indeed the two superior modes cannot be adapted to the proposed examples, this must be attributed to diabolical tricks by which either he removes the man (called lycanthropos) from the sight of others & transfers him elsewhere meanwhile he deludes his phantasy, & substitutes a true wolf or other beast (or if you prefer its specter & appearance): or he surrounds that man either with the skins or appearance of a lupine body, & he himself either immediately, or mediately through that lycanthropos vexes men & beasts, nay & sometimes in turn permits the same to be pounded & wounded according to appearance in a lupine body, according to the truth of the thing in his own human body. And this opinion about tricks is of Augustine lib. 18. on the City of God c. 18. Thomas on Miracles art. 8. & p. 1. q. 114. art. 3. & there of the commentators. Raph. la Torre tract. 3. disp. 4. Leonard Vairus on Fascination; Delrio disquisition l. 2. c. 18. & commentary on Seneca Agamemnon. Very many authors are cited by him in the Disquisitions, Cornelius a Lapide commentary on Daniel chap. 4 p. 1300. from our men Danaeus tract. on Magic; Lavater on specters, Reynolds prelection on

apocryphal books 92. 93. Casmann lib. 3. c. 18. qu. 6. From the Physicians & Philosophers Daniel Sennert Medical Institutes place cit. Timpler chap. cit. qu. 28. Peucer on Divinations, where on ecstatic. Of Cardanus, Weyer, Reginald Scot, Erastus, Martin Biermann tract. On Magic. And ICC. Godelmann, Greg. Tholosanus, & Althusius. The fourth mode of evasion, referring this to the bestial morals of men; which Timaeus Locrus intimates l. on the Soul of the world, & after him Plato in the Epinomis with his followers, (About which Rhodiginus lib. 9. c. 21. & Vives on Augustine's cited place) because it is ludicrous & allegorical-Mythological, does not remove the difficulty nor feeds acromatic minds. We bring forward this reason against the substantial transformation of men. Because the human soul cannot inform a bestial body, nor vice versa. For any substantial form requires proportionate & peculiar to itself dispositions, & organization of the body: as is clear from the definition of the soul. Nevertheless we do not approve the incredulity of Weyer lib. 4. cap. 23. Cardanus lib. 8. on the Variety of things cap. 8. Reginald Scot in the Detection of Magic l. 4. c. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. Dalecampius on Pliny lib. 8. c. 22. Who have all things for fables, whatever are usually related about lycanthropes: or impute it to melancholic disease, or to diabolical illusion & corruption of the imagination. Resp. it is too rash to argue all histories & experiences of falsehood; especially since it is repugnant neither to scripture, nor to reason, nor does it imply contradiction that mode of prestigiatory metamorphosis shown by us. And necessarily that must be established when they seem not only to themselves but also to others to be wolves, dogs etc. On the other hand we much more disapprove the too great credulity of the Hammer of Witches, Olaus Magnus, Bodin in the Daemonomania, Remigius l. 2. daemodolatry c. 5. Spondaeus commentaries on Homer, John Frederick Wolfeshausen the Leipzig philosopher adds in his Oration on Lycanthropes held there in the year 1561. Paracelsus, Pomponazzi, Peucer, Fernel, (whose words there is not leisure now to compare & weigh), & he professes to accede to them, & ex professo defends the opinion of Bodin: yet in such a way, that with very many histories having been adduced about men transformed into wolves, asses, cats, he adds this limitation p. 41. 42. "Not simply to be turned into beasts, but only in external figure & form; with the spirit & human reason preserved, however by the art of the devil for the most part lulled to sleep, & oppressed by the presentation of unusual phantasms. Which the same Homer may testify about the companions of Ulysses, And Boethius lib. 4. on consolation in the meter beginning, The sails of the Narician leader etc. So that in the said metamorphosis there is not Cis, nor eros but amolowCis; and that transformed man is not amo but motor & to such an individual through transformation not app, but iπgò™ s a certain thing had acceded." But lest I prefer to establish that such a thing can be done by the devil with James Capellus in Sacred & exotic History to the year of the world 3428. p. 241. I exhibit his words about Nebuchadnezzar here, "The mode surpasses our mode of captivity. Let it be lycanthropism, let it be corybantism, let it be melancholic fury. Provided we know that man was not in fact changed into a beast: But that external figure, not essential form received that change: nor can such a thing be performed by the men of superstitious maleficence or by Satan himself, such as God here accomplished, by demonstrating his power & crushing the insolence of proud princes." Frederick Wolfeshausen cited mode thinks that the mode of mutation can be explained physically thus p. 51. 52. "It is therefore probable, that for transforming the bodies of men & the external lineaments of the members such matter is selected by the demon, & immitted through hidden passages to the bodies, to which a natural faculty of altering according to the proposed effect is innate. But because corporeal matter on

account of its native crassitude is inept for penetration into any part of the alterable, I would rightly, I think, say with Caesalpinus, that a more tenuous substance from things, which may be accommodated to the work, is elicited by the demons. For as we see Physicians to preserve health express juices, & Chemists through sublimation elicit from all earthborn things the purest essence, which they call Quinta: so it is entirely credible, that a spirituous substance well purged from all foulness, & as it were a form freed from the crassitude of matter is separated from things by the industry of demons & used for the proximate instrument to feign a foreign form to the body. And hence ist undoubtedly what they induce almost in a moment of time any affections since the spirit penetrates everywhere by too much tenuity, and, what is clear in a pestilent state of the air, the poisons of serpents & almost all contagious diseases, operates in a very brief time.

But thus (I think) the demon acts after the suitable matter of contagion has been received inside the body, just as the Soul, which is attributed to nourishing & increasing the body of the animal. For as this by the aid of innate spirit & heat wonderfully subdues the bloody juice of food brought to the outermost tubes of the veins, thoroughly cooks, thickens, & clothes with a new & more solid appearance of flesh, yet multiple & diverse according to the multiple nature & temperament of animals: (thus in man, it appears gently covered with a tender & bra skin, but wrapped in a slightly hard and shaggy hide in quadrupeds: And in them it grows cut into the fingers of the feet and hands, and decently, here it ends in stiff hooves and curved and horrible nails.) Thus the demon having glided into the bodies of Lycanthropes with an invisible spirit disturbs the corporeal matter at will through its mediating drug, variously moves & mixes, transfers, composes divides, by the speed of motion & efficacy of the drug accomplishing in a moment, that the matter, which is nearest to nourishing & enlarging the body, polluted by foreign qualities, assumes a nature diverse from its innate one, & thus goes not into parts of the human body, but the limbs of beasts, the spirit inwardly moderating & directing the motion of matter at pleasure. Hence soon the bodies of Lycanthropes flower with hairs, and feet & hands are armed with a new kind of nails, the ears are spread apart, the beautiful and charming face grows into a new deformity with an oblong manner of mouth, and the whole visible condition of rational nature, divinely erected to the contemplation of heaven, passes over into the figure of brute nature, with the body depressed & the face inclined looking at the earth.

Moreover it is credible, that in such a metamorphosis not only are the outermost limbs altered & changed by the force of new qualities, but also by a peculiar machination of the demon they are contracted, spread apart, unfolded, directed, and the whole body in short is curved, in the way Weyer writes a certain impostor (from Josephus Scaliger & Matthiolus) effected, that someone with a finger inserted in the mouth would bite it not without pain & clamor unwillingly, with the jaws convulsed by the tincture of a certain powder, so that bent he could not raise himself up, at the same time he would also become mindless and exhibit amazing gestures, a certain anointing around the temples & wrist arteries making such great force.”

The peculiar reasons for the limited [power]. First, because Nebuchadnezzar was transformed into a beast Daniel 4. and to the ass of Balaam human reason was given for a time, Numbers 22. 23. with 2 Peter 2. 16. the same is asserted about the serpent Gen. 3. Ephrem. Resp. both

are denied. For those things can be explained otherwise without difficulty. 1. Nebuchadnezzar was not transformed as to essence, but only as to habit & cultivation of the body & certain accidents internal and thus the use of reason through bestial melancholy. Thus the more excellent Theologians cited by Cornelius a Lapide & Willet commentary on Daniel 4. 2. Human reason was not given to the ass of Balaam (for this would imply a contradiction that an ass remaining an ass is endowed with reason,) not even human speech univocally & properly so called, but to the likeness of human speech; In which way most Theologians judge about the speech of the serpent Gen. 3, who can be seen in Pererius, A Lapide, Willet and other commentators. 3. About the serpent endowed with reason for a time according to Ephrem in Bar Cepha rete & Cornelius a Lapide on Gen. 3. they are paradoxes. But let him remember that we will retort the same to the Papists, if they allege anything from the same Ephrem for their Papism. To the third question. Resp. the devil can indeed send his own ecstasy or rapture, or deprive a man of life, but not separate the soul from the body to be soon reunited or migrate to other bodies. The reason for the former is because that would be the same as resurrection from the dead; but resurrection is impossible for the devil, as we will soon say. The reason for the latter is, because any soul is not only adapted & united to its body the same in species (as was just said) but also in number, & vice versa. Nay we think the contrary, that it be done, implies a contradiction: For this composite would be ae one suppositum in this one number & again this other in number, that is it would be one & not one. Which implies. For this haecceity of the composite has no other internal principle of its individuation, than the singular union of this individual form with this organic body, or the singular respect & adaptation of one to the other, from which it happens that it is this man, namely Socrates. Moreover the foundation & first principle of that singular union, arising from the singular proportionation & mutual respect of those parts, is to be sought no other than external, namely the determination of the first cause, which as all things, and actions so also substances it determines to its own singularity, that this may be, & not this other. But when it has once adapted, applied, & determined this matter to this form, this cannot be changed, unless at the same time the individual & its haecceity is changed. For what has been done cannot become undone. To the fourth question. Resp. It cannot restore anyone from a lethal disease. It cannot restore sight to the blind, to whom blindness has occurred through the lack of eyes; or of humors, or of tunics in the eyes or of similar things necessary for vision: the matter is otherwise in blindness which arises from weakness, or distemper of the organs, or some obstruction. But the reason is, because that is miraculous. It cannot restore viscera or principal limbs. About which below. It cannot make an old man young. Delrio book 2. qu. 22. & Baranzanus in new questions digl. 19. theor. 13. feel the contrary. But to the examples brought forward there it can be said, either nothing of the sort happened, or it was according to appearance for the most part; whatever besides may have been, in truth it could not have been a juvenile complexion, namely of the same degree, since youth does not express the species of complexion but the degree. Much less can it raise the dead; because this is proper to God John 5. 20. 21. Rom. 4. 17. 2 Cor. 1. 9. Heb. 11. 19. And here the theorem of Aristotle is valid: From total privation to habit there is no return; namely naturally. To the examples, which are brought forward from Philostratus and others in Delrio book 2. qu. 29. sect. 2. we respond, if indeed they are not fictitious, they were either a diabolical specter in the appearance of a dead man; or the corpse of the dead man borne & moved for a time by the devil (you have examples in the psaltress of Bologna in Peucer on Divination p. 14. & a certain

messmate of Cornelius Agrippa in Delrio Magical disquisitions book 2. qu. 19. sect. 1.) Or that man was not truly dead, but seemed so: which is not unusual in lethargy, apoplexy, syncope, hysterical passion and other symptoms, so much so that sometimes living men have been buried through error; (which they say happened to the Subtle Doctor John Duns Scotus at Cologne in the year 1308.) Or that man was so lulled to sleep by the devil, and all his motion so restrained, that he seemed dead to those standing by. But what is further objected about flies and other insects naturally reviving. Resp. If indeed they are dead, they are not the same in number, but others are produced from putrid matter and consequently there is no resurrection from death. Compare disputation on creation. Then, the consequence is not valid from the production of flies, which are raised by celestial heat from putrid matter, to the production of a perfect animal, much less of man. It is objected by Delrio for the restitution of youth the example of the serpent & eagle. Resp. That youth is said not specifically such, but analogically & metaphorically. Consectary 1. We reject Pomponazzi, who c. 10. p. 199. says resurrection is natural, & can be procured by art & consequently by a demon. V. About the human soul and its faculties it does not operate these things. I. It does not glide into the mind or will, nor operate within them, nor operate about them in such a way, that by physical action it makes them understand or will anything. II. Consequently it does not operate immediately in the passive intellect, which alone elicits intellection, judges & understands: nor does the passive intellect receive intelligible species from it, but from the agent intellect alone. III. It does not elicit intellection, nor form a formal concept, nor physically make the intellect judge by speculative or practical judgment. IV. It does not immediately & physically apply, determine the will to acting, whether through practical judgment, if the will is stated to be determined by it. V. Nay not only does it not operate within the will, & in the will, as its operation is by the mode of act, but it does not even immediately touch the will, strike, or operate about it by the mode of object or proponent of object or instrument proximately disposing: For a thing is proposed to the will by the intellect alone so that it may be borne into it. VI. Hence it follows that man is not excused from sin, nor can that be imputed to the devil, as to the proper cause directly & sufficiently producing it: since it only acts through the mode of proposing & persuading the appetible & indeed remotely: (See the Scholastics on 1. 2. q. 80. art. 1.) & whatever the devil may have done, nevertheless no human action exists properly & formally so called, unless it proceeds from the free inclination & conversion of the will to either of the opposites. VII. In the Phantasy & the rest of the sensitive faculties the devil can do many things, yet not all. 1. It cannot change the phantasy of man by the impression of a new species, therefore it cannot effect that a blind man from birth rightly imagines about colors. 2. It cannot take away all the affections, or some affection e.g. of sadness, fear etc. entirely as to root & species from man. 3. Nor can it by physical causality certainly & inevitably send someone an affection e.g. of hatred, love etc. towards such or such a singular object. VIII. Since therefore the devil cannot do so much about the affections of man & the rational will it is too clear, that the opinion about love potions & bewitchments is foolish, which through various actions, ceremonies & natural things by the art & aid of demons were believed to impress love or hatred to deva. Let him see, who wishes, those fables in Virgil in eclogue 8. to which is the title Pharmaceutria through the whole, & Aeneid 4. with the commentaries of Servius, Hortensius, Taubmann, La Cerda, Pimpontius, Peter Nannius etc. And in Theocritus Idyll 2. with the Greek scholiast; And in Horace Epode 5. against Canidia, with the commentaries of various ones published together & separately of Lambinus, Torrentius,

Chabotius. And in Pliny book 8. chap. 42. And Aristotle book 2. on animals chap. 14. & book 8. chap. 22. & Albertus Magnus book 22. on animals Ficino Platonic Theology book 13. Pomponazzi on Enchantments c. 8. Calcagninus in a peculiar treatise on Amatory Magic; & who collected many things from all authors Delrio book 3. part 1. qu. 3. sect. 1. & 3. & 2. who alone could suffice for him, for whom there is no book & leisure: where he also proves the nullity of those magical love potions, & antidotes. Among other things, which are usually employed for conciliating love that is celebrated which Theocritus loc. cit. calls qur, which is commonly translated there a plant. And thus the Greek scholiast takes it, and castigates Theocritus by this name. But Casaubon in the Theocritan lectures chap. 3. expounds fury by 4: by which the poet is freed from the censure of the scholiast. It is said that hippomanes is a little piece of flesh on the forehead of a newborn colt, according to that of Virgil, "It is also sought from the forehead of the newborn horse, And love snatched from the mother." The scholiast of Theocritus loc. cit. describes it with Pliny book 8. c. 42. "And indeed love potions are born in horses, called hippomanes, on the forehead, the size of a fig, black in color: which the fate immediately devours at the birth of the offspring, or does not admit the offspring to the udders, if someone has it snatched beforehand. By smell this kind is driven into madness. sent into the herd of the parent army, the rest of the fate raise the orphans." Theophrastus in Photius in the library num. 278. refers to envy that the equat απιθίωτων πόλων τίππομανὲς καὶ γδ καὶ ἔτο προς έναχρήσιμον Var. Phavorinus in his lexicon describes, that [it is] μεγεθεί ἔλτιον ιχάδΘ , μικρὸν, πλατύ, δειφορές, ἐτι δὲ εἰς πολλὰ δέ pov But by what authority, or by what experience he affirms this after Theophrastus, Pliny, & the Scholiast of Theocritus, I confess I do not see. For who does not see that superstitious or magical uses are useless? We have said what it cannot do about man: We add in three words, What specifically it cannot do about the elect. It cannot 1. in general deprive them of eternal salvation Rom. 8. v. ult. II. Consequently it cannot kill them on that account, or send a total & final frenzy or mania before actual conversion. III. Nor can it take the Church out of the world: consequently it cannot so sift & lay waste the catholic church living in this world at one time, that all either for a time deny the faith of Christ.

Problem. Whether it can appear in the appearance of the truly faithful & holy whether living or dead? Resp. Why not?

Consectary. What Thomas quodlib. 2. at. 7. denies that the demon flows into the rational soul. And Jerome on Matt. book 2. c. 15. that thoughts are sent by the devil, & Gennadius chap. 83, Didymus on the Holy Spirit book 3. substantially or according to substance to fill the soul or mind of man, all that can be rightly expounded according to the distinctions posited.

14. About the purely natural it cannot 1. change anything in the celestial world, either substance, or qualities, or ordered, motions, or sites of heaven & stars? nor the times & seasons which depend on it. It cannot lead the moon down from heaven, not take away the light of the stars nor the diffusion of light & influences, not change or stop the course; for these things would be repugnant to the immutable law of nature fixed by God, & can only be changed through his absolute power, Gen. 8. 21. with Jer. 33. 20. 25. Matt. 24. with 2 Pet. 3. About the change around the sun see Exod. 10. 2 Kings 23. Matt. 27. We therefore reject those who think the moon can be led down from heaven by the Magi (see in Delrio book 2. qu. 9.) or that astral

devils can feign, refashion, increase influences at will, & thus use them impressed on sublunary things for wondrous operations. II. It cannot do so much in the elementary world, that it changes whole elements or containing bodies either as to substance or as to qualities both primary & secondary. The same is to be understood about the place, site, contiguity with their own adjoined bodies. Thus e.g. it cannot effect that all water ceases to be humid, cold, separated from the earth however joined in one globe, that all the course of rivers ceases, every flow of the sea namely & reflux, swellings & detumescences, from East to West etc.

Problem. Whether it can make a valley from a mountain a continent from an island & vice versa. Inclined in the affirmative with a distinction. It cannot move the earth from its place because it is not proportionate to its power to change the order of the elements of the world: There is also no passive potency or inclination of the earth to be outside the place assigned to it. It cannot move & rotate the same earth in its place: because this is the universal law of nature that the earth remains immobile in its place Eccl. 1 Ps. 104. III. About any bodies composed of elements, it cannot do so much. 1. That per se, directly & by its own power, that is by local motion it immediately produces some substantial or accidental form, namely corporeal & permanent. For we do not deny that it communicates some incorporeal or spiritual, or rather intentional as & corporeal of weak entity & soon to perish; as will be seen below. 2. That consequently it introduces new forms in things. 3. That even mediately through natural agents not univocal, & their powers it produces perfect animals, whether as an equivocal cause, or as a univocal one. Thomas gives the reason p. 1. q. 110. ar. 2. & against the Gentiles l. 3. q. 103. & quest. on Demons art. 9. because the corporeal cannot be made except by a corporeal agent or by him who eminently contains it. For whatever becomes, becomes from something similar to itself. 4. That it can make flesh, blood, bones, much less hearts, brains, chests, heads, livers etc. & parts of this kind integral to animals. The reason is the same as above. And those things must altogether be produced by a principle living with vegetative & animal life. 5. Nor can it unite any body to itself substantially into one nature or hypostasis: The same is to be said about matter, form, & integrating parts of bodies. 6. Nor in a body accidentally assumed, or outside it exercise truly vital works, e.g. speak, eat, hear etc. About which let the Scholastics be consulted on 1. qu. 111. etc. & from the more recent Delrio, la Torre, Tanner loc. cit. & Pererius, Alapide, Willet on Exod. 7. Martyr of common places class 1. c. 2. Zanchius on the works of creation Book 4. Hyperius Method. Theol. book 2. Casmann Angelogr. book 2. 7. Nor can it confirm, sharpen, actuate the eyes & sight of man, so that he himself may see an object however remote through any opaque bodies, & dense without a visible species: or so confirm & multiply visible species, that they may spread through any opaque places, even most remote: or that not eliciting species from the object, it alone produces them wherever. For these things, if they can be done absolutely, are to be attributed to God alone. See what the commentators bring forward for the explication of the vision of Stephen Acts 7. & of Moses Numbers 27. 12.

Problem. Whether it cannot appear in the body or appearance of a lamb, or dove; or even of a man without some manifest defect or deformity? R. We relegate the affirmative opinion to redesus; although it is asserted by some.

15. It remains for us to consider the operations of the devil positively, first in general what it does, then in particular how it effects each thing. Therefore in general 1. Not a few things both it itself & the Magi pretend, as if they had been done, in which if anyone inquires, he will find them false. II. It does very many & indeed most wondrous things not in reality, but in appearance & external appearance, by which it plays & deceives the exterior senses, about which tricks later. III. Besides these it injects many things into the internal phantasy of man whether sleeping or waking, as if they are really done; when nevertheless they are not done. IV. It also effects many things, which are really such; & those through local motion especially & immediately, then also through other motions mediately: namely while it applies natural agents to their patients or separates from them, or adapts artificial instruments to the work to be fabricated. V. It pretends, deceives, moves, changes all those things, either per se or through Magic & the Magi; Yet with this distinction, that those things which surpass human strengths & arts, it alone properly & formally operates: & men conduct themselves either as purely passive subjects or moral instruments. VI. As by these its operations it intends nothing except evil, so also it effects, as much as is in itself. It infests, shakes, & as much as is in itself subverts the souls, bodies & goods of men, families, schools, Churches, Republics: It obscures the glory of God & of our mediator, it exalts itself into God & proposes to be worshipped. But if it does not obtain, that it be done openly, as among the most foul Magi, & blind Calecutans? or that it be done by some title & scheme of the Gods and form or image that, in which it is accustomed to appear to them, as among the ancient Gentiles; at least through consequence, practical & interpretative demonolatry it induces: while it draws men into horrendous crimes & teaches to serve the flesh and the world. VII. Of good (in its genus, objectively & materially so called) if it does anything, that itself is for evil. Thus it heals to harm, it says the truth to deceive, it promises nay & sometimes preserves life to destroy, it confers certain things to gain the soul, and body to be tortured for eternity, it teaches sciences & arts to unteach the fear of God, it persuades some acts of religion & virtue to make hypocrites, proud, idolaters by peremptory deception. About true & good things most wickedly exhibited by the devil see what we note in the Desperate cause of the Papacy book 3. sect. 2. Tertullian narrates most of the diabolical effects briefly & elegantly in his Apology chap. 22.

"And what pasture is more accurate for it, than to turn man from the thought of true divinity by false tricks? which also I will explain how it works. Every spirit is winged. This angels & demons are. Therefore in a moment they are everywhere. The whole world is one place for them, what is done where they know as easily as they enunciate. Speed, is believed divinity; because the substance is unknown. Thus & they sometimes want to be seen the authors of those things which they announce. And they are plainly of evils sometimes, yet never of good things. They also excerpt the dispositions of God, & then to the Prophets preaching, & now resounding in the readings they seize. Thus & from here taking certain lots of times they emulate divinity, while they steal divination. But in oracles by what ingenuity they temper ambiguities into events the Cræsi know, the Pyrrhi know. But for the rest the Pythian announced that the tortoise was cooked with the fleshes of cattle in that way which we said above; in a moment it had been among the Lydians. They have from the habitation of the air, & the vicinity of the stars, & from the commerce of the clouds heavenly preparations to know, so that also the rains, which they now feel, they promise again; plainly beneficent & around the cures of illnesses. For they first

harm, from here they prescribe remedies, new to a miracle, or contrary, after which they cease to harm, & are believed to cure themselves. What therefore shall I say about the other talents, or even the powers of spiritual fallacy? Phantasms of the Casori, & water carried by a sieve, & a ship promoted by a belt, & a beard reddened by touch; so that stones might be believed divine powers, & the true God might not be sought."

Consectary. No commerce therefore of man with the devil is licit, that in any thing to be learned or done it may use his counsel & work directly or indirectly, mediately or immediately. See our Disputations on Magic & on Exorcism.

16. In particular its operations are either about intelligent causes, or about purely natural ones. The former are Christ the mediator, good angels, separate souls, demons among themselves, men on earth. As for Christ, it tempted him, transferred him from place to place, vexed him Matt. 4. Luke 22. 53. John 14. 30. About the angels scripture indicates its operation Jude v. 9. with Ps. 15. 11. & 34. 8. from which we gather contention, repugnance, & impediment both of their glory and work, as much as is in itself. About separate souls, in hell of course its work is, to torment them. To this pertains the local motion of souls. Mendoza in questions p. 401. disputes, whether it can draw them here & there. About themselves mutually, the Scholastics & exorcistic writers want them to operate this that they contend of course, & some hostilely infest others, throw down from possession etc. Which we think is to be taken with a grain of salt from Matt. 12. 26. Luke 11. 16. The Scholastics rightly elsewhere on 1. qu. 109. art. 2. to 2. with a distinction respond between demons there is a certain concord, not indeed proceeding from friendship, but from wickedness. About man we distribute its effects, into those which tend 1. Into the whole composite & its adjuncts. 2. more into the body. 3. more into the soul. 1. Into the whole composite: 1. Assiduously & secretly it goes around them, plots against eternal & temporal salvation, opposes them, 1 Pet. 5. Eph. 6. 12. 13. 2. it infests them with terrors & specters both in life & death; about which Disp. on Specters. 5. It carries them by its calumnies before God, men, & themselves Job 1. Apoc. 12. 10. 4. It harms their many goods in many ways whether immediately, or mediately through the Magi, & other wicked ones roused by it. About this more in the Disp. on Magic lo. 1. 7. 5. Where let him see, who has leisure, the commentaries of Joh. Pineda. Sometimes it takes away life Job 2. v. 6. Very many examples are brought forward by Launoy, Simon Goulart, & other writers of miscellaneous history & examples. To which add those deadly ones of Doctor Faustus, & Christoph. Aurigarius, described by a pious man & worthy of faith together with their lives & deeds. 6. Finally it precipitates the souls of the wicked, & then their bodies, and thus the whole of them into hell & torments them as a torturer. II. In the body 1. It transfers it from place to place. Indeed Weyer, Regin. Scotus, Agrippa, Fr. Samuel the Minorite, Martin de Arles, Ponzinibius, Baptista Porta, Alciatus, Duaren, Aeodius Michael Montanus, Philip Camerarius, Ulrich Molitor, Godelmann, Leonard Vairus, Marcus Antonius Zimara deny that in the tract on Magic chap. 15. Which Caesar Longinus increased from his own: who in the same place for his opinion cites Luther, Melanchthon, Alciatus, Duaren, Aerodius, Camerarius, Vairus book 2. on fascination c. 3. who refer all that translation of witches or other men from place to place, & that through a goat or reed etc. to phantastic & diabolical illusions. But that nothing here is impossible, & that the named authors commit the paralogism from the particular, is shown at length by Delrio book 2. quest. 16. Raph. la Torre tract. 2.

dispute 5. & there Tanner quest. 3. page 59. & the Scholastics to part 1. quest. 110. art. 3. & 3. quest. 41. article 4. And Libavius in singul. part 1. title on the Strigiportion. 2. Extrinsically it strikes, pounds, wounds, dislocates it. Acts 19. verse 16. Multiple experience is added; which he who eludes by the pretense of corruption of the phantasy; truly he bears a corrupt mind. 3. It tortures with various venefic diseases inflicted per se or through the Magi. About which in Disp. on Magic. 4. It operates locally within the body & possesses it. About which Disp. on Energumens. 5. It wearies & takes away the proper strengths of the body, while it lends its strengths to unusual impulses (Matt. 8.): as can be seen in the duperodognois, who when the paroxysm of seizure ceases, when they betake themselves to rest, for the most part fall on the ground half-dead with debilitated strengths. This not only the text Matt. 17. teaches, but also experience. Compare Disp. on Energumens. 6. It deludes the exterior senses or organs of the senses in not one way. The ears, of course with fictitious sounds, the touch with tactile qualities together with their substance or subject artificially fabricated etc. Here the Scholastics dispute & after others Vasquez Disp. 184. chap. 2. & 3. whether the bodies of animals, especially of men compacted by an angel or devil from air & coarser matter can be discerned from the true flesh of animals, or the bodies of men. Cajetan responds 22. q. 25. 4. 3. & Vasquez loc. if anyone attentively considers not indeed through sight about the color & figure of the body, but through touch about the true hardness of the bones, & softness of the flesh he can judge from Luke. They say the same about the voices of brutes, about human song & voice (which it is accustomed to imitate). And they add these diacritic signs, that the voices are strident etc. See Thyraeus on Demoniacs, R. la Torre tr. 2. disp. 8. We cannot profess that xe & art of discerning; therefore we leave it in the middle & to them, since through the grace of God from frequent conversation & colloquy with demons (which they themselves boast) we neither want nor can contend with them in experience. Moreover what Augustine moves about the washing of feet, & Luke Jacob to Gen. 18. 19. 6 32. in the Enchiridion c. 59. how those bodies were not apprehended to be other than human, when they could not have that intrinsic hardness, is not of this place to decide. But especially it deludes the eyes with various tricks, About which both here & Disp. on Magic (where about the prestigiatrix) many things could be asked. To be brief, we say the tricks & fallacies are made either on the part of the object; or on the part of the medium, or on the part of the organ, or on the part of all at the same time. On the part of the object: e.g. about vision (where very many deceptions happen) it deceives in two ways either by forming anew a fantastic body & objecting it, whether it itself assumes it or surrounds another thing with it, so that the thing may appear otherwise than it is: or by variously moving an object otherwise formed while it swiftly agitates it, variously places it, separates it, secretly glues it together etc. Which can be illustrated from the artificial tricks of Circulators, from the admirable both speculations, and Optical operations. On the part of the medium of air of course, either when visible species are impeded lest they be brought to the eye of course by the interposition of something impeding the species, by which it happens that the whole object or part is hidden: Or when by the moved air the species are moved; or when the medium is affected by some quality e.g. by some color; by which the species passing through the medium are so affected, that they do not represent the object as it is: Or when the medium is condensed around the object itself: Or when the sensible species emitted from the object all the way to the sense are variously conformed & multiplied. On the part of the organ in two ways, (as Thomas excellently in Lombard 1. 2. dist. 8. qu. only art. 5. to 4.) either when the species are stirred from the

treasury of the imagination through local motion by the demon, so that they may flow to the organs of the senses & be united there, as if things were present outside & actually sensed: such as we see naturally happen in dreams; although there the species do not reach the exterior organs, because through sleep they are bound. Moreover this is a most admirable prestigiatory & diabolical illusion, and on that account seemed impossible to many. But Raph. la Torre subtly & learnedly defends it & Thomas tract. 2. disp. 6. & before him Molina explained it on 1. qu. 111. 4rt. 4. From which Delrio book 2. qu. 2. Moreover you will find very many examples of the deceptions & mockeries of the devil about the senses in William of Paris part. ult. on the Universe c. 22. & some in Delrio loc. cit. The other mode is, when the site of the organ itself is changed, likewise when the humors are agitated and disturbed, when the way is obstructed by a thicker humor, lest the optic spirits reach the organ, finally when by any other reason the power of seeing is dulled. About the blindness of the Sodomites Gen. 19. & the deception of sight in the disciples Luke 24. 16. & of Mary Magdalene John 20. 14. 15. And that those about to capture did not know Christ John 18. And that Balaam did not see the angel which the ass saw Num. 22. is to be inquired elsewhere.

17. And indeed these are the operations around the body. III. Around the soul in general scripture collectively attributes to it, that it sends into the heart John 13. 2. that it fills it Acts 5. 3. that it von blinds 2 Cor. 4. verse 4. that it enters into man Luke 22. 3. John 13. 27. That it tempts to evil (about which Disp. on Temptation) whence Tempter Matt. 4. That it seduces to any sins 2 Cor. 11. 3. In particular & distributively, experience teaches that it seduces to Idolatry, Magic, Heresy: not only internally suggesting those things, but also employing external objects, occasions, means, its emissaries & proxies assumed from men. About which Disp. on Magic & on Heresy. Among the suggestions & illusions the Apparitions or diabolical visions stand out as extraordinary, which are either internal or external. The former are dreams, ecstasies, raptures, & diabolical enthusiasms: about which Disp. on Prophecy is to be treated. The latter are, external e as of Christ, or an angel, or a saint sent by God, etc. By both how much Satan has raged, the examples of the ancient & more recent heretics & Enthusiasts teach, among whom the Anabaptists of Münster & others excel, whose madnesses together with their icons & deeds are described in a peculiar book. Nor are the Monks, Clerics, & Papal saints to be passed over, with their revelations & visions, so oft sung in iron legends & Lives. If anyone now wants to know the demons deluding them with the appearance of divine visions, let him not have faith in us, but in the Jesuit Delrio, who here strenuously uncovered the shameful parts of his Roman mother, book 4. quest. 3. From diabolical lesion of the phantasy they note so many false apparitions, ecstasies, & revelations Augustine on care for the Dead c. 12. Cajetan on 22. qu. 95. a. 3. Victoria on Magic num. 35. R. la Torre tract. 2. disp. 6. But here that difficulty is to be dispatched more closely, whether & how far the devil acts on the human soul: about which it is anxiously disputed, by the Scholastics. Yet there is scarcely, that it does not remain, something of obscurity & dróty. We will guide the beginners for capacity by these conclusions; of which the First concl. The devil can operate internally & immediately around the sensitive & corporeal faculties of the soul, namely the common sense, phantasy & memory: & consequently around the irascible & concupiscible appetite. The reason is, because they are corporeal; & every body obeys the spirit, as far as local motion. Second concl. Into the common sense it carries things sensed both arising from objects, spectacles & speeches, and from external tricks & illusions: &

from there further it operates. Third concl. Around the phantasy it so acts that it acts directly and immediately within it & into it; (for it is a corporeal faculty) and that in a threefold way 1. by strengthening, or weakening the faculty itself, as to its organs, and that either by local motion, while it agitates the animal spirits & moves them in various ways, or dilates and compresses the ventricles of the brain; or by motion of alteration & augmentation, while it increases & diminishes the animal spirits, or affects them with the ventricles by agitating & altering the humors. In which way we see this happen naturally in phrenitics, & those delirious from fever or melancholy. 2. by exciting & producing the sensed species stored in the sensitive memory, so that man may imagine through them, & variously compose & divide them. 3. By introducing anew insensate species & not supplied by the common sense & fabricating new phantasms. Which it does both immediately & through local motion, and mediately & through alterations & other actions. In the former way, when it conjoins & variously mixes the species which are partly supplied by the external senses through the common sense, partly regurgitate stirred by it from the treasury of the sensitive memory, from the commingling of which new species & unusual phantasms arise. In the latter way, when it stirs up humors & vapors (as has now been said) accommodated to its purpose, or affixes them around the ventricles of the phantasy, or introduces them into the brain. Therefore in one way or the other or both; or rather (as was said above about the exterior senses) on the part of the object, medium & organ the devil so deludes, that he sends whatever phantasms he wants to men whether sleeping or waking, & men revolve those deceptive imaginations in their phantasy, & think they see or hear those things, which they neither truly see, nor ever saw.

Consectary about the kingdoms of the world which the devil showed to Christ Matt. 4. Luke 4. We think it should be established, with the Scholastics on 3. qu. 41. article 4. that on a high mountain it confusedly showed the region & site of each kingdom; and besides as if painted & represented the images of all the kingdoms in the air condensed by it through various refractions of the light of the Sun like a painter, as the commentators Theophylact, Jansenius, A Lapide etc. want. There are those who with the Author on the Fast & temptation of Christ (in the works of Cyprian), want the devil to have acted on the Phantasy of Christ, & there through a phantastic vision (that is, illusion) not truly external sensible to have represented to Christ all the kingdoms. But the former opinion is safer. Other modes of vision, which could be pretended here, are not possible for the demon, as was just said.

18. Fourth concl. Hence it follows that it acts interiorly on the intellect, but mediately: because & insofar as it acts on the phantasy, on which the intellect depends, although not as to act & , at least as to object, according to that of the Philosopher: "It is necessary for the one understanding to speculate phantasms." But this is asked whether besides this mode of operating another immediate one should be established: Most Scholastics deny that it operates directly on the intellect. Some doubt about the further mode, & seem sometimes to say something, but in such a way that by saying they say nothing. Therefore let there be a Fifth concl. The devil in some way acts immediately & directly on the mind, not that it touches the passive intellect or elicits intellection, but that it immediately impresses intelligible species on the agent intellect as principles of understanding through the mode of object & thus communicates some intellectual light, or illuminates, that is manifests the knowable, whether it be true or false,

verbal or real, notional. We seem to ourselves to be able to gather the affirmative opinion 1. partly from the places of scripture just cited which to expound only about the operation, in the phantasy & through it mediately in the intellect is too forced. 2. partly from spiritual temptations, injections, & suggestions of those propositions, discourses about God & divine things, of which the least rumor or notice never reached those pious & uneducated men, who unwillingly suffer those buffets of Satan, before that time. 3. partly, from the knowledge of many particular things, which are then done elsewhere, or were recently done in remote parts of the world, which nevertheless those Magi or Enthusiasts or Pythonici could not know through nature or art & human industry, nor does the devil propose to them externally, nor so impress on their phantasy, that the intellect thence assumes & learns by understanding, for the phantasy per se & as such is incapable of continuous speech & prolix colloquy, which they often relate. It remains therefore that those are immediately impressed & communicated to their mind. 4. Partly from the knowledge of philosophical things, or Theological, or exotic languages; which the men never held before, nor could they have learned in such a brief time by multiplied exercises & acts of the intellect, namely by forming their intelligible species. For that narrow time is not proportioned to so long a work; as neither are the powers of the human brain & spirits. Besides that the phantasy does not illustrate phantasms, nor produce intelligible species, nor per se make the object to be represented in an intelligible species, since it does not abstract & prescind from individuating conditions, nor produce universals, much less that by ultimate abstraction it may produce & speculate beings of reason. But now universals are of the object of all sciences, & beings of reason of Astronomy, Logic etc. But you may say the sciences which he himself knows; he sometimes communicates to the human mind, not through the mode of gradually proposing objective concepts, & thus assisting externally only (which Socrates & other preceptors do) but through the mode of preforming & impressing internally intelligible species, & indeed in imperceptible time: Not also through the mode of a solitary agent, so that the man does nothing (in which way he ordinarily draws forth the knowledge of hidden things in the energumens, who conduct themselves merely passively) but so that by the light of the intelligible species introduced by him the man may use it for his perverse will, & by it as a principle of understanding be helped to promptly easily form the formal concept about that previously unknown knowable and elicit intellection. And thus Thomas 22. qu. 16. does not deny that the devil teaches the arts & sciences through speech & manifestation of his concept, although qu. 16. de Malo art. 12. he denies that it happens by flowing species into the intellect itself. But we do not see, why he denies this, Moreover examples of this intellectual light (so to speak) communicated by the devil are supplied by certain fanatic heretics, who without any study of their own, when before they were ignorant of letters & «v«xáble, suddenly began to pronounce sacred scripture & theological matters by memory: Such a thing R. de la Torre refers to disp. 6. let faith be in him, he could have added from the Jesuits Ribadeneira in the Life of Ignatius, & Delrio book 4. Magic disquisition c. 1. The example of Ignatius Loyola, to whom the devil flowed in such an abundance of divine intelligences into the soul. We refer to the notorious art in the same Delrio, moreover those impious youths & warCophagi affecters, who promise & sometimes boast of having had all the knowledge of things, however proven to be destitute of the necessary means of nature, method & exercise as well as time. About which mystery it was contended many years ago in many books published about the said Fraternity of the Rosy Cross. If the things, which those shadowy ones themselves say in the fame & confession & in

the subject letter of a certain Physician, are true, certainly they make for us no small suspicion of intellectual light received or expected from the devil. Let those consult, to whom the relation of George Molther Physician about an unknown brother of the Rosy Cross published at Frankfurt on the Main in the year 1617, together with the Fame & confession of the Fraternity, in German in 8. About that student of Padua who boasted that he would repeat 30000 words heard once in order, & made faith by some notable specimen (in Muretus in various readings book 3. c. 1.) let the judgment be the same. Nevertheless we want nothing prejudged to true memory whether natural or artificial, & to divine compendiums for arriving at some universal or multiple science. 5. Partly, from the speech of angels with angels of demons with demons, which according to the common opinion they accomplish by immediately impressing on the mind of the other an intelligible species which intuitively represents its own & internal thought. About which the Scholastics on 1. qu. 107. art. 2. Yet in such a way that to no creature is attributed the power of changing the mind & will; although it may immediately & directly impress something on it, & move it thus far. I do not see why such an impression & communication may not take place in the separated mind, nay & conjoined with the body. Briefly the demon acts on the intellect of the demon, the angel on the intellect of the angel, either on the separated souls, & these on each other in turn, speaking intellectually & immediately communicating & affecting without the medium of phantasy or phantasms, on which alone it seems to be affirmed by the crowd of scholastics to act immediately & directly. Why therefore can the demon not act on the intellect conjoined with the body whether mediately or immediately by proposing & impressing intelligible species? Whether also by variously mixing & disturbing them among themselves, in the way it is commonly affirmed about phantasms? About the mixture, disturbance, & confusion, which happens with the intending, immediately & proximately preceding the actual intellection & volition of man; it seems it can be affirmed more easily. For in such who hand themselves over into slavery to the devil, that of the apostle is fulfilled 2 Cor. 4. verse 4. he has blinded etc. But about the mixture & confusion of species, which would happen without the proper intellection & volition of man, it must be inquired further; the disquisitions and votes of the wise must be heard. This reason is also added that from the opinion of certain Thomists they state that the species & intelligible light is produced by it & from that theorem, which among the Scholastics on 1. qu. 111. art. 1. about the illumination of the Angels is acknowledged. About the illumination of the Demons, by which the superior illuminates the inferior Vasquez affirms disp. 217. num. 10. Raphael la Torre says tract. 2. disp. 6. p. 225. 226. that even demons by their attempted natural power, can move the intellect of men, by illuminating it, because in natural things they are of equal power, according to all Theologians. But what he there subjoins that Thomas de Veritate qu. 11. art. 3. & in 2. dist. 1. qu. only art. 5. to 6. & qu. 16. de Malo, & 1. 2. qu. 80. can indeed impress intelligible light on the intellects of men, not by producing of course new light or a new form, but by fortifying the natural light already produced & preexisting through the immission of species; yet never to strengthen the intellect by intelligible light on account of their hatred & malice: nay on the contrary to cloud the intellect with darkness & lead it into error, all that seems to me a logomachy. For in whatever way & to what end the devil may manifest the intelligible, & promote the intellect to understand previously unknown things through intelligible species, which it mixes arranges & impresses on the intellect, we have what we want that is that the devil impresses not only phantasms on the phantasy, but also species immediately on the mind. Tertullian in his Apology c. 22. seems not to be alien to this opinion of ours, although he

does not express it so distinctly & acroamatically; "And so they inflict illnesses on bodies, & some bitter misfortunes, but on the soul sudden & extraordinary ones through the force of excess. Their subtlety, & tenuity suffices them to approach either substance of man: much is allowed to spiritual powers; so that invisible & insensible they appear rather in effect, than in their act etc. Therefore by the same obscurity of contagion the aspiration of demons & angels also accomplishes the corruptions of the mind by madnesses, & foul & cruel frenzies, with various errors, of which this is the chief, that it commends those very ones to the captivated & circumscribed minds of men etc." And chap. 27. "He etc. (the demon of course) fights from your minds against us, by modulated & suborned secret inspiration to every, which we have begun in the beginning, both perversity of judging & iniquity of raging." Sixth concl. It can be asked whether it also operates immediately in the intellective memory, removing species from there and thus inducing forgetfulness, or inducing new ones into its treasury without the interceding & preceding actual intellection. Resp. About the Latter I prefer to inquire further, than to determine anything. About the Former, I affirm. But whether that removal happens by some immediate & intrinsic operation in the intellective memorative faculty, or truly only mediately, namely by lesion of the organ & through it by infirmation of the faculty? Resp. If experience teaches that not promiscuously any species are removed & flow out, but only of certain things, certainly it could be inclined to the affirmation of the former. Seventh concl. It is asked whether this diabolical operation can be extended not only to the minds of the waking, but also to those of the sleeping? Resp. I do not see, what prohibits. For as to the waking they send raptures & ecstasies; so to the sleeping dreams, through dreams notions of future, unknown things. See about demons & magi kings Tertullian Apology c. 23. Irenaeus book 1. c. 12. 24. Justin apol. 2. Eusebius book 4. history of the church c. 7.

Consectary 1. The greatest use of this controversy about the power & mode of internal operation of Demons around the human mind, is in practical Theology in the chapters on spiritual Temptations & desertions. II. At least this & mapódy we here taste from it: That man can be tempted by the devil alone without the temptation of the flesh preceding, or concurring. III. On these hypotheses rests the consolation, which the practicals suggest against certain injections of Satan, which do not proceed from the corrupt mind of the faithful (insofar as it is still such), & to which they confer no acts of their intellect & will, but only & indeed unwillingly receive & suffer them from Satan injected & impressed on the agent intellect like lightning, either once or repeatedly. IV. We intimate that there are such vexations of Satan & as it were mere spiritual or mental specters in the Disp. on Desertions to th. 9. But how & by what signs they can be distinguished from our sins will have to be said in the Disp. on Temptation. VI. The use of the doctrine about the deceptions of the devil around the internal & external senses is illustrious 1. in the Process against Magi & Witches: so that if any are innocent & without their will such, that is deceived by the devil they may be considered worthy not of punishment but of commiseration. 2. In the probation of spirits, visions, & revelations: lest from the dreams, deliriums, & deceptions of the phantastics & those mocked by the devil dogmas may be constructed to the faith & ways of living. About the deceptive imaginations of those proud contemplatives the most celebrated Theologians from the Papists have also warned: cited above not noticing meanwhile, that they undermine the principal foundations of their own superstitions.

Problem. Whether there is no evil thought without the proximate & present instigation of the devil? Neg. with Gennadius on Ecclesiastical dogmas c. 82. & Bede on Mark book 2. chap. 7. homily 40. With whom the Scholastics agree on 1. qu. 114. art. 3. where they cite Chrysostom, Basil, Nazianzen, Gregory the Great. But about these & other questions in the Disp. on Temptation.

19. Regarding the natures or irrational corporeal creatures specifically, we must go through each one to distinctly understand what the devil can do. We have already spoken about the celestial bodies in the superior world, and we add that whatever operations he presents there, or that magicians and other more imprudent people boast he can do, should be referred to mere illusions and deceptions, so that they only appear to men, but in reality are not what they seem to be, for example, the drawing down of the moon and stars from the sky, the inhibition, slowing down, acceleration, confusion, anomaly, etc. of their motions and illuminations. In short, neither does that nature depend on the devil in its being and working, nor does he in turn directly depend on them. Nevertheless, the vain and curious question of the Scholastics is alien here: Whether the intelligences moving the orbs (which office they presuppose for them without any reason) can move their orbs more slowly.

It remains, therefore, for us to inquire about the natures of the lower world, namely the elements and those things composed of the elements, both imperfectly and perfectly mixed. 1. He can move elementary bodies 1. by local motion according to each one's nature by the straight motion of heavy and light things, where he uses their naturally implanted qualities. Not that he moves in an instant from one terminus to a distant one, but in a very short and imperceptible time to us, so that it is thought to be an instant. 2. Beyond and against their particular nature by violent motion, carrying, pulling, gyration, where he himself is locally present as the containing cause, or agent according to substance conjoined with the patient. 3. In addition by projection, where he himself is the disjoined cause. Here doubts are raised. First, whether he acts at a distance by some power emitted from himself, as fire does by its heat, the sun by its light, or by hidden influences, as the magnet and other natural things do by antipathies and sympathies. Answer: No, for complete spirits have no commerce with bodies through corporeal qualities, but only through local motion; for they do not have those qualities of natural things in themselves either formally or eminently. Second, whether he can produce in the patient mobile projected by him an impetus (as they call it) or impress on it some quality by means of which it, being locally disjoined from him, may be further moved to its terminus. Answer: There is nothing absurd if this is said, since it has now been determined by the most acute philosophers that such an impetus is imprinted by a man on a stone projected by him as a motive quality that quickly vanishes. Third, whether he produces other qualities in them besides the propulsive force, per se immediately, and by local motion alone. Answer: No, but only by means of nature and natural agents, namely by applying them to the patient. II. The elements themselves are considered in two ways, either as they are parts of the world, or in relation to mixture. In the former respect, the devil cannot change them according to their whole or greatest or great part, as to substance, or qualities, or place. But he can 1. move smaller parts locally, change the continuity and boundaries of both, by pulling apart, joining together, mixing up, for example, fire or air, leading them down from the higher regions to these lower ones (which we consider to be the

Apocalypse 13:13, although it could also be said that it was produced by generation, which we will soon discuss) and again to begin to raise up into the heights the earth or water or their exhalations by the power of the sun and stars, to drive them across, to rotate them in a circle. 2. Consequently, to rarefy, to condense; to make large and small, and that through rarefaction, condensation, or through the addition and subtraction of parts. But it is asked firstly whether it can make them more fluid, or solid, hard or soft, etc. The answer is that it can, but mediately, by using natural qualities and applying them to passives. It should not be denied, along with Vásquez, that it can immediately change the fluidity and softness of air and vapors or bodies compacted from them in itself through local motion, but it can sustain and support them in such a way that they resist human touch and thus appear hard and solid. Secondly, whether it can do anything about quantity in itself and absolutely speaking, e.g., that a body may be without its own quantity; or under the quantity of another, so that the dimensions mutually penetrate each other and two bodies are in one place or one body in several places. The answer is no. Thirdly, whether it can procure the substantial generation and corruption of elements, e.g., of air into water, and vice versa. The answer is yes, but mediately, that is, through the application of natural agents. For if through chemical operations the elements (which they call) are separated and extracted, if one is converted into another, if fire is excited by friction alone, by uniting, or by antispasis, or by some other similar alteration; why should the devil not generate fire from stones, by a concave mirror, etc.?

Indeed, from air: since it can grind, compress, unite, etc., and even convert it into another element through the victory of that element. 2. To intensify and diminish both the first symbolic and non-symbolic qualities and the second qualities through the approximation or admixture of contraries, and even to introduce new ones. Thus, for example, it heats water, cools air, infects with foreign colors, fills with poisonous qualities, whence pestilence and other malignant diseases arise; about which more in the disputation on Pestilence. III. If we consider the elements in relation to mixture, and thus the mixture itself, it can 1. mix and temper various elements and those things immediately composed from them, but in such a way that the mixtures are of the same species as natural ones, considered in this way in general; but the mixture is either imperfect, or rather only an imitation and similarity, if it is compared to the devil as an instrumental and artificial agent. 2. Hence it happens that it fabricates various forms and figures of natural bodies through that manifold tempering from the elements, which indeed are truly those bodies which they imitate and are thought to be, e.g., of men, beasts, etc., but they only exhibit the external figure and form, lacking the internal essential one. About which I think the same must be said as about meteors, that they do not differ in species from the elements and bodies from which they were made, and because they are distinguished only by an external accidental and thus artificial form, they are mere beings per accidens. 3. Those fabricated corporeal things are assumed by them, and then, having been set aside, are resolved into their elements. 4. But that assumption says firstly that they are local movers of them. Secondly, that they are represented in them in some way. 4. Therefore, those bodies cannot be called organic, although they are mixed. Because since these three things are found in an organic body - mixture, complexion, organization - the latter two have no place here, but only the first.

Consequence 1. Some Scholastics and Rusca in book 5, chapter 7, deny that demons dwell or operate in the element of fire (which we leave undecided whether it is below the concave of the moon) and in the uppermost region of the air. We think this is defined curiously and rashly. 2. Others, on distinction 2.1, state that angels form bodies for themselves to assume from the upper and pure part of the air, but devils from the lower and misty part of the air. We assert that both parts of the assertion are not lacking in vanity and curiosity.

20. Concerning imperfectly mixed things, that is, meteors, what it can do is a rather difficult inquiry: first of all, whether it produces thunder, lightning, winds, rains, earthquakes, etc., or agitates these things here and there once they have been produced. The Scholastics, and not a few of our own, affirm this from Job 1 with Ephesians 6 and manifold experience (see examples in Delrio, book 2, chapter 11, question 11). Others plainly deny it, such as Seneca in book 2 of Natural Questions, question 4, and certain Theologians (whom Baranzano criticizes in Digladiation 19, theorem 5), and Godelmann, Wier, Reginald Scot, etc. Others distinguish, such as Villetus on Exodus 7, who states that the Devil does not stir these things up, but uses them once they have been stirred up. And all those sayings of Scripture seem to favor this opinion, which claim these works for our God by a special reason, Psalms 18:6, 29, 68, 147, and Job 40. We, to confess the truth, do not see why the first opinion should not be defended, since the locomotive power of demons seems to suffice for extracting exhalations from the earth and water in the first place, or at least for intercepting them according to some part once they have already been drawn out and are ascending, and thus for sending them, having been agitated upward, downward, in this direction and that, and having been clothed with accidental meteorological forms, against whomever they wish, with God permitting this to them. Delrio in book 2, question 11, dissolves the reasons that are usually brought forward to the contrary.

21. Concerning perfectly mixed things, both animate and inanimate: 1. It feigns their production with various tricks. 2. It produces inanimate bodies, such as metals, stones, and other minerals; no less than some more outstanding philosophers persuade themselves that true gold can be made through alchemical art, and not without reason. 3. Let the judgment be the same concerning vegetative things, in which human art and industry play in more than one way, as can be seen in Wecker's Secrets and Della Porta's Natural Magic. 4. It generates imperfect animals from decaying matter, with timely heat and celestial influences having been observed and mediately applied. Thus the Scholastics commonly hold. 5. It moves any sensitive bodies whatsoever, not inanimate ones, carries them around wherever it wants, assists them as a mover to its mobile, exercises and forms actions in them that are not indeed animal or vital but similar to them. Thus cattle, the horse of Achilles, the doves of Dodona, the dog of Simon Magus, and even the river Causus, the keel of the ship Argo, and statues are said to have spoken. But that speech was not properly and univocally human. The same is true of other acts of the progressive faculty of animals, whether in statues and other artificial things, or in natural, animate and inanimate bodies, and even in human bodies themselves, or in bodies made and assumed by the devil, in which it has imitated them. It is asked concerning eating, whether it is real or happens through illusions. Answer: There are three things in it: chewing of food, injection into the stomach, and digestion. Since the third and principal one is absent, we deny that it is true eating, but only some fiction of it. 6. It alters and corrupts bodies, whether animate or

inanimate, in various ways: both immediately through compression and other violent local motions, and mediately through the application of natural causes and artificial instruments. Thus it afflicts and torments with wounds, diseases, and pains, and even kills, partly extrinsically and partly intrinsically, about which see the Disputation on the Possessed and on Specters, and on Magic. 7. On the other hand, however, it heals wounds, dislocations, and diseases, not indeed in an instant, but in a short time. To this refer ophiatria and similar methods of healing, about which see the Disputation on Magic. 8. For its mediate operations, it uses all kinds of animate and inanimate bodies, and in a certain special way poisonous herbs or beasts, about which see Psalm 58:5-6, and most frequently serpents. To this refer the worship of Aesculapius and demons, frequently performed by the Gentiles in the form of a serpent. Concerning these things, see what Cornelius a Lapide notes on the Apocrypha, additions to Daniel; especially what Fernando Corduba diligently collected in chapter 10 of his Didascalia Multiplicia.

Consequence 1: Baranzano, in Digladiation 19, theorem 7, denies that theologians demonstrate that a demon cannot produce material forms through itself, i.e., immediately. But his reasons are frivolous. Because an angel rotates the heavens and produces a motion or at least an impulse that is merely material. Because a rational soul co-acts with material powers acting materially. Because God, who is the simplest spirit, produces and conserves all corporeal things. To these we will respond in the Disputation itself. 2. Just as it cannot change the species of perfect animals, so also it cannot change the sex of individuals in each species, contrary to Delrio, book 2, question 22. 3. It seems that it must be conceded, along with Delrio in book 2, question 13, and Baranzano in theorem 16, where he shows various ways in which this can happen, that a human being is preserved by it for a long time without food. 4. Are the colors and figures in which the devil appears real, or are they intentional, so that they appear to us to be such in a certain position, but in reality are not? Answer: Vásquez denies that they are real, in disputation 184, chapter 2, and along with him and from him Ludovicus Cerda, in On the Excellence of Celestial Spirits, chapter 47, but only a mixture of light, as in a rainbow. The reason is that the matter of assumed bodies is too simple and subtle, and therefore incapable of secondary qualities. Therefore, I would vehemently doubt whether all bodies fabricated and assumed by it are so subtle. This depends on the solution to the following doubt. 5. Whether and how it penetrates enclosed places with assumed bodies. Answer: Is it because they are sometimes so subtle that they easily penetrate through cracks and other pores, like air? Or does it fabricate bodies on the spot in an enclosed space, from air and other matter, if any is present? Or finally, if indeed they are thicker and more solid, does it secretly open and close doors or windows again, or remove and replace a part and stones or beams of a wall or wooden partition?

22. From these additional or attributed things, both affections and effects of demons, there result two originated attributes, which can be considered as the affections and effects of those just mentioned: they are the Mimicry of demons and imposture. The apostle alludes to both in 2 Corinthians 11:3, 14, 15 and 1 Timothy 4:1-2, and both can be explained and treated in those texts. The Mimicry of demons is a deceptive expression and assimilation of God and the works and servants of God by a demon with peculiar art and zeal. Here we must consider 1. The

persons whom; 2. The things and actions in which; 3. The forms and modes under which, or by which, or through which, he imitates. From the combination of these, various kinds of this mimicry, various parts, and forms result. 1. He imitates and mimetically represents the divine persons, when he seems to retain the ancient truth, so that he may most cunningly overturn it and wrest it from men. Thus when he feigns Pallas, that is, wisdom born from the brain of Jupiter, he mimetically paints and by painting takes away the truth about the internal actions of God, namely the generation of the Son from the Father. See the anonymous booklet of observations on the mythology of Natalis Comes under the word Pallas. Compare similar things about Bacchus, Hercules, etc., noted by Justin and Tertullian to be cited just below. He attributes to himself the proper name of God, Jehovah, and under the deflected or broken names of Jove, Iao, etc., he has made himself worshipped among the Gentiles: On this see Parker, book 1, on the descent into hell. He feigns the properties of God, and so colors them in himself, that he frequently persuades men. This will soon be clear in the imitation of divine actions. He mimetically attributes to himself the external and proper actions of God, the creation, conservation, and governance of the world, under the titles of Jupiter, Neptune, Pluto, genii, the soul of the world, the Fates, Fortune, etc. The same must be said about the works of redemption, He promises eternal life and an abundance of temporal goods to those who do idolatry, superstitions, and many other shameful things. This is proven not only by the vain and idolatrous, but also by the abominable and shameful sacred rites of the Gentiles, the apostate Israelites, the ancient heretics (in Augustine, On Heresies). To this refer the paradise promised by the impure Muhammad, truly the brothel of all brothels; the paradise promised in the Roman Church to Assassins, parricides, and persecutors of the Church of Christ. See and compare the practical commentators on the temptation of the demon in Genesis 3 and Matthew 4. 2. He mimics both natural religion, namely faith, hope, invocation, and also instituted religion. (namely the word and its preaching, and sacraments and signs, furthermore vows, prayers and their formulas etc.) to its consecrated ones. As this is abundantly clear, from the horrendous rites of the Gentiles and Magi. But this is most evidently proven from Matthew 4 verse 8. Hence the songs of Zoroaster, as if panegyrics of demons, the hymns of Orpheus and Callimachus. Add also the confessions of sins, Mapheus in his Indian epistle book 1 reports that the demons called Quigoqui in Japan extort confessions of sins. If those confessing do not properly perform these, they hurl them from a cliff and shatter them into pieces. Nor are there lacking martyrdoms and martyrs, who shed their blood for Atheism or Epicureanism, for Turkism, Gentilism, Judaism, or bring death upon themselves in honor of demons, and so that they may live gloriously with them. See the custom of the Japanese in Fr. Solier the Jesuit, volume 1 of the Japanese Ecclesiastical History, book 1, chapter 14. Compare the disputation on Autoparia and on Martyrdom. Here refer to the subordinate means for the established cult, Sabbaths, the established church, and its assemblies and gatherings, ministries and ministers of rites etc. But there are gatherings and conventicles of Magi, Atheists, Libertines, Gentiles, and others foreign to the faith, of heretics, the profane and wicked, and their Dogmatizations, writings etc. 3. Indeed, it even mimetically fashions a religion and cult of the new covenant through a mediator. For to this pertain the intercessions of Gods and Goddesses, heroes, demigods before the Great God; To this add all sorts of anathemas, and devoted heads, (of which sort are e.g. Iphigenia, the virgins of the Carthaginians, and all human sacrifices), lustrations, expiations, propitiatory sacrifices of the Gentiles and all kinds of appeasing rites, by which both in olden

times and today in Japan, Mexico, and other parts of the new world they are accustomed to appease the angry God or Gods (in reality demons). To this the Anonymous observer thinks the fable of Pallas pertains in his observations on the mythology of Natalis. Add that entire mimic ceremonial procession, through priesthoods, vestments, crowns, incense, feasts, banquets, fasts, temples, lanterns or lamps, cleanliness and uncleanliness etc. Which, from the prescription of God, typically attested the gospel or covenant of grace and its promises through types; but were corrupted by the demon and twisted toward demonolatry.

5. Finally, it feigns to preserve and imitate the extraordinary works of God, such as miracles, prophecies. Concerning the various wonders of the devil, and how they differ from the miracles of God, see the commentators on Exodus 3, Acts 8, 2 Thessalonians 2, and our disputation on Miracles. Concerning oracles and other divinations, and diabolical prophets, especially raptures, ecstasies, and enthusiasms, and their ceremonies and formalities, see the disputations on Prophecy, on Magic, on Heretics.

II. It mimetically counterfeits good angels in divine missions and commands, apparitions, discourses, revelations, actions both defensive and offensive. See the commentators on 2 Corinthians 11, and Delrio book 4 of the Magical Investigations, chapter 1, question 3, where he relates several examples.

III. It mimetically represents pious and faithful servants of God, in the whole system of true piety toward God, and of charity and justice toward one's neighbor: while it substitutes heresy for faith; magical or diabolical faith for divine faith; presumption and carnal security for certainty, confidence and Christian hope; spiritual pride for humility; the worship and obedience of oneself, that is, will-worship, for divine worship; for sincere charity a specter or mask; for justice, clemency the highest injustice and cruelty; and for zeal of God carnal fury (John 16:3). Here refer to all superstitious devotion, in prayers, in pilgrimages, in vows, religious castrations and abstinences, and innumerable other superstitions customary among Magi, Gentiles, Mohammedans, Jews, Papists. And if one should run through the whole Decalogue, one will find that there is no species of virtue of which it does not exercise a mimic. As it has been truly said, that it is the ape of God; so it can also be said that it is the ape of the saints. But that mimic is either more immediate and proper: or more mediate and common. The former again could be distinguished into elicited and commanded, namely when either through itself or through its Magi and prophets it speaks the truth and sometimes publicly preaches, in order to deceive; it promises life and health, indeed sometimes even cures, in order to destroy; it augments with riches, honors, and other supports of this life, and to that end makes itself, or at least feigns, subservient for a time, so that the soul may fall to it as prey: to which the spirits of Johannes Faustus, and Christoph Aurigarius, and similar familiar spirits bear witness.

The latter is when in hypocrites and whitewashed walls, whether only civilly honest among those outside the faith, or moreover professing faith and piety within the bosom of the church, it blinds the eyes of the mind, and perverts their hearts, or teaches and makes them pervert and deceive, so that they promise themselves communion of divine grace and glory: either by exterior ostentation only and lying profession it imposes on those men, or even by interior sense

and fallacious persuasion. Concerning this mimic, see the disputation on Simplicity and Hypocrisy: where besides Perkins, the Homer of practical writers, I point out the treatises of Daniel Dijck and Robert Bolton, of profound and pious erudition.

But as the demon imitates in his own the common and ordinary spirit of faith, repentance, and new obedience and self-denial (as in the rites of Mithras in Nazianzen, Oration 2 against Julian) by a certain false appearance and image of good; indeed even its excellent degree in heroic zeal, all the way to confession and martyrdom, so that there is no lack of zealots, confessors, martyrs of the devil, even voluntary: so also it imitates the extraordinary and peculiar motions and spirits of the saints, as the offering of Abraham in Genesis 22, from which example the slaughters of children customary among the Canaanites and neighboring nations are wrongly deduced (Psalm 106).

Corollary: The procurers and chief ministers of the demons' mimic were the Epic, Paraenetic, Tragic, Comic, Lyric, Hymnographic poets, etc., whom it used as its theologians, mystics, doctors and trumpeters of its worship; whom therefore Tertullian in his Apology chapter 47 rightly calls adulterers of the truth. See Homer, Hesiod, Orpheus, Pindar, Euripides, Callimachus, Aratus, etc., and their Latin imitators. Concerning their mythological theology joined with the philosophical, Tertullian thus says in Apology chapter 47: All things are constructed against the truth from the truth itself, those spirits of error working this emulation. From them adulterations of this kind of saving discipline have arisen, from them certain Fables have also been let in, which by their similarity might weaken faith in the truth, or even, if they could, overcome it, so that one might therefore not think that Christians should be believed, because neither poets nor philosophers, or might think that poets and philosophers should be believed more, because not Christians. And so we are also laughed at for preaching a God who will judge. For so also the poets and philosophers place a tribunal in the underworld. If we threaten Gehenna, which is the treasury of secret subterranean fire for punishment, we are likewise derided. For so also among the Dead is the river Pyriphlegethon, and if we name paradise, a place of divine pleasantness destined for receiving the spirits of the saints, segregated from the knowledge of the common world by a certain fiery girdle of that zone, the Elysian fields have preempted belief in it. Concerning the same Mimic artifice Justin says in Apology 2. Compare Reynolds in his 228th prelection on the apocryphal books.

Perhaps elsewhere something must be said about the Magic of Orpheus and other ancient poets, and of the Platonic and Pythagorean Theologians. And so much indeed concerning the mimic of demons. Concerning the imposture or deception connected with it, very many things can be noted from scripture and experience, but many are still unknown. This, however, must be done, that we may know its depths, Revelation 2:24, and that its thoughts may not be unknown to us, 2 Corinthians 2:11. Which is especially necessary in daily practice, and in the explication of practical theology concerning the deception of the human heart or hypocrisy, and concerning Temptations. And in the explication of the stratagems of Satan, in the seductions of heresies, and in the deceits of superstition and idolatry. We here pass over the not so explicable mode of deception: content with certain knowledge both That it is and What it is, from 2 Corinthians 11:3 and 1 Kings 22, John 8.

We now only make a judgment of certain heads, to which most things can be reduced. But they are: I. open and crass lies: of which sort some occur in the temptation of Genesis 2 and Matthew 4, Job 1. And in the mouth of its prophets, 1 Kings 22, and of others lying, Acts 5. Here refer the lies and calumnies by which, both of old and today, true religion is wont to be prejudiced. But now, says Justin in Apology 1 near the end: And that too, that it should be done by certain evil men, the depraved spirits effected. For bringing forward certain persons to calumnious accusation against us, etc., so that through horrible and formidable tortures, they might extort confession of those crimes which are asserted in vain discourses and fables, etc.

II. Palliated lies: which it is wont to obtrude 1. through retailings of poetic fables both before and after Christ: so that it might render the truths about Christ and about other mysteries of faith suspect, or displace them. Concerning which Tertullian excellently says in the chapter cited above, 47. And Justin in Apology 2 not far from the beginning, and from all compendiously Johannes Langius in his preface to the said Apology of Justin. The passages are too prolix: therefore I will not transcribe them, but leave them for the reader to inspect. 2. Through subornations of pseudo-Christs like Theudas, Judas the Galilean, Moses the Cretan: or raisings up of rivals to the glory and admiration which had befallen Christ through miracles. Of which sort were two notorious impostors, Simon Magus, and Apollonius of Tyana. Concerning whom Eusebius, Justin, and others, and from them Baronius in his Annals. 3. Through equivocations, amphibolies, reservations or restrictions, also fallacies of composition and division, and other sophisms. Its oracles are proof. But in oracles, with what ingenuity they temper ambiguities into events, Croesus knows, Pyrrhus knows: says Tertullian in Apology chapter 22. Let those published and collected by Opsopœus be seen, with the Sibylline Oracles in Greek and Latin. Compare the disputation on prophecy. Here refer the frauds and deceptions in the mouth of men, nominally of the Jesuits, who publicly profess the artifices of equivocations.

III. Fallacies only or more internal and spiritual: which are accomplished through sophisms, pseudographs, paralogisms. Which see noted in the various practical commentaries on Matthew 4, in the books on Temptations; in the sophisms and assaults of apostates and heretics. I would add also the Stratagems of Satan by Acontius, if indeed he had more closely touched the marrow of practice, and had not admixed those stratagems (prudently or imprudently, God will judge), which we have noted in the disputations on the Trinity, and on Fundamental Errors.

IV. Fallacies and impostures; partly external and sensual, when it supposes and counterfeits something for something, by words or deeds, or by external figure and appearance. 1. When among the Gentiles it counterfeited God or deity, and substituted itself for the true God. Tertullian in Apology chapter 22. And what pasture is more precise for it, than to turn man away from reflection on the true divinity by false impostures? And later at the end of the chapter: So that stones might be believed to be deities, and the true God not sought. Compare chapter 23, where it subtly refutes that lie. 2. When by fallacious apparition and revelation it displays Christ, or an angel, or the soul of a saint from heaven; and deceives men with various pseudo-prophecies. See examples in Delrio book 4. Compare Thyraeus on apparitions, and our disputation on Specters, and on Prophecy. 3. When it covers itself with the appearance of any

man, or of another creature, namely of fire, light, etc., so that men might not dread familiarity with it. Compare the disputation on Specters. 4. When through impostures it deceives human senses; or supposes for divine miracles the real operations and wondrous works truly produced by itself. Tertullian in the chapter cited: For they first harm, then prescribe remedies unto a miracle strange or contrary, after which they cease to harm, and are believed to have cured. What then shall I say of the rest of the ingenuities, or even powers, of deceit? The phantasms of the Castors, and water drawn with a sieve, and a ship moved by a belt, and a beard reddened by touch, etc. Compare the disputation on Miracles.

V. Fallacies and simulations in suffering: namely when it feigns that it is bound, compelled, tormented, put to flight by those men, by such faith and worship, such words, characters, figures, natural or artificial things. See the disputations on Magic, Specters, Energumens, Exorcisms.

24. With demons agree and in scripture are compared I. certain animals hostile to man, like the Lion, 1 Peter 5; the Serpent and Dragon, 2 Corinthians 11:3, Revelation 12; which similitude Cyprian explains in Tract 3 on the Simplicity of Prelates. Basil in some scripture passages compares it to the Leopard, Gregory the Great in book 33 of the Morals on chapter 14, to a beast, dragon, bird.

II. Profligately evil and noxious men, and especially heretics, Magi, tyrants, Alastors and overthrowers of Churches and Republics, who are sons, brothers, associates, counselors and emissaries of the devil. Thus Judas is called a devil, John 6:70. The Jews sons of the devil, John 8:44. The synagogue of Satan, where it has its throne, Revelation 2:9, 13. And universally sinners are sons of the devil, are from the devil, go after Satan, 1 John 3:8, 10, 1 Timothy 5:15. Polycarp called Marcion the heretic the firstborn of the devil in Eusebius book 4, chapter 13. In the Council of Constance, session 2, in the articles of accusation, articles 1, 21, 22, Pope John XXIII is honored with the title of devil incarnate. And certainly not only that rotten man, but also the remaining Antichrists formally so considered must be called firstborn of the devil, and devils incarnate; because the devil gave to both the Roman beasts its power and its throne, Revelation 13:2, 11, 12.

III. All sins; especially lies, Job 8; envy, pride, blasphemy, idolatry, etc.

IV. But specially demonolatry, or the worship of demons, whether more crass and open, like that of the Calicuthians; or more subtle or palliated, like that of the Magi: whence the treatise of Nicolaus Remigius not without reason bears the title On Demonolatry, and that of Filesacus, Parisian theologian, On Magical Idolatry; and that of Nicolaus Jaquerius the Dominican, The Scourge of Fascinated Heretics. The worship of the ancient Gentiles is reduced to demonolatry, 1 Corinthians 10; because they thought them Gods and heavenly powers, or heroes and souls of illustrious men. It is evident that this worship is sought by demons from Matthew 4. And that it was persuaded and commanded to men, and rendered by them, Augustine in book 10 of The City of God chapters 9 and 10 (where see the commentary of Ludovicus Vives), Theodoret in Curative Discourse 3 which is on angels, Gods, and demons, pages 47-48, Eusebius in book 4

of Preparation for the Gospel chapter 11 and book 5 chapter 2, and Origen in book 8 against Celsus clearly prove against the Gentiles.

24. The opposites or adversaries of the devil are both persons, and things and actions. The persons are I. Divine in the unity of deity, and in a particular manner Christ as mediator, Genesis 3:16, 1 John 3:8, John 12:31 and 16:11. II. Angels; to which could be referred that in Revelation 12:7. III. Pious and faithful men, who are all his sworn Antagonists, James 4:7. IV. Among them orthodox and zealous pastors of souls. V. Those endowed by God with the gift of exorcism, who in a certain peculiar manner fight against the devil. Concerning whom see the Disputation on Exorcism.

Things and actions repugnant to the devil are either putative, or truly such. We have indicated the putative ones in the Disputations on Specters, On the Energumens, on Exorcism. Things and actions truly repugnant to the devil pertain either to malice, against him, opposition; or to the punishments imposed by God. The former are partly extraordinary, Exorcisms and ejections of those who are endowed with that charism; what efficacy they have we have indicated in the disputation on Exorcism: partly ordinary, namely the spiritual armor of Ephesians 6 and the resistance rendered through it, James 4, 1 Peter 5, finally victory, Romans 16. Concerning which see the Disputation on Temptation.

In the Punishments imposed on the devil consider I. the degrees II. the parts. III. the Consequences. IV. the Adjuncts or circumstances. And I. concerning the degrees it is to be observed, that their punishment is infernal all the way to the day of judgment, the same in species with that which they will undergo after the judgment, yet distinct from it in degree, and that this is gathered from Matthew 25:41, Revelation 20:10, 1 Corinthians 6. And so I do not see the reason why Vasquez in disputation 243 number 15, against Cajetan, denies that the punishment of the demons who have remained in the air (I would say of all) is to be increased after the day of judgment. Certainly the ancient Scholastics, among whom Richard, have handed down that their punishment increases all the way to the day of judgment, not indeed essentially but accidentally. But whether they merit new punishment (concerning which Vasquez in disputation 241 section 19), seems to be a logomachy: for if you restrict the word merit to the way, Deny, for their works have been done in the end. If you take it broadly, Affirm.

II. The parts of the punishment (if it is permitted to speak thus) are the punishment of loss and of sense. The former consists in the privation of beatitude, not insofar as those perceiving it are saddened (for this is sense) but insofar as they are actually damned. Thus the Scholastics rightly distinguish. The latter is every evil, which to that extent is disconvenient insofar as when known it brings sadness. Here the Scholastics dispute, Whether it is tortured by corporeal fire? How this can happen? Where there are various opinions. The more common one now seems to be, that it is tortured by allegation. Again they anxiously dispute, Whether and how the Demons remaining in the air are tortured by infernal fire? etc. See those laborious trifles on Thomas part 1 question 64 article 4, and in Rusca book 5 chapters 22 through 32, and Cornelius a Lapide in his commentary on Jude verse 7. Furthermore, the things which Cyprian has in his tract on the Praises of Martyrdom are similar to the fabulous fictions of the poets (as Cornelius a Lapide

frankly says on 2 Peter 2:4), unless they are explained metaphorically. Would that the Papists had not elsewhere forged dogmatic Theology from similar Metaphors of the fathers!

III. The Consequences are pain, despair, envy, hatred, blasphemy. Concerning which the Scholastics on the cited question of Thomas, article 3.

IV. Concerning the circumstance of place; we gather that it is hell from 2 Peter 2. The Scholastics on the cited place, and Rusca chapters 6, 7, 8, 10 needlessly torture themselves about the dark air as the proper receptacle if not of all at least of most demons, all the way to the day of judgment. What prevents it from being said simply that the receptacle and destined place of all is hell; although from there they very often travel into this air, in which we walk, and even onto the earth. In the same way the domicile and station of the angels is in heaven, although they very often ascend or descend.

Concerning the duration of the punishment it must be said, that it is eternal. Matthew 25:41, Revelation 20:10. Therefore the opinion of Origen is rejected, if indeed such an absurd thing is to be attributed to that man: concerning the eternal Gospel to be preached after the judgment through which demons and the damned would be admitted to repentance, grace, and salvation. Some had mixed the same error into the writings of Gregory of Nyssa: whom Germanus Patriarch of Constantinople purges in his apologetic in Photius, Mirobilion 233. But whether Origen wrote any such thing, or whether it was stuffed into his books after his death by heretics, finally whether his words admit a more benign interpretation; both in olden times and today the erudite dispute, and the case is still undecided. Concerning which Rufinus is to be seen; and from the more recent Merlinus, Parisian Theologian, in his prolegomena to the Latin Works of Origen. Rusca book 5 chapters 30, 31, 32. Elmenhorst on Gennadius chapter 19. Baronius the Annalist, Possevinus in his Apparatus, etc. And the things we note above in the disputation on Christ section 2.

Problem: Whether demons perceive joy and pleasure from the vexation and victory of men and so alleviation of their torment. Reply: it is not true joy: but in attempt and affect more than in effect. It thinks to find rest and seeks, but in reality does not find nor feel, when it has completed its evil: not otherwise than if a man from pain and despair should leap into fire, so that he might escape the prickings and blows of the sword.

25. We subjoin the Divisions of demons: not that they may be specifically distributed through essential differences (for we see no reason why all should not be said to be of one species); But because both among themselves, and the individuals from themselves, they can be distinguished by certain adjuncts: as that is gathered indefinitely from Ephesians 6:12. But it is rash to definitely explain those various orders, and differences, what, of what sort, how many they may be; when scripture is silent. But no certain principle of cognition besides it can be imagined here. From the light and principles of nature nothing is demonstrated; and the relation of the demons themselves (whence the Magi, and other superstitious men have drawn most of their vain speculations) ought not to be believed.

Briefly, however, we indicate the distributions usually brought forward: of which I. is certain and scriptural, into prince and legates or subjects, from Matthew 25:45, Revelation 12:9. The prince is he who excels among all the others, and presides over them. Who synecdochically and antonomastically is called the devil, Matthew 25:75, Revelation 12:9, and Satan, Revelation 12:9, the great red dragon, Ibid. And perhaps the same is said to be the prince of this world, John 14:20. Although commonly and promiscuously the demons are called rulers, Ephesians 6:12. To the same also either simply, or by appropriation, or as to the principal agent all the actions and passions of the demons are attributed, Revelation 10, 2 John 16, Luke 10. Concerning the temptation of Christ, whether it was accomplished singularly and only by the prince of demons, see the Scholastics inquiring on 3 question 41.

A doubt could be moved here, whether the theological demonstration, which is wont to be constructed from Matthew 12:2, 24, 26, and 10:25, for the distinction of demons into prince and subjects, and for the proper appellation of the prince, namely, Beelzebub, is certain and solid. I reply: We prefer to deny, or at least to suspend. For they are the words of the Pharisees; whose theology was not infallible. And when Christ merely repeats this hypothesis of theirs, he neither expressly approves nor disapproves it, but only impugns the principal assertion, That he was casting out Satan through Satan. Concerning the word Beelzebub, let the reader curious to investigate philology and sacred antiquities go to the far most erudite Selden in his 2nd essay on the Gods of Syria chapter 5. And Drusius and Scultetus in the places cited above. The Rabbis call the prince of demons Ashmedai, from the root "he destroyed", "he exterminated". Selden in the place cited and Buxtorf in his Targum Lexicon cite from the Targum on Ecclesiastes 1:12 אשמדי מלכא דשדין that is, Asmedai king of the demons. But I do not find these words there in the Basil edition in folio. In Bereshit Rabba section 36 he is called שר השדים אשמדון Ashmedon prince of the spirits. The Zohar and from it R. Moses Gerundensis and R. Abraham make this prince Samael, concerning whose history and magic cult among the Jews of today see Buxtorf in his Synagogue chapter 21 near the end, and Selden in the place cited.

Concerning the worship of the prince of demons among the ancient Gentiles and Magi, Grotius in his notes on Matthew 12 verse 24 page 232. We exhibit the words here, because perhaps not everyone has the leisure to buy or read the book:

Among the impure spirits there is one who presides, both the writings of the Jews and of the Apostles teach us. He is the ruler of this world, John 12:31, 14:30, 16:11, the prince of the power of the air, Ephesians 2:2. Why he was called Beelzebub by the Jews, we have touched on above. But the enchanters, when trying everything they made no progress, were accustomed finally to use force and power against the demons of that prince of demons, whose secret name also they threatened that they would utter. In Lucan, Erichtho:

Is he to be addressed, at whose never invoked name the earth always shudders, who beholds the Gorgon unconcealed, and with his scourges chastises the trembling Fury, who holds Tartarus despised by you whose superiors you are, who forswears the Stygian waters?

Tiresias in Papinius:

Scorn me not, I warn, the power to rage against us is ours: for we know both whatever you fear to be said and known, and to disturb Hecate, did I not revere you, Thymbraean, and Him highest of the triple world whom it is sin to know, but I am silent.

Porphyry wants this prince of demons, the root (as he himself says) of the evil powers or demons, to be called Serapis, whose are these words: "But that the evil demons are not rashly suspected under Serapis", and elsewhere: "Lest they still be those over whom Serapis rules, and of these the symbol is the three-headed dog; that is, he who is the evil demon in the three elements, water, earth, air": which passage illustrates, if I am not deceived, those Statian things about the triple world. The same Porphyry in another place which Theodoret cites in his discourse on Angels: "They want to be Gods, and the power presiding over matter seems to be the greatest God." To the same pertain those verses in the Porphyry I have mentioned:

"Demon who has obtained the diadem of criminal souls, going about beneath the lowest recesses, and above the earthly."

And the formula of threats in Iamblichus book 6 chapters 5 and 7. These are the rites of the secret arts, by which they address I know not what powers, as Arnobius says. The Scholastics curiously dispute on 1 question 109 article 2 and on the Master 2 distinction 6, and William of Paris on the Universe part 2 chapters 14, 15, 16. Antonius Rusca on hell and the state of demons book 5 chapters 11, 12, 13, 14: Whether they are distributed into orders according to hierarchies, that is into three classes consisting of three orders. Whether according to species some are superior to others, and the prelacy is founded in their nature. Whether the order of demons Commanding and obeying is partly from divine institution, partly from their own nature, partly from the choice of their own will. Whether the delegation of demons for attacking men is made by God ordaining, or by some principally commanding. In what order the Satanic prince conferred the offices on his satellites. How the inferiors willingly obey the superiors, when they are most proud? Whether some charity follows their mutual consent in evil. There are also discussions and determinations of other problems in the Sententiaries on 2 distinctions 6, 7, 8. But from them (since they rest partly on false partly on uncertain hypotheses,) we can scarcely elicit a drop of sound and solid theology, therefore we leave them to them. Let them see whether these do not in some way agree with the Magic and Ethnic opinions of the ancients Egyptians, who, distributing the human body into thirty-six parts, assigned to each a certain ethereal demon: others said more, attributing different ones to different parts, and named them in their language Chumen, Chnachumen, Cnat, Sicat, Biu, Eru, Erebiu, Romanor, Rejanoor etc. As Origen relates and refutes against Celsus book 8.

II. The second division is from the disparity of malice: which we think scripture indicates, Luke 11:26 with Matthew 17:21.

III. Whether a division can be instituted from the disparity of natural power, is not certainly evident to us; although some Scholastics dispute about it. And thus indeed some are distinguished from others among themselves.

IV. From the forms of apparitions they are variously distributed: concerning which see the Disputation on Specters. Among them are the hairy ones, he-goats, that is hairy and sylvan demons, because they appeared in the likeness or form of he-goats. And the Targum on Leviticus 17:7, Isaiah 13:21, and 34:14 expounds this word through שדין. Elsewhere it calls demons of that form לילית Psalm 121:6, Song of Songs 4:6, as if to say morning specters. With these most closely agree the Fauns who are half-goats (if they are not the same) and Centaurs: concerning the former see the antiquities of the Gentiles in Natalis Comes book 5 chapter 9. Concerning the latter, whom the Vulgate Translator mentions on Isaiah chapter 34, see the commentary of A Lapide; and compare Pliny book 7 chapter 3, and Natalis book 7 chapter 4, especially Francis Fernandez de Cordova chapter 8 of his Didascalica, where after all the more recent writers, he exhibits a cornucopia most worthy to be read. But what he disputes, that there once were and even now can exist in the nature of things hippocentaurs and onocentaurs, which are monsters, but brutes, no less than satyrs, although in external form or figure it is mixed both human and bestial; we easily admit, provided it not be denied that demons have appeared, and even now can appear, in the same forms. Concerning satyrs, Pan, Silenus, Natalis in the book cited chapters 6, 7, 8. Compare concerning the various forms or apparitions of demons the disputation on Specters. This, however, is to be observed that divisions of demons in themselves and among themselves cannot hence be properly constituted. Since individual demons appear in all those forms as often as it seems good to them, and God permits.

V. Of the same nature is the distinction taken from places and times: so that some are called metallic, aquatic, Sylvans, ruricolous, nocturnal, meridian, subterranean or Telchines, as Cardano calls them in book 19 on subtlety, around the beginning, etc. For all are able to appear in any places and times; and none of them is condemned and restricted to a certain figure, form, or time, or place.

VI. Finally of the same kind is the distribution into paredrus, and not paredrus. The former is he who has devoted himself into servitude and obedience to a certain man as an attendant and apparitor, who namely is at hand to perform any services; and indeed in a ring, or mirror, or glass, or any other thing, or natural form, made artificial by the Demons, to which through allegation they persuade the Magi that they locally and πυκνῶς inhabit or are present. Such a paredrus openly professes to have been had by his father for 30 years, Cardano on subtlety book 19 page 963. Such a one Johannes Faustus led around for 24 years under the form of a Monk, and Christopher Aurigarius for seven years under the form of an ape. The histories of both of these magi stand out, described in peculiar little books in German and Dutch (whether also in Latin, I do not know). Among the ancient Gentiles nothing was more frequent. Lucian in Slander calls it a paredrus and ἀλεξίκακον god. Tertullian in Apology chapter 23, an assisting power of Demons. Concerning the same paredri some things occur in Tertullian on the Soul, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, Eusebius, Epiphanius: which the reason of the Theses does not allow to be transcribed here.

We reject here the curious or uncertain disputations I. of the Scholastics on 1 question 109 and Rusca in the cited manner: What are the orders and classes of demons? And whether that Hierarchy will remain after the day of judgment? Concerning which we have just now said something. II. The opinion of the Jews, concerning the distinction of Demons into masculine and feminine sex. Concerning which it has already been spoken. III. The Magic distribution into noxious and innoxious: (concerning which above) from which the recent Jewish writer R. Menasseh ben Israel does not seem to shrink in his 22nd problem on creation, where he reports that some do not inflict harm when they appear with two men.

IV. The distribution into celestial, and elemental, Spirits of fire, air, water: Also spirits of Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, etc. Psellus discussing those in his manner on page 82-83, makes some ἐμπυρείους fiery, others ἀερίους πολυειδῆ κεκτημένους τὴν φαντασίαν having a multiform imagination. But the subterranean, he says, and lucifugous are contrariwise. Thence it happens, that they do not use more forms, inasmuch as they are endowed with no more kinds of phantasms, nor have an agile and versatile body. But the aqueous and terrestrial intermediates of those mentioned before, as they are unable to put on more forms subsequently, certainly persevere perennially in those in which they delight. For as many as live in humid places, and use softer food, transform themselves into birds and women. Thence it happens, that the Greeks call them Naiads, Nereids, and Dryads in the feminine gender. But as many as dwell in arid places, or inhospitable wildernesses, they also have somewhat arid bodies: of which sort the Onosceles, as if you should say demons with asinine legs, are said to be, and transform themselves into men. In the same place page 84: Therefore there is no reason that you should wonder that the demon, by which puerperal women are vexed, appears in female form, since it is lascivious, and delights in unclean humidities, because it puts on a form, which corresponds to a pleasing, and to itself agreeable manner of life.

Concerning the spirits of Saturn, Jupiter etc. in their manner philosophize Trithemius and Cornelius Agrippa, Dausqueus in his notes on some orations of Basil page 117, from the plunge of the pigs (in Matthew 8) thus collects: I think this genus of demons was paludal. For as some demons are aerial, others terrestrial, or aquatic, or subterranean: so some are aquatic. Lactantius Firmianus book 1 chapter 7: Δαίμονες, οἳ φοιτῶσιν ἀεὶ πόντον [Demons, who always haunt the sea]. I translate: Demons, both lands, and the spread out sea they wander. Orpheus: Ἀερίους, χθονίους, καὶ ὑποχθονίους, καὶ ἐνύδρους [Aerial, earthly, and subterranean, and aquatic]. Nor are the aquatic demons anything other than Tritons, Leucothea, Melicertes, Matutæ: similar worn out trash of superstition. Perhaps in Luke 11 and Matthew 12, the unclean Spirit who was wandering through marshy places, had no rest: because he was accustomed to have pools, marshes, watery places. But one should rather abstain from such excessively curious conjectures.

V. The distinction according to Provinces, men, vices, and affairs, over which they are said to be set and destined. Concerning which the Scholastics on Thomas in the cited place, and Lombard 2 distinction 7, and Rusca in the book cited, Cornelius a Lapide on Ephesians 6. Who can be seen: I only note these words of Themeswar book 2 on demons, lecture 2, section 29: How diverse principalities of them are assigned among demons. Note that according to William

distinction 9, In demons there are diverse principalities: as the Master says. Whence there are at least seven general princes, according to the seven mortal sins. And of all these Princes Lucifer is emperor. Thus he. And so as the Master says, Demons according to the mode of greater or lesser knowledge have prelacies among themselves, some greater, others lesser: whence the greater know more than the lesser. And some, he says, are set over one province, others one man, some vice. Whence it is said the spirit of pride, the spirit of lust, and of this sort. Because concerning that vice it can especially tempt men, from which it is named, and deceive etc. Therefore according to some Lucifer is called the prince of pride, Mammon of avarice, Asmodeus of Lust, Satan of wrath and discord, Beelzebub of gluttony, Leviathan of envy, Beelphegor of sloth, etc.

VI. The distribution into astute or crafty, and into fatuous or stolid: Which the book Zohar has, and from it R. Moses Gerundensis, and R. Abraham.

VII. The distinction of individuals, and names of demons, such as occur among the Talmudists Ashmedai, Higueret, bat Mahalat, Nahama; who also call that seducing devil of Eve Samael. Rambam in The Guide of the Perplexed book 2 chapter 31. There occur in the paraphrast Jonathan 6:4, among the angels who fell from heaven, Shemhazai and Azael. Compare concerning the names of demons Asmodeus, Samael etc. customary among the Jews, the Lexicons of Buxtorf and Schindler, and Selden on the Gods of Syria essay 2 chapters 5 and 6. Here refer those Egyptian names in Origen against Celsus book 8. Indeed even the whole progeny of fauns, satyrs, dryads, Naiads, Nereids; Lares, Penates, Lemures; and thus the whole theogony, and theography of the Gentiles: since the gods of the Gentiles, as the apostle teaches 1 Corinthians 10, were demons. And that demons were worshiped by them, Origen, Justin, Eusebius, Theodoret, Tertullian, Augustine etc. cited above convince from their own theologians and wise men. Very many also occur among the nefarious Magi, nominally in Trithemius in his book on the seven Intelligences not to be mentioned here. Especially Agrippa book 3 on occult philosophy where from chapter 24 to 32, from the Rabbis, Kabbalists, Magi, he collects ways of investigating the names, characters, signets of demons. All of which are as inept, stolid, and absurd as they are superstitious.

And these things indeed briefly for the reason of the subject concerning demons. If any desire to survey more throughly the whole erudition and history, and various opinions, they should go to, besides the authors on angels in general, indicated in the preceding disputation, the Scholastics on 2 distinction 6, 7, 8, and from them Themeswar book 2 of the Rosary under the word demon, but there are many inept and curious questions there. Especially Delrio book 2 of the Magical Investigations, where also a number of others are cited: the peculiar tracts on demons of Johannes Laurentius Ananias and Antonius Rusca (but of weaker judgment) cited by us several times above. Add Bartholomew Sibyl in his mirror of peregrine questions, And Alphonsus Mendoza in his questions, Francis George's problems volume 6 section 5. From our writers of common places Hyperius, Martyr, Zanchius. From the Physicians, Philosophers, Philologists Augustinus Niphus, whose treatise on Demons consisting of three books was printed together with six books on the Intellect at Venice in folio in the year 1554 by Hieronymus Scotus. Where in book 2 chapters 7, 8, 9, 10, against the Peripatetics thinking demons to be amusements and

fictions of wisdom etc. (as he himself indicates in chapter 4 of book 1), he proves that there are such demons from Magic arts and effects. These and many other things worth knowing he there proves from natural reason. That treatise can sometimes be read not without fruit, by those who pursue the encyclopedic knowledge of philosophy, and natural theology.

Add Andreas Cæsalpinus in the treatise whose title is Investigation of demons. Cardano book 19 on subtlety, and on the truth of things: but who intermixes not a few inept and absurd things. Let the writers on Magic, on the Energumens, on Specters, cited in our disputations, be compared.

ON SPECTERS.

Respondent: ANDREW ESSENIUS. On the 28th of October and 4th of November, 1637.

So that we may rightly inform the judgments of the youth concerning specters, and fortify them against the opinions of the Sadducees and Papists, I. with the description of a specter having been premised, II. we will ventilate the principal controversies, Whether it exists, and what a specter is. III. We will subjoin some Problems.

1. The word Specter (as also of species, spectus, Spection) is derived from the verb specio, that is, I see attentively, which corresponds to the Greek σκοπέω and the Hebrew צפה and שור. Its synonyms are, ὄψις opsis, ὅραμα horama, phantasma, in Latin visum, visio, thus Cicero expounds in book 1 of the Academic Questions, and phantasma in Pliny the Younger book 7, letter 27. Where Casaubon thinks phasma should be read, but without necessity. For among the Greeks it is used in the sense not only of φῦσμα (from φαίνω) but also φάντασμα (from φαντάζω). To pass over the profane authors, it occurs in Matthew 14:26, Mark 6:46, where the Vulgate retains phantasma, Erasmus and Beza expound it as Spectrum, Isidore Clarius as Spectrum and terriculum or terriculamentum nocturnum [nocturnal fright or terror]. The French translation fantosme. II. Spiritus, Greek πνεῦμα, Luke 24:37, 39, and apparitio spiritus [apparition of a spirit]. III. Εἴδωλον, in which manner in Euripides in Hecuba, the Shade of Polydorus is called ἄελπτον ὄμμα φάντασμά τε. Philostratus in the life of Apollonius of Tyana book 3 calls εἴδωλον the simulacrum of the king of the Indians slain by them which followed them wherever they went. IV. Terriculamentum, terriculum, μορμώ, μορμολύκειον, larva. Olympiodorus in Plato's Phaedo calls them σκιοειδῆ φαντάσματα. Plutarch φρικτὰ φάσματα. Apuleius in his Apology, formidamina, terriculamenta, occursacula, which last agrees with the Hebrew פגע pegah. V. Infestatio, infestation, hence loca infesta, infested places. It is also called illusio, illusion. VI. Absolutely also it is called δαιμόνιον. Thus Lucian in The Ass: ἐνθένδε δαιμονίων δέδοικας. VII. Furthermore, more special appellations are those of the manes, shades, etc., everywhere in Virgil, and of the lemures in Persius satire 5, "Then the black lemures" etc. There is an elegant passage in Apuleius in his Apology, "But to you" etc. "either that God" etc. "always the obvious Species, whatever of shades there are anywhere, whatever of lemures, whatever of manes, whatever of larvae your eyes may present: all the nightly

occursacula, all the formidamina of tombs, all the terriculamenta of sepulchers." The same author in his On the God of Socrates teaches the difference between manes, lemures, lar, larva. See the same differences explained by Gutherius in book 2 of On the Law of the Manes chapter 16. And the things which the polyhistor Salmasius notes on the explication of δαίμονας καὶ τὰ ἐν χθονὶ in Pythagoras in the golden verses, in the preface to the Greek, Arabic, and Latin edition of Cebes' Tablet. VIII. By the Rabbis it is called מזיק mazzik, that is, harming, from the Chaldaic root נזק nezak, that is, it harmed, injured, Daniel 2:6 and 6:2, Ezra 4:15, 13, 22. Hence the Targum on Psalm 106:37 מזיקין. Also פגע pegang, that is, occurrence, from פגע it occurred, fell upon. They use the former word, R. Solomon Jarchi in his commentary on Psalm 91:5-6, and the Hebrew Translation of Matthew 14:26. The latter is found in the second Targum of Esther 1:2. After the first edition of this disputation, that most excellent Rabbinic lexicon of Buxtorf came out: which has made it so that I may safely refrain from this oriental philology to be more richly cultivated by second cares. I safely refer ours to it, pages 658, 877, 1139, 1937. The Syrian paraphrast in Matthew 14 and Mark 6 translates φάντασμα as חזוא דגלא chezvo daggolo, that is, a false or fallacious vision. X. The Arab خيال khayāl, as if to say phantasm, from the verb خيل khayala, that is, he imagined, fantasized. XI. In Dutch Spoock, Spoocksel, Spoockerye. And so much indeed concerning the onomatology of specters. One who has leisure may consult Delrio in his Magical Investigations book 2, question 27, section 2.

2. But so that we may rightly investigate the definition of a specter, let us first distinguish a phasma [apparition], apparition or vision of whatever sort into divine, natural, artificial, diabolical. Divine is what is exhibited by God immediately or extraordinarily: concerning which we must treat in the Disputation on Prophecy and revelation. Natural is what has its origin from natural principles, whether it is καθ' ἐμφάνειαν [according to appearance] or καθ' ὕπαρξιν [according to subsistence]; concerning which phases or phasmata the Opticians, in the chapter on reflected and refracted Vision, and the Physicists in Meteorology. Artificial is what is shown by the industry of men, and quick motion, concerning which prestidigitations, as they call them, which are licit, elsewhere in the disputation on Magic: or even through natural Magic by applying natural agents to their passives: or through Mechanical magic. Concerning the artifices of both Magics, Baptista Porta's Natural Magic, and Wecker's Secrets, and Cardano On the Variety of Things are to be consulted; and the little book whose title is Mathematical Delights, published in French and Dutch. Diabolical is what is thrown up by the devil. For the understanding of which it is to be noted that the existence or ubication of the devil somewhere with respect to us can be distinguished into absence or presence. The former is when he exists in hell, or somewhere else in a place remote from us. The latter is when he exists around us. Which presence again is twofold, perceptible or imperceptible. This is when he betrays his presence by no actions or signs. Perceptible is either internal or external. The former is when the devil either infests men in the body through possession, or in the phantasy either of the sleeping or of the waking through disturbances and injections of various phantasms, or in whatever other way. The external is whatever assistance or presence around a man, concerning which we must properly treat here, and by reason of our perception it is called a specter. Which we define: an external apparition of the devil, infesting men or other things on account of men. In this definition we say it is an apparition of the devil so that we may distinguish it from the presence or local assistance of God, angels, natural things, men. By apparition; so that we may exclude whatever assistance or

local presence of the devil, but imperceptible, and betrayed by no operations or signs. We take the word apparition here in a lax or broad signification, with the denomination made from the principal species. For we are not ignorant that there are various presences and diabolical infestations without an external visible species. External, so that it may be distinguished from internal infestation either within the body, or around the soul. Infesting men etc. Because from the effect this is properly called around men a specter, phantasm, apparition of a spirit, and infestation.

3. However, although the devil has a thousand arts of harming, a thousand forms of apparitions, and thus all those cannot be enumerated; nevertheless, with experience as a guide, it is not absurd to attempt some divisions of specters for easier cognition. Therefore let the 1st division be from our perception. The primary are visible and audible, which are perceived by hearing or sight: The secondary, olfactible or tactile, which are perceived by smell or touch. There are also mixed ones which are presented to various senses, as to sight, hearing, etc. The visible are when colors and figures either real or apparent are exhibited. Concerning which we will soon speak. Audible are when sounds are perceived either natural, for example a beating, noise, crackling, such as is wont to be of winds, waters, flame, bodies colliding, or broken: or animal, as neighing, roaring, lowing, etc. or human, as laughter, weeping, speech, vocal song, instrumental. Olfactible are when foul and unusual stenches are excited. Tactile, when puncture, impulse, carrying, dragging or whatever local motion, likewise heating, cooling, or similar non-natural alteration is perceived.

II. By reason of matter, if it is permitted to speak thus. Thus we apply to them that distinction which Aristotle makes of natural phasmata, that some are ἐν ἐμφάσει others καθ' ὕπαρξιν, that is, apparent or true. The former are those which consist of no real matter or real body, but only of colors and forms (as they call them) intentional; which are not so much things or entities, as images of them, like an image in a mirror, the colors of the rainbow; to these add the false natural apparitions, for example, a stick appearing broken in water, square towers which are seen as round, etc. Concerning which the Physicists and Opticians treat when they deal with the Fallacies of sight. Which by a peculiar reason and most properly are called illusions, impostures, simulacra, false images. Hence those appellations taken from the more powerful and more frequent, are attributed to all specters in general. The latter are those which consist either of bodies formed from air, or of bodies and cadavers of men, or of other bodies from the inanimate or animate kind assumed for a little while.

III. By reason of external form and figure. And they are either white, or black, or red and fiery, or of another color. Again either of unusual and terrible form, or placid and familiar. The nefarious Teachers of Magic have this distinction, among others Trithemius, Abbot of Sponheim, in his Steganography book 2, chapter 1, and book 1, chapter 8. To these add they appear in the form of quadrupeds, birds, serpents, insects, men in whatever habit, etc. Also monstrous forms. Hence have arisen those names: Striges, Mormones, Lamiae, Gorgons, Empusae, Ephialtes whether Hepialoi or Brimones, Alcones, Alphitones, Lares, Lemures, Penates, Fauns, Satyrs, Sileni, Onocentaurs, Onosceli, Hippocentaurs, Sphinxes, Scyllas, Harpies, Tritons, Naiads, Nereids, Sirens, Napeae, Oreads, Dryads, Hamadryads, Pans, Plutos, Charons, Cerberi,

Erinyes, Alastors, Gellones, Parcae, Fates; Elves, Sibyls or the white lady or nocturnal lady with her queen Abundia; to these Cobali, Koboldi, Pygmies or manikins, which the Dutch call Kabouter-mannekens, Hellequins and other orders of armed men, etc. Which names see explained by philologists, lexicographers, especially Delrio in Magical Disquisitions book 2, question 27, where he briefly describes the distinct modes, forms, and operations of apparitions. Compare the immediately preceding disputation on Demons part 2 at the end. And the disputation on creation parts 9-10, where we explain anthropology; and we relegate some putative genera of men to the specters, and there we note the authors.

IV. From the efficient or origin. Thus some are spontaneous or thrown up by the demon alone, others are Magical evoked by Magi and sent upon men. Of the latter kind was the specter of Samuel, and similar effects of Necromancy.

V. From the effects, some are said to be harmful and unlucky, others beneficent and prosperous: although none do good except for evil. Again some are placid, quiet, only appearing, without noise, voice, agitation, assault or terrifying; others are turbulent which strike terror by apparent assault or attack, threat, agitation, blows, violent translation, fire, etc.

VI. From the things which they feign. Thus they are called lemures, manes, shades, lares, larvae, ceriti, because they represent the dead and feign the souls of the deceased. Penates, Genii, tutelary Gods, which feign to be Gods; to which refer the whole troop of the Gods of the Gentiles, Jupiter, Neptune, Diana, Ceres, etc., whose monstrous forms depicted Vincenzo Cartari's book exhibits, cited by us several times. And specters which in the Papacy so often, now by a certain external form, now by words, have pretended to be Christ, or angels, or saints, nominally Mary. Of which the Jesuit Delrio, a witness most worthy of faith for us in this matter, has gathered examples from experience and from his own historians.

VII. From places. Some are aerial, aqueous, terrestrial, subterranean, among which the Telchines stand out, or specters in mines of metal, etc. To the aqueous specters I would think the Dioscuri, Greek δαίμονες, should be referred, of whom mention is made in Acts 28:11. Concerning whom see Gyraldus in Syntagma 7 on the Gods of the Gentiles, Natalis book 8 chapter 9, Cornelius a Lapide in his commentary on Acts 28. Vossius also treats something of their worship in book 1 On Idolatry chapter 38. However, although the interpreters assign various reasons of mythological theology why these were worshipped by sailors; I nevertheless seem to myself to conjecture not without reason that there were especially two reasons, both the natural apparitions of lambent and fatuous fires (well known to meteorologists), and the apparitions of demons in ships or above the waters, who using the popular error about the meteors just mentioned, by this occasion stabilized their demonolatry. To this that narration about two stars appearing over the heads of Castor and Pollux among the rest of the Argonauts seems to pertain, at the sight of which the tempest was calmed. If such a thing was done, it is to be referred to none except the demon as the author of specters. Compare the disputation on Demons. The celestial and fiery ones which occur in Orpheus, Apuleius, Psellus, Trithemius, Delrio rightly explodes in book 2, question 37. By reason of places they can be divided into wandering, or fixed to a certain place by the will of the demon. To the specters of the latter kind

we refer the Penates, Oreads, Naiads, Sylvanus, Pan, etc. Finally all which familiarly walk through, infest the same places in number whether natural or artificial, as a house, senate-house, monastery, cemetery, sepulcher, temple, etc.: whence those places are called infested. Concerning diurnal and meridian specters (among which Pan, once celebrated by the Gentiles, in Theocritus Idyll 1), some Rabbis with the Chaldean paraphrast interpret that of Psalm 91:6. But without reason. For it is known what קטב is from Hosea 14.

VIII. From the circumstance of time. Hence some are diurnal. Again, some are transient, which appear only once, others at fixed times, or more frequently recurring.

IX. Human specters (so to speak) can be distinguished from sex and the various forms of men. Thus some appear in the likeness of men, and indeed of big, small, medium-sized, whole, mutilated, monstrous men; others in the likeness of beautiful women and virgins, which by the ancients were called lamiae, Empusae, etc. Concerning which see Delrio book 2, question 27, section 2, and the philologists on that passage of Horace, "And the lamia having eaten up the living boy may draw him from her belly." With these are to be compared the things which we inquire concerning incubi and succubi in the disputation on Demons. Today lamiae and striges are called not demons or specters, but poisoning women or witches. Whence Erastus' tract on Lamiae.

4. The causes of specters both are, the Efficient indeed, the first, God Most High through governance, who concurs and cooperates with all the real motions of demons, and who permits their malice or κακοήθειαν, and orders the same and converts it to good, good, I say, both of his own glory and of chastisement, or probation, or punishment of men. The second, proper and particular, and the same principal and proximate is Satan. The Proegumenal is his hatred against the Human race. The Procatarctic is the viciousness of men, ingratitude, specifically superstition, idolatry, aversion from the true knowledge and true worship of God. Hence you may see specters raging everywhere in Gentilism and the Papacy. Let their own legends be witnesses, lives of the saints and histories of similar ilk, more recent writers on Specters, demons, and Magic, Delrio, Thyraeus, Leloyer, etc., and others to be cited below. A distinction, however, is to be applied here, that the particular cause of all specters and infestations is not some enormous sin, or the universal impiety of those who are infested. In what way concerning the blind man John 9:1-2. Consider the examples of Tobit chapter 1 and Paul 2 Corinthians 12. The Final cause with respect to the devil is the ignominy of the divine name, and the perdition of men; with respect to the Magi, if any intermix themselves in this business, the saturation of ambition, avarice, desire of revenge, of pleasure; with respect to God permitting and ordaining, either probation and temptation, to which Deuteronomy 13:1-4 can be applied, or the just punishment of the reprobate (compare Thomas part 1, question 114, article 1), or the excitation of men to at least servile fear of the deity, according to that of Silius Italicus: "Fear first made gods in the world." The material cause of all cannot be assigned, except of those which are accomplished through bodies condensed and compacted from air, earth, water, or vapors, or natural bodies, or cadavers of the dead, or artificial bodies, which the devil borrows so that for a time he may carry and display. But how and how far he can do this has been said in the Disputation on the Nature and operations of Demons. No internal substantial form can be

assigned here, because a specter is not a being one per se, but a being per accidens from the genus of concretes and ἀνυποστάτων. For it is constituted from the devil as its material and from the species and external form or sign as formal. When a specter is visible, its external form is various: of which we have enumerated some species in the preceding thesis.

From the Adjuncts or properties whether absolute or comparative, whether positive or negative, we now note only these. I. That often, not always, they are antecedent or concomitant or consequent of death, mournful calamity, public change, warlike calamity or destruction. Examples are in Lavater book 1, chapter 17, Munster's Tract on Specters, and Simon Goulart in his Select Histories, and an anonymous author in his History of Specters. And that therefore they have the nature of an omen or prodigy. Of which, however, no certainty is to be presumed a priori; but only a posteriori, some place is left for observation. The reason is, because these or those specters as σημεῖα do not reciprocate with these or those events, nor have an infallible connection with them. For nowhere either from scripture, or from reason and universal experience can certain rules be constituted. Although we do not deny that specters accustomed to precede death are almost always harbingers of death. III. The distinction between specters, and divine and angelic apparitions; negatively indeed and a posteriori, but not equally positively and a priori, has hitherto been able to be established by common judgment. If by chance there are any apparitions which no signs follow, whence they can be detected a posteriori (which I think happens most rarely), there is no reason why we should labor much about them. It will suffice, if indeed we are unwilling to reduce them to the class of specters, that we show ourselves ἀδιαφόρους, and with never culpable ἐποχῇ leave them in the middle, if by chance in the future they offer themselves better to be judged. Because no circumstances now appear sufficiently, which we may apply to the one rule of the probation of spirits, namely sacred scripture: And because God does not supply to us extraordinary revelation of the spirit, nor has promised that he will supply it, nor do we expect or desire it; having indeed Moses and the prophets, in whom we acquiesce. Concerning which in the Disputation on the Probations of Spirits. IV. Therefore nothing is to be learned from specters as formally teaching, nor is familiarity to be cultivated with them, or society to be entered into. But it is another thing if they are said to teach us materially and objectively and causally or occasionationally, that is, metonymically, as all creatures Psalm 19:1-2, etc. And we to learn from them; namely their malice, not to be imitated, and the providence of God to be adored.

Problem: It is asked whether conversations with them are to be protracted, or disputations to be held. I reply: We judge this to be an idle work; First because pearls are cast before swine, against Matthew 7:6. For neither will the demons be convinced by us, and we are unwilling to be convinced by them, or at least to be exercised and informed to more solid erudition by disputing. Then, by disputing and responding we suggest to them the occasion of saying more, as much as is in us; when rather by the example of Christ Luke 4:41, and Paul Acts 16:17-18, this is to be done, that even the discourses of those speaking true things be broken off, if indeed this could be done by us. I would not, however, deny that sometimes it may be advantageous that their calumnies and tricks be detected and refuted, if some of the hearers or spectators seem to be moved by them, and led into doubts and depraved opinions.

V. Particular places, not by some proper condition, or natural necessity, but by the free choice of the devil, and finally by the most just and most free providence, are infested by specters more than others, experience teaches: from which, when houses change owners or inhabitants, they are sometimes liberated, sometimes not.

Problem 1: Whether not to buy or rent infested houses, or even to depart from them, if it can be done conveniently, is intrinsically and per se a sin. I reply: I do not think so; although perhaps one may profit little by that migration since specters are not bound to places, and can easily follow the one migrating, and are sometimes accustomed to do so.

VI. No age, no condition of men, no time of life is as if by a certain privilege immune from specters. That the dying also are sometimes infested by them experience teaches. But it is Asked, whether they also appear to the pious then. I reply: I see no reason why this should be denied. For that is the foremost time of warfare upon earth. But now among the enemies, who attack the pious, the first is the devil. Senarcle reports an illustrious example in the preface to Bucer of the history of Johannes Diazius edited by himself: If it seems good to you, compare for me with those highest theologians, a certain farmer, who recently in the town of Thuringia, Freiburg, with far other greatness of soul died in the Lord. The rustic was lying sick afflicted with a grave disease: and when now he was near to death, those who were with him in the dwelling saw a certain man of vast body, truculent aspect, flaming eyes, from which he seemed to hurl sparks of fire as it were, entering the bedchamber of the one lying down. He, having turned to the sick man, said: You must die today, and I by my right demand your soul. But the sick man with a present mind responded: Indeed I am prepared to depart hence, whenever I will have been called by my Emperor, who has placed my soul in this domicile of the body as in a certain garrison: and to him alone, who has freed it by his blood from the servitude of death and sin, I will hand over this soul which you unjustly demand. Then he said: You are defiled with many crimes, and I am present for this only, to describe all your sins. And when he had said this, he suddenly drew out from his bosom paper and ink, and as if prepared for writing, sat at the table, which by chance was then set there. Then the rustic: I know that I am contaminated with many sins, but nevertheless I know again that they have all been taken away onto the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, on account of which mediator I certainly trust that I have a placated father. But if you desire to describe my sins, I dread nothing: indeed I will gladly dictate to you. Write therefore: All our righteousnesses are unclean, like a menstrual cloth, which will not be able to subsist by any reckoning in the judgment of God. You have also promised: For my own sake, for my own sake I blot out your iniquities. You have also promised: If your sins are like scarlet, they will be as white as snow. The impostor passed over these words, and strongly urges that he abide only in that argument, concerning which he had begun to dictate from the beginning. Then the sick man with great alacrity and constancy of soul said: The Son of God appeared, to destroy the works of the devil. With this saying that perverse calumniator suddenly vanished, and in a brief time after the holy soul of that farmer migrated to that eternal society of the blessed.

Especially the wicked, as with internal terrors of phantasy and conscience, so also with external specters, are most often tormented in that evil day. We reject, however, the figment of the Jews,

concerning the ordinary apparition of the angel of death at the sight of whom all the dying are exanimated [lose consciousness]: See concerning this fable Buxtorf's Jewish Synagogue from the Rabbis chapter 35. The same angel is mentioned in the Targum on Psalm 89:49, Habakkuk 3:4, Ruth 4:21, where מלאך מותא [the angel of death].

VII. The devil can cause that the same specters are seen by some present, by others not; namely by disturbing the medium and visible species, or in whatever other way by impeding vision.

Corollary: The old womanish and vulgar figment, concerning certain men called in Dutch Beeld-witt (the etymology hitherto unknown to me), whom it has been believed are endowed with the faculty or gift of seeing nocturnal Specters, specifically of the manes and funerals, is to be rejected.

6. The circumstance of place, and of time are indeterminate; because the devil is a spirit endowed with intellect and will, and thus a voluntary cause, not natural. Certain places are assigned by some where treasures are hidden, where unjust slaughter has been perpetrated, where one has laid hands on himself, etc. But specters appear neither always, nor only there. There are those who distribute demons into certain classes and orders, so that some delight in such places, times, and affairs, are restricted and set over them, others in other places. Thus Trithemius in his book on the seven Intelligences and on Steganography. But these things are vain and Magical. If they frequently wander in mountains, woods, desert places Luke 11:24 with 4:1-2, and in the nocturnal time, it is on account of solitude, so that they may vex, tempt, terrify men so much the more. Thus they sometimes appear in time of storms, lightnings, etc., and mix themselves with physical causes and effects, both so that they may deceive men, and so that they may add greater affliction and outward terror to the afflicted. The same can be judged concerning the Ephialtes, Lycanthropy, melancholy, fever, and other natural diseases, which it cannot be denied that diabolical apparitions and operations sometimes mix themselves with.

Corollary 1: That specters appear above the air in the heaven of the blessed, or even in the starry heaven, can be proved neither by scripture nor by reason (Ephesians 2:2 with 6:12, Jude 6). Therefore that narration in Job 1:6-7 is a parabolic description or fiction, as Luke 16:23-24, Hosea 1-2, 1 Kings 22:19-21.

II. Hence it follows that speculations are obtruded upon us gratis, concerning celestial demons in the starry heaven (from Psellus and others cited above), or above it in that vast void, which a certain astronomer recently asserted to be filled with demons (lest of course a vacuum be granted).

III. That there are demons or meridian specters and how those are distinguished from others cannot be proved from Psalm 91:5-6: although such a thing the Chaldean paraphrase, the Greek Interpreters of the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, the Syriac Interpreter, the Latin Vulgate have, and some from the Rabbinic commentators. For the words דבר, קטב most plainly admit their usual and accustomed signification, which the circumstances of the text also evince.

Thus simply דבר, extermination, destruction, perniciousness interpret, from the Papists themselves Prato, Pagninus, Arias Montanus, Vatablus, Simeon de Muis: whatever Delrio may contend for the Vulgate version and its meridian demon, book 2, question 27, Lorinus in his commentaries on the cited place: although he endeavors to defend this interpretation; he nevertheless confesses in the same place, that many explain it of a pestilential disease. He adduces in the same place from a commentary under the name of Jerome these words: Although it is the opinion of many that there are meridian demons; it nevertheless seems to him that this is frivolous: but at that time a demon has power over us and to enter into us, when we sin, whether in the morning or at noon, or in the evening.

7. The Effects, I. They terrify men. II. They disturb and impede their affairs and actions. III. They beat, drag, push, violently carry or transfer from place to place, whip and bruise. The specter in a certain town of Silesia provides an admirable example, which for so long infested almost all the houses, inhabitants and strangers, that travelers avoided that town as infamous for specters. Weirichius the Physician describes the history at length in the preface to Pico della Mirandola's Strix. See more examples in the book of an Anonymous author published through Grosius the bookseller of Leipzig and printed in quarto at Eisleben in the year 1597, titled Magic, or wonderful histories of specters and apparitions of spirits, etc. IV. They procure fires, ruins of buildings, diseases, plagues. We have noted some things concerning this last effect in the Disputation on the plague. V. They not only wound, dislocate, etc., men, but also kill them. Examples are in Lavater, Pierre Boaistuau, Launoy in his Select histories. VI. They seduce to superstitions and idolatry. The errors and idolatries of the Gentiles and Papists owe their origin for the most part to the apparitions of specters and their responses. Concerning the Papists, ὡς ἐν παρόδῳ we have proved this in The desperate cause of the Papacy book 2, section 2, chapter 10, pages 177-179. Concerning the Gentiles it is known from the oracles and responses of idols, and the apparitions of the putative Gods, or heroes. And the same thing was observed by Tertullian, Justin, etc., among the fathers, cited in the preceding disputation on demons. I think Theodoret is especially to be consulted in his Cure of Greek Maladies, discourse 3 on Angels, Gods, and demons, and discourse 12 on Oracles. VII. Sometimes they also benefit men or seem to benefit them. Hence previously under the darkness of the Papacy among our grandfathers and great-grandfathers there was much talk about Pygmies (Kabouter-mannekens) performing the domestic tasks of manservants and maidservants by night: whose indwelling or conversation in their houses they were even accustomed to think and proclaim happy by popular error. To this pertains the example of the specter leading a man out of prison, which see related by Petrus Messia part 2 of his Various Lessons, chapter 22.

8. In some way the following agree with specters, yet are to be accurately distinguished from them, I. certain natural phasmata whether ἐν ἐμφάσει or καθ' ὕπαρξιν: concerning which the Meteorological authors. II. All more unusual Apparitions, where the visible radiates by a reflected or refracted ray, concerning which the Optical and Catoptrical writers. III. Specters exhibited through the art of Natural Magic. Concerning which art Cardano On the Variety of Things, and Porta in his Magic, And Wecker in his Secrets. IV. Fallacies of sight arising from a defect of the eye and weakness of vision; concerning which the Physicians; among them in peculiar treatises on vision or the eye, Fabricius of Aquapendente and Fortunatus Plempius. V.

Diabolical Dreams and internal phantasms sent or aroused by the devil. Concerning which the writers on divinations, indicated in the disputation on Prophecy and Magic. VI. To which add the sonorous images of Dee. Concerning which the authors noted by me in the disputation on creation part 10. VII. Noctambulation of noctambulists. Concerning which the Physicists and Physicians. Among others the peculiar treatise of Tobias Tandler, Physician of Wittenberg, published with his other little works. And Keckermann, in his physical disputations, the chapter on sleep and dreams. VIII. Specters which from an illusion of excessive fear, or melancholy, or phrensy, or another disease seem to be observed by the waking, when in reality they are not presented. Concerning which see Gutherius On the Law of the Manes in the place cited above. And the writers on Melancholy cited elsewhere. To which add the admirable Medical histories.

9. The opposites are either by reason of truth, or by reason of malice. By reason of truth these are opposed: I. false opinions, concerning specters in general: concerning which below, in the Elenctic part. 2. False Apparitions, or putative specters. Which are either through our fallacy, or through the fictions or frauds of others. Through our fallacy they are, when either by a natural fallacy of sight, or by a defect and weakness of the eye and of vision and hearing, or by the delirium of melancholy or another disease, or by excessive fear and perturbation of phantasy men think they see or hear those things, which in reality they neither see nor hear. The example of Antiphon is memorable, in Aristotle book 2 On the Soul, who walking always saw his own image at his side. See more in Delrio book 2, question 27, section 1, Lavater book 1, chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, and chapter 11, where concerning physical things, which are taken for specters. Thus the unskilled common people of old took lambent fires, fatuous fires, flying dragons, and other meteors for specters: as also among artificial things flying eagles and doves, the walking statues of Daedalus, etc. We warn concerning these and many other things in the disputation on Errors etc., which we will sometime publish for the sake of our students, God willing. Specters far too many are wont to be fabricated through the frauds of men. Erasmus depicts this custom to the glory of the Papacy of course in the colloquy The Exorcism or The Specter, and in his letters; indeed even Delrio himself, although on account of this indication made he honors Erasmus with the title of the Batavian Lucian, brings forward some examples, among which that of Boniface VIII, speaking through his tube and exhorting the simple Celestine to the resignation of the Papacy. Among ours Rivius, Godelmann, Lavater book 1, chapters 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 are to be seen. Through fictions and pure lies very many specters fly about everywhere through the mouths of men. Only read the legends of the Papists and the lives of monks and clerics, whom they want to have been illustrious in sanctity. By reason of malice, to specters are opposed I. divine and angelic apparitions. 2. Antidotes.

Divine apparitions are either audible from heaven, as Matthew 3:16-17 and 17:3, 5, John 12:28, Acts 22 and 9:3-4. On earth 2 Kings 7:6, 2 Samuel 5:24. Or visible, as of a cloud, column of fire Exodus 13:21, and a cloud in the temple 1 Kings 8. Here refer things presented by the prophets, for example baskets of figs, a staff, etc., to these add the apparitions of angels, concerning which as also all the modes of divine revelations we must elsewhere treat ex professo: Or mixed, Acts 2, Matthew 3 and 17. Antidotes to specters, the false to be rejected; the true to be taken. False antidotes are partly vain, partly superstitious. To which we refer: I. arms, especially warlike engines, fire, animals faithful to man; especially dogs and horses, a multitude of men

and of the brave, which Cardano On the Variety of Things book 16, chapter 93 very much commends. Similar things occur in Psellus On Demons page 35, cited in the disputation on Demons. Whose superstitious trifles the Papists themselves rightly explode, Delrio and Ludovicus Ballester, a Theologian of the Jesuit order, in his Onomatography, under the word demon page 112, where he thus writes: And elsewhere he openly called another Demon iron: as when he said: When you see the wrathful Demon coming, sacrifice the unstable stone. In which places Psellus himself seems to bring forward very many things not alien to superstition. But among the Persians Mnuzirin is a stone, as the same Psellus signifies, having the power of evoking the other demon Macorem. Compare the disputation on demons, where it has been shown that demons are not affected by corporeal things. And the disputation on the Energumens, where we teach that the power of putting demons to flight is falsely attributed to stones, herbs, and other natural things. II. Add here the lighted torches at the sepulchers of the dead, because they believed that the souls of the deceased wandered around their sepulcher for some years. Henri de Sponde contends in his tract On Sacred Cemeteries book 1, part 3, chapter 20 that the custom of sepulchral lamps, proved from various Gentile authors, is rightly observed by Christians but for another end, and is to be observed further. See, I ask, canon 34 of the Council of Elvira. III. Music, which Bodin in his Demonomania book 3, chapter 6 wrongly collects to be hateful to the devil, and that he is put to flight by it, from 1 Samuel 16. See Valesius' Sacred Philosophy chapter 28. And the commentaries of Serarius and Gaspar Sanchez on the cited place. Where nevertheless I do not approve in them, that they want also the demon to have been driven away through the words of the decanted Psalm. Mendoza in his Questions page 255 inquires, Whether the devil hates Music. But these things are sought in vain: since no other cause is under it: than that the melancholic disease aroused by the demon, and with which the demon mixes itself, can naturally be mitigated by the sweetness and delight of Music as is rightly proved by the authors just now cited. Compare the following disputation on the Energumens. Where nevertheless it must be taken care, that too much not be attributed to Music. Truly arid seem to me the things which Plutarch has in his book On Music and Martianus Capella book 9, preface at the end. IV. The burial of the dead, if they were kinsmen, under the hearth: which Peucer testifies to be the one panacea among the Pilappii continually infested by specters, in his book On Divination, the chapter on Theomantia page 213. V. The exhumation of the buried, whose specters wander about, and the denuding from flesh: for as long as the flesh of those cadavers remains whole, for so long their souls or specters are feigned to rage. Weinrich refers to this antidote, nor does he seem to disapprove it, in the preface to Pico della Mirandola's Strix cited above. VI. Curses and execrations. VII. Playful, jocose, inane, obscene words, derisions, sarcasms, etc. See Menghi's Flagellum Daemonum, where he teaches the formula, that he should be called the Cook of hell, as if he were dishonored there in the vilest place and ministry: which contempt he says the devil cannot bear. Maximilian van Eynatten in his Manual of Exorcisms, has formulas of exprobrations. Francis of Assisi taught that the devil was to be put to flight by any of his monks through these words: open your mouth, and I will defecate into it. Lutherans object to a nearly similar thing in Serrarius on Tobit chapter 8, question 2, ignorant of course what was in the back of the cloak. But the proof of Serrarius from Luther's Table Talk is null: because it is not a book of Luther, nor was ever seen by him. The Colloquies of Luther published by Rebenstock relate that far otherwise, page 119. VIII. Magic superstitions, consecrated things, amulets, the Exorcisms of the Papacy, which Delrio has in

book 6, which are to be seen; and we have reviewed the greatest part in the Disputation on Magic, on Exorcism, and the Energumens, collected with the disputation on Benedictions and Sacramentals, on Agnus Deis, on Superstition. IX. Superstitious lustrations accustomed to be applied by the Gentiles, and other remedies worse than the disease itself; among which nefarious sacrifices, lustral saliva (concerning which Persius satire 2, and there Casaubon), a head of garlic eaten in the morning (Persius satire 5), and infinite other depulsories, euphemisms, etc., concerning which Lavater book 3 on specters chapter 4, Delrio book 6, page 921 etc. of the edition in quarto, And Thyraeus On the apparition of Spirits part 3, chapter 57. But the two latter do not enumerate all the pseudo-antidotes. Pliny book 21 and 28, chapters 3-4, and the authors there annotated by Dalechamps, and Casaubon in his commentary on the cited place of Persius, collected with his commentary on the chapter of Theophrastus' Characters on superstition, Gutherius On the Law of the Manes in the cited place, Desiderius Heraldus book 2 of his Adversaria chapter 9. In the disputation on Benedictions and on sacrifices we note what is to be thought of the lustrations and sacrifices of the ancients by which the devil, while he seemed to express mimetically the typical lustrations prescribed by God, in reality subverted them. Especially abominable are those lustrations, which were thought to avert specters and demons by human sacrifices. Which Aelian relates were performed by the Locrian state of Temesa in Italy, book 8. IX. the superstitious antidotes of the Jews, which read in Buxtorf's Synagogue chapter 2, pages 76-77 of the first edition. X. Mohammedan superstitions, of which sort are the reading of the Koran, which is called an amulet against demons, Sura 27. The stars, which are said to expel demons, and strike fear into them, Sura 75.

XI. Problem 1: It could be asked in what place the exsufflations of demons, customary to the ancient Christians, are to be held, and the desputations also today not unusual by popular custom or error. Concerning the former Tertullian book 2 to his wife chapter 5, Irenaeus book 1, chapter 9, Sulpicius On the life of Martin book 3, Prudentius in the martyrdom of Romanus. And this was transferred to the rites of baptism, as is evident from the saying of the Areopagite in his Ecclesiastical Hierarchy chapter 2. Reply: If indeed they applied them as amulets; in any case they are to be relegated to superstitions. And perhaps they had retained this bad habit from the lustral salivas of Ethnicism or in imitation of them. But if it was an arbitrary sign of abomination and contempt to them: in any case it would have to be judged otherwise. But it is better to abstain, lest we seem to want to put demons to flight by them, and collude with the vain observances of others.

Problem 2: What about the sign of the cross customary to the same ancients? Reply: If they applied it as an efficient cause or object, as if of course it effectively repelled demons, or at least as if the demon could not bear it: in any case they cannot be excused from superstition. But Baldwin in his Cases book 3, chapter 7, case 8, does not at all believe such a thing to have come into their mind. I concerning the latter, namely the objective depulsion, would not dare to believe with Baldwin. But if only as an external symbol of the Christian faith and profession they freely fortified themselves against the devil, in any case Baldwin thinks it was licit in the same place. We judge that it is to be abstained from. Compare the disputation on Staurolatry and on indirect Idolatry. And these things indeed it will have sufficed to have indicated concerning pseudo-antidotes. With which agree those things which we have noted in the disputation on the

Energumens, and on Magic, especially the disputation on Exorcism. For adjurations are accustomed to be used among the Papists in a threefold case, against specters, against demons from the possessed, against fascination and magic maleficia. Let him compare, if anyone wants, Baldwin book 3 of Cases chapter 7, where in cases 6, 7, 8 he refutes the pseudo-antidotes of the Papists and Thyraeus. The genuine antidotes are piously and rightly set forth by the same Baldwin, case 4. Who is to be seen. We, having pointed them out with a finger in the first edition of this disputation, add nothing.

The true antidotes are none other, than those which are suggested in Ephesians 6:12-14. Among which since prayer excels, that is, since all the others involve prayer, without doubt both that shield and sword are to be seized in this warfare: Thus God will not send them, or if he sends them, he will confirm us until the end. And since in silence and patience is all our strength against the evils of this life: here we must not murmur against God (Psalm 39:9), nor contend with demons with clamors and much speaking, much less with curses, in imitation of the Archangel Michael, Jude 9, and of the Israelite people, although in another case, Isaiah 36:21.

10. There remain controversies. Of which the first is Whether specters exist. Which we must touch upon, on account of the very many new Epicureans, Sadducees, Libertines, David-Georgites, Lucian-like mockers of our age, who as they explode all belief in evil angels, so also all experience and history concerning their apparitions as old wives' fables or melancholic deliriums. As once among the Gentiles, with Plutarch as witness in the life of Dio, this was the reasoning of certain ones, τῶν ἀναιρούντων τὰ τοιαῦτα, who took away or denied all these things: to no one of sound mind was a demon or simulacrum observed to appear; but boys, little women, and men delirious from weakness of body, when they are held by some error of mind, or distemper of body, admit opinions alien and absurd while they superstitiously believe an evil demon to have invaded them. Not far from these recedes Strabo book 1, page 13, where he says the lamia, Gorgon, Incubus, larva to be fables for terrifying boys. And Polybius book 6 near the end, where he says this whole business about the Gods and those in the underworld, and indeed not without reason, to have been devised among the Romans and tragically proclaimed, so that by uncertain fear and a tragedy of this sort they might restrain the Roman plebs. Compare also Dionysius of Halicarnassus book 2. This opinion is more vulgar, where impiety, atheism, Epicureanism, Scepticism especially flourishes. Alexander in his Genial Days book 4, chapter 19, calls it a popular error, namely in Italy. His words are: We also read that there were very often many illusions of evil demons among holy men, which our age has seen not once. By which salutary examples we are admonished, that we may be fortified against the snares of those, who are hostile and inimical to us, and as if standing on watch in ambush, and lest slothful and lazy by the conceived popular opinion we least believe those things of theirs, we may slip into some danger. Marin Mersenne in his digressions against the Atheists, which he inserted into his commentaries on the first few chapters of Genesis, ascribes the denial of specters to the atheists or Deists there. The same, as also Raphael de la Torre in his tract on the power of the Church cited in the disputation on the Energumens, think that Atheists are also to be convinced by the apparitions and operations of demons. We determine that besides the fictions and lies of men, besides the frauds and artificial impostures, besides the fallacies and delusions of phantasy and the exterior senses, besides divine and angelic apparitions, besides

phasmata purely natural, besides phasmata exhibited in natural things by the aid of art, there are given specters or apparitions of spirits.

It is Proved 1. From the testimonies of scripture, Matthew 14:26, Mark 6:49, Luke 24:37-39, with John 6:19-20, 1 Samuel 28, where is the history of the specter of Samuel. Where see the commentators. Beza adds Matthew 4:1-3 in his notes on Matthew 14, and the circumstances of that temptation sufficiently intimate that it was an external apparition of the devil. Which also other commentators ancient and more recent determine.

II. From reason the same by which we have proved that there are energumens. Those things which are heard, or seen, or perceived by another sense whether ἐν ἐμφάσει or καθ' ὕπαρξιν; either are from men, or from a natural cause, or from God, or from angels. The consequence is valid from a full enumeration. But they are not from men nor from a natural cause; because specters do and speak many things, which exceed all human and natural power; Nor are they from God or angels, because they do, say, by teaching or commanding, very many things to the reproach of God and the eternal perdition of men. Thus for example Luke 24:37, what the apostles thought they saw (nor does Christ in the thesis refute such an opinion, but rather concedes it, only in the hypothesis he proves the application to himself to be badly made), could not be or be conceived by them a good angel: because he by the presented species of the body of Christ, could not deceive the apostles and mock them.

III. From equals; if energumens are granted, and inhabiting devils; therefore specters are granted, that is assisting and appearing devils. The antecedent has been proved in the Disputation on the Energumens.

IV. If Magic is granted, and Magical operations, therefore specters are granted. The antecedent we have proved by invincible arguments from scripture in the Disputation on Magic. The consequence is manifest: because magic pacts, familiarity with a Demon, adjurations and nefarious operations are not wont to be exercised without apparitions of spirits.

V. If there are demons, who wander through the air, the earth, etc., who here work in men and around men according to Ephesians 2 and 6 and 1 Peter 5, etc., certainly their sensible apparitions, that is, specters, are by no reason denied.

VI. From the History of Job chapters 1 and 2. Whatever things are there narrated to have been done by the devil around the person, children, goods of Job, can scarcely be understood without some sensible presence and apparition of the same. See the commentaries on the cited place.

VII. If in the very state of innocence there was a certain apparition of the devil, Genesis 3:1-2 with 2 Corinthians 11:3, who will deny that there are specters after the fall?

VIII. Finally, it proves the universal experience and testimony of most Christians, Gentiles, Jews, Mohammedans, and not only (although the voice of the people is commonly said to be the voice of God) but also of the wise, Theologians, Jurists, Physicians, Philosophers, Historians, Poets,

Orators. From Christians all (as far as I know) ancient Theologians agree with us, and more recent ones both Reformed and Papist. From the ancients let Augustine be seen in his book On Care for the Dead, Ambrose sermon 80, the Life of Chrysostom, the Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus described by [Gregory of] Nyssa, Sozomen Ecclesiastical History book 6, chapter 28 and book 7, chapter 23. And all who comment on the places of scripture just now cited, and very many others cited by Delrio book 2, question 28, but whose sayings he twists elsewhere. I come to more recent ones and at the same time furnish a library. Besides the writers on demons, Magic, Energumens, Exorcism indicated each in their own places, there are first the anonymous author, who collected histories of specters published by the bookseller of Leipzig at Eisleben in the year 1594 in quarto. Then more recent Theologians from the Protestants, Luther, who not rarely experienced these things, see his life. More are wont to be adduced as if from the Table Talk of Luther himself collected by Aurifaber, and others collected by an anonymous author and published in the year 1571 by Rebenstock at Frankfurt with the title Colloquies, meditations, consolations, counsels, judgments, responses, witticisms of Dr. Martin Luther etc. But these ought not to be attributed promiscuously to Luther and some are to be received with a grain of salt. Melanchthon in his book on the soul, and in his Theological Examination, and from him Manlius in his Commonplaces, the title on Specters and Satisfaction, Martyr in his Commonplaces Class 1, chapter 9, Daneau in his Isagoge part 2, chapter 34, Simon Goulart in the book cited, Hondorf and Lonitzer in their Theater on the 2nd commandment pages 141 and 165 and on the 3rd commandment page 236, Aretius in his Problems part 1, Baldwin in his Cases book 3, chapter 7, Lavater in his peculiar treatise. Add the commentators on the places of scripture, and the writers of common places, the title on the Separated Soul, Purgatory, Demons. Nor is Reynolds to be passed over in his prelections on the apocryphal books. And from the Papists, peculiar treatises have been published by Thyraeus, titled On the apparitions of spirits, Nicolas Taillepied titled A Treatise on the apparition of Spirits. Delrio has also collected very many things in book 2 of his Magical Disquisitions, questions 26, 27, 28, who alone could be in place of many: Mendoza also touches on some things in his Questions page 392, Bartholomew Sibyl in decade 1, chapter 4, questions 1 and 2. So that I may now pass over commentators, writers of common places, Casuists, Exorcists. Besides Theologians of all orders the wise assent to this truth. From the philologists and Historians Zwinger in his Theater of Examples, Baptista Fulgosus On memorable sayings and deeds book 1, chapter 8, Magius in his Miscellanies book 3, chapter 12, Polydore Vergil On Inventors book 6, chapter 20, Rhodiginus book 9, chapter 9, Gutherius book 2, chapter 16, Philip Camerarius century 2, chapters 14-16, Vossius book 1 On Idolatry chapter 6, Johannes Rivius in his peculiar treatise on specters, Kornmann in his tract on the miracles of the dead. From the Philosophers and Physicians, Tobias Tandler physician of Wittenberg in his peculiar treatise on Specters, Mirandola in his Strix, with a preface of Weinrich, Cardano On the variety of things book 16, chapter 93 at length, and book 19 on subtlety, Marsilio Ficino cited by Delrio. From the Jurists and Politicians, Alexander ab Alexandro in his Genial Days book 1, chapter 10 and book 2, chapter 8 and book 3, chapter 14, Leloyer a Papist, and Johannes Munster von Vortlage one of ours in peculiar treatises on specters: to whom let Godelmann On Magic be added. Add also all who comment on Law 31 in the Pandects on the various meanings of words. And Pierre Grégoire of Toulouse On the Republic book 12, chapter 20 and his Syntagma of Law book 34, chapter 16, Althusius in his Dicaeologica book 1, chapter 101. From the

Gentiles, Plato in his Phaedo, and letter to Dionysius; whom Olympiodorus, Porphyry, Athenaeus, Iamblichus, Psellus, Macrobius book 1 on the Dream of Scipio chapter 1, Apuleius in his Apology and other Platonists follow. Pliny book 21, chapter 2 and 28, chapter 4 and book 7, chapter 52, especially his nephew in letter 27 of book 7, Valerius Maximus, Julius Obsequens On Prodigies, Persius in satire 5, where he calls specters black lemures. Furthermore, that I may here produce Homer, Ovid in his Fasti, where concerning the Lemuria, Plautus in his Mostellaria, Virgil, and very many similar ones, with the ancient scholiasts and more recent commentators, the reason of the theses and of our undertaking does not bear. Let him see who has leisure, Martin Delrio on Seneca's Octavia verse 117 and Oedipus verses 172 and 174 and Hercules Furens verse 123 and Medea verses 355, 831, 960, 732 and Servius with Luis de la Cerda and Taubmann on Virgil's Aeneid 2 on those words:

The unhappy simulacrum, and shade of Creusa herself.

And the commentaries on Lucan book 1. Let Suetonius in his Julius Caesar, Plutarch in the lives of Cimon, Dio, Brutus, Theseus be compared; Dio Cassius book 55 in the beginning; Julius Capitolinus on Pertinax, Flavius Vopiscus on Tacitus, Ammianus Marcellinus book 21 on the death of Constantius and book 25 on Julian; Pausanias in his Attica, in his Eliaca, in his Boeotica; Briefly whatever Gyraldus in his Syntagma and Vincenzo Cartari translated from Italian into French by Antoine Du Verdier have collected from the Theology and writings of the Gentiles concerning the Gods, whatever Stuckius on Sacrifices, Guillaume du Choul in French on religion, Natale Conti on Mythology, Gerhard Johann Vossius on Idolatry, that in its way proves apparitions of this kind of Gods, that is of specters: Since whatever the Gentiles sacrifice, they have sacrificed to demons, 1 Corinthians 10:20. Namely to demons, some of whom have appeared to them, whence first the form of the idol was taken and fabricated. See how Gerhard Johann Vossius proves this by the suffrages of the wise of the Gentiles and by their own experience against some Gentiles denying it, in book 1 On Idolatry chapter 6. From the Jews, specters are acknowledged by R. Solomon Jarchi on Psalm 91 and other Rabbis of whom Munster makes mention in his scholia on Matthew in Hebrew chapter 14. The Jews of today commonly believe that there are specters; but in their way they add these ridiculous things, that they are stirred up by the shaking out of marrow from bones; their efficacy is taken away through the flapping wings of cocks so that they can harm no one anymore; they sit on hands not yet washed (Buxtorf Jewish Synagogue chapter 7, page 209 and chapter 4, pages 117 and 232). Not to say anything about the infestations of the demon Samael, and of other shedim, as much in life as after the death of the Jews: concerning which see Buxtorf chapter 7, page 219. That the Mohammedans admit this truth, can be proved from their Quran itself, where in Sura 12 of Joseph in the beginning, Satan is said to be the manifest enemy of the human race. From which manifest hostility, external and sensible infestations are collected, Sura 29. The reading of the Quran makes an amulet against demons. Compare Julius Caesar Scaliger in his 355th Exercitation page 1090, where he notes the faith and experience of the Moors in this part.

The other controversy is, What specters are. To its determination the collation of the place or question concerning the Probations of Spirits will be useful: concerning which in its place in the

disputation on Signs. Now briefly in these conclusions we set forth our opinion: I. They are not mere figments of men. II. Nor impostures of impostors or ingenious men: Although often such things are substituted for specters. See examples of those deceptions in Erasmus noted above. From antiquity Vossius notes some things in book 1 On Idolatry chapter 8. Famous is the fate both of the monks of Orleans in Sleidan, and of the Dominicans of Bern in Lavater on Specters, and Delrio in his Disquisitions. III. Nor natural phases, of which sort are many meteorological ones, likewise fishes, stones, woods shining by night, and certain natural sounds in human bodies, in mountains, caves, woods, such as those of mount Etna, which Antonius Rusca in his book On Hell and the State of demons makes to be the howlings of damned souls. IV. Nor phasmata exhibited through the art of Natural Magic. Concerning which above. V. Nor fallacies of injured phantasy, or illusions of the senses. VI. Nor souls of the wicked transformed into devils on account of crimes, which may wander around sepulchers and bodies of the living, whether in place of punishment inflicted by God, or from hatred against some men, or even from love towards others, or towards their own bodies, as the Platonists wanted, concerning which Olympiodorus in his Phaedo of Plato. Add Apuleius cited above in thesis 1. And Pliny in his Letters book 7, letter 27. Compare the authors noted in the disputation on the Energumens. Chrysostom refutes this opinion in his 29th homily on Matthew. From more recent ones Pareus in his Oratorical Exercises page 188. Compare Reynolds in his prelections on the apocryphal books, and other Antagonists of the Papists.

VII. Nor souls of heroes performing nearly the same duties, which they were accustomed to do in the body. The souls of Achilles and Patroclus, on the island of Achilles (which is named from the said hero), were thought by the Gentiles to have been observed, and to have appeared to those sailing in sleep and waking, and to have aided those approaching to this island, with Dionysius Periegetes as witness, and Arrian in his Voyage around the Euxine Sea nearly at the end. Concerning the Dioscuri accustomed to appear to sailors on the top of the mast or yard-arm, who for that reason were called and worshipped as σωτῆρες ἀνθρώπων [saviors of men] (in Theocritus Idyll 27), there was a similar opinion. See concerning them Natale Conti. But concerning the souls of heroes in general fully and plainly from the opinion of the Platonists Maximus of Tyre dissertation 27, who is to be read with others. For the words are too many, than that they should be exhibited here. He who desires to know more inwardly the difference of heroes from Gods and demons, let him compare the notes of Heinsius on the cited place of Tyrius and of Salmasius in his preface to Cebes' Tablet.

VIII. Nor souls of any of the deceased, as long as their bodies remained unburied. For before they did not think them to be at rest, but wandering weeping around the sepulcher. See what Gevartius notes concerning the weeping soul in book 3 of his Electa page 134 and Gutherius book 2 On the Law of the Manes chapter 10. Hence among the Gentiles, they prepared a just full burial for the deceased, or if this could not be done, by the casting of dust and cenotaphs they aided the wandering souls. Concerning which see very many things noted from antiquity by Sponde in his book on cemeteries part 1, chapter 11, And Gutherius book 2, chapters 16-17, and other writers on Funerals.

IX. Nor souls wandering of those, who had perished by a violent and unjust death, as long as vengeance had not been taken, and the cadavers buried, even if the just age, which they would have lived naturally and left to themselves, had been completed. Concerning which Servius on Aeneid 4: The physicists said that the souls of the biothanati [those dead by violence] are not received into their origin, unless wandering they had completed the legitimate time of fate. And Tertullian chapter 56 On the Soul: until the completion of the remainder of the age, with which they would have completely lived through, if they had not died untimely. A little after in the same place he says that to have been the most absolute burial when the souls lulled at a just age, disjoined by an upright death, had been expunged by a prompt inhumation. Let him see, who has leisure, what Nicolas Rigault notes on Tertullian, and Juan Luis de la Cerda, and the same on Virgil's Aeneid 4. And what Henri de Sponde has collected in his book 1 on cemeteries part 1, chapter 11, And Gutherius On the Law of the Manes in the place cited chapter 18. To which is to be referred that figment concerning blood from the body of one slain at the presence of the homicide by the soul of the one slain. Concerning which in the disputation on Lots etc. abuses.

X. Nor spirits begotten from Adam in those one hundred and thirty years when he abstained from Eve as the Jews fable. See the words of R. Abraham the Spaniard described by Munster on Matthew 14.

XI. Nor Lilith, whom the Jews feign to have been the first wife of Adam, who is the mother of demons, and who especially infests women in childbirth and newborn infants according to Ben Sira in Buxtorf's Synagogue chapter 2, pages 76-77.

XII. Nor souls of the impious indeed thrust down into hell after death, but which nevertheless by the just judgment of God are sometimes sent back into these lands: Which is the opinion of Weinrich in the preface several times praised. However, although it contains nothing impious in itself, nevertheless since it is propped up by no moment of reason, it ought to be rejected as easily as it is asserted. The Papists also embrace the same opinion; as we gather from various histories of which Delrio refers to two as true in book 6, chapter 2, section 3, question 3, page 990.

XIII. Nor extraordinary divine or angelic apparitions. For concerning common specters, even harbingers of death or some sad calamity, this can be affirmed by no solid argument. Although something extraordinary may sometimes offer itself, (as Thyraeus wants to conjecture concerning certain sounds aroused by angels before death in book 3, chapter 9,) which indeed does not betray by external indications what it may be: it must be said first, that it makes no rule. Second, that no one can certainly determine in this part, unless God extraordinarily reveals it to him. Therefore in the meantime the rule is to be followed nor is an exception to be admitted. At least, if one cannot feel the contrary, the matter is to be left in the middle. Nor are they wild beasts, or any other beasts whatever, as Dio in his Histories Book 2 seems to think concerning lamiae, the words you have described in Luis Ballester in his Onomatography under the word Demon (for the author himself is not now at hand to me); where he adds, that lamiae also seem to be acknowledged by Isaiah chapter 34 and Jeremiah in Lamentations chapter 4. But there is no argument, which is drawn from the opinion of the Vulgate translation. Those skilled in

Hebraisms translate otherwise. Concerning wild beasts I think the opinion arose from the confusion or abuse of words. For just as metaphorically the devil is called a serpent, but truly is not, so also certain specters were called to the ancient Magi θήρες χθόνιοι that is beasts of the earth and κύνες χθόνιοι that is dogs of the earth in Psellus, because of course they appear in such a form. Hence it is evident what is to be judged concerning those peacocks or birds which on the island of Achilles are temple-keepers and guardians, concerning which Arrian in his Voyage around the Euxine Sea.

XIV. Nor are they souls of the dead called back to their body by incantations, as the Pagans thought. See Lucan book 6, where concerning Erichtho the witch at the order of Pompey evoking the soul of a soldier, so that he might know from it the outcome of the war. And Pliny book 28, chapter 2, Homer in Odyssey 11, Horace in satire 1.8, Statius in his Argonautica, Dio on Caracalla, Maximus of Tyre dissertation 22. Origen touches on this necyomancy against Celsus book 1, Tertullian in his Apology chapter 23 and On the Soul chapter 7, Justin in Apology 2, Augustine in book 7 of The City of God chapter 35. And they called those evoked spirits, with Tertullian as witness in On the Soul chapter 28, catabolici, paredri, Pythonici. The practice of the witch of Endor in 1 Samuel 28 agreed with this magic superstition of the Gentiles. On which place consult the erudite commentary of Peter Martyr, or the same in his Commonplaces Class 1, chapter 4, where he has collected various things from authors. Compare the disputation on Magic.

XVI. Nor are they separated souls of the just, as the Papists dispute in favor of purgatory, indulgences, masses and other suffrages for the dead and the whole Roman kitchen, Delrio and Thyraeus in the place cited after Bellarmine, Stapleton, Perron and the rest of the patrons of the Desperate cause. We oppose these arguments to them. First, because nowhere does scripture inculcate such a return, wandering of souls, to the instruction of the living (as the Papists want), but rather the contrary Luke 16:28, 31 with Isaiah 8:19-20 and Ecclesiastes 7:10. Second, because that so miserable, so mournful wandering rather befits the state of the living and of wayfarers, than of the perfection, rest, and blessedness of those, who now no longer are pilgrims from the Lord, nor know any more in part, 1 Corinthians 13:9-10, 2 Corinthians 5:7, Revelation 14:13. Compare the Disputation on Purgatory. Third, Because it least of all befits the souls of the just, that they so cruelly infest, and terrify men not only impious, but also pious and once in this life especially dear to them. Nothing can be excepted here, than that they are sent back hither and deputed to that work by the will of God then for their own and for others' punishment or probation. We rejoin that concerning such a will of God nothing is certain: It is therefore a mere begging of the principle. But Delrio, and others just now cited, with them Mendoza in his Questions pages 413 and 423, urge and dispute that the soul of Samuel was led back. I reply: The obscure is proved by the much more obscure. We with the author of the Questions and responses under the name of Justin question 52, (With whom nevertheless Justin himself in his dialogue with Trypho seems to fight, although Lange in his commentary endeavors to reconcile them, but in vain in my judgment,) Tertullian On the Soul chapter 57, Augustine book 2 to Simplicianus question 3, with the Canon Law 26, question 5, canon "Nec mirum", and other fathers adduced by ours in the controversy on Purgatory and by Reynolds in his Censures volume 2, and with some of the Papists themselves determine that the devil

fashioned the soul of Samuel, 1. because God was unwilling to respond to Saul, 1 Samuel 28:6, how then would he now respond through the dead and necromancy. 2. because the devil and the Magic art do not have power over the souls of the just, much less of so great a prophet. 3. Either Samuel returned unwilling and compelled or willing. The former is absurd, because otherwise he would have been subject to Magic and the devil. The latter is no less absurd, because it would follow that the soul of so great a man by this deed of his stabilized necromancy. 4. The true Samuel would not have driven Saul to despair, but rather would have exhorted him to repentance. 5. Because the contrary opinion of adversaries not lightly stabilizes Goetia and necromancy, of which this is the principle: That the spirits of the dead can be led back. The fourth argument is to the man. If Raphael de la Torre cited in the Disputation on the Energumens solidly proves that it is not souls of men, but devils by whom men are possessed: to these if Thyraeus book 1, chapter 9, with Delrio book 2, question 28, section 2, page 302 and question 27, section 2, page 295 and William of Paris cited there, rightly demonstrate that the apparitions of the Gods among the Gentiles, and of armed specters nominally of the Hellequins or from the family of Hellequin, are not good spirits, but illusions and specters of the devil: Certainly it is concluded with equal certainty concerning the pretended souls of the just, that they are mere mockeries of Satan. Which also some of the Papists have acknowledged, among whom Girolamo Maggi in his Miscellanies book 4, chapter 12. And Leloyer on Specters book 4. But lest by chance they except that the authors cited were not by profession or formed Theologians, I add to them Cardinal Torquemada, and Bartholomew Sibyl of the Order of Preachers, a most illustrious theologian (Thus the title of the book has it) in his mirror of peregrine questions decade 1, chapter 4, question 1, page 247. Where he thus speaks: Evil angels on account of the deceptions of enchanters, even with assumed bodies go out from their receptacles, and appear to the living, as to Saul seeking the pythoness, that she might divine, and raise up Samuel, Samuel did not appear because he was not roused from his rest, but some phantasm, and imaginary illusion made by the machinations of the devil, which scripture called Samuel. As images are sometimes called by the names of their own things, 1 Kings 28. These things the lord Johannes de Turrecremata Cardinal on the chapter "Tempus" 26, question 5. Fifth, Whatever they may dispute, nevertheless the dogmas of the Papacy remain, and the daily trafficking and dispensation of the suffrages which depend on the judgment and revelations of specters and are applied, are uncertain; because by the proper confession of Thyraeus, Malderus, Delrio (whom we have cited in The desperate cause of the Papacy book 2, section 2, chapter 10), all probation of appearing spirits is uncertain, whether they are damned souls, or truly of the just, or angels, or diabolical specters. Sixth, from the testimonies of the fathers adduced by Reynolds, in the place cited, and by the Antagonists of the Papists on purgatory. Which I do not want to repeat here, but I refer my reader to the authors themselves. I exhibit only one here, because perhaps it does not always occur cited anywhere, and Athanasius in Greek is not so at hand to all. Athanasius On virginity: Οὐκ ἔτι δὲ τοῖς δικαίοις θάνατος, ἀλλὰ μετάθεσις, μετατίθενται γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον ἀνάπαυσιν· καὶ ὥσπερ τις ὑπὸ φυλακῆς ἐξέλθοι, οὕτως οἱ ἅγιοι ἐξέρχονται ἀπὸ τοῦ μοχθηροῦ βίου τούτου εἰς τὰ ἀγαθὰ τὰ ἡτοιμασμένα αὐτοῖς. Death is no more to the just, but a translation: for they are translated out of this world into eternal rest; and as one would go out of prison, so the saints go out from this laborious or toilsome life to the good things prepared for them. Thus far our reasons.

The arguments of the adversaries studiously instructed by Delrio do not merit a response. But they are these: I. from the common opinion of the Gentiles, page 226, 236. I reply: This of course is the demonstration of the Papistic faith, from such a principle. A worthy lid for the pot. II. From reason. Because God can do whatever does not imply a contradiction. But the apparition of souls does not imply, nor is repugnant to the nature of the soul etc., therefore, page 227. I reply: It is an ignorance of the issue: for the question is not about the absolute power of God, but about his will and about the fact. III. Because it is fitting and useful for God to permit this sometimes, because it makes for the glory of God and the utility of many, page 232, 234. It is said gratuitously without any proof from the word of God. Concerning the instituted worship and concerning its ordained means and principles, it must only be judged from the will of God. IV. From human authority, page 236. I reply: It does not make divine faith, to which the false cannot be under it. But such a theological virtue is required here. V. From the writings of certain astrologers Ptolemy, Firmicus, Albumasar and other Arabs, who although they thought apparitions of souls to depend on the conjunction and influx of the stars, nevertheless did not deny them, so that in this the heretics of today are judged worse than them. VI. From the opinions of the Chaldeans, Mohammedans, Kabbalists and Rabbis etc., page 237. VII. From laws, tribunals, Budé, Alciati, Porcius, Ferronus, Covarrubias, Brisson etc., who acknowledge manes. I reply to arguments 5 and 6-7 the same as to 1 and 4. VIII. From the perpetual sense of the Church, in the Old Testament 1 Samuel 28, in the New Testament Matthew 17:2-3, Luke 24:37, Acts 12:15, and thus through all ages, from which he adduces a medley of writers of every kind from page 240 all the way to 266. I reply what was said to argument 4. Compare our disputation on the fathers: Although specifically many things could be excepted against those allegations. But there is no need. To the place Matthew 17 we say that an extraordinary miracle exhibited then on account of Christ does not make a rule, no more than the opened heavens Matthew 3, the voice sent from heaven John 12. To Luke 24, I reply: it only proves specters.

12. Problem 1. Whether no specters appear to men rooted in faith. Denied. For if the devil can vex them and buffet them (Job 1 and 2 Corinthians 12), indeed even persecute Christ himself by an external apparition Matthew 4, and corporeally possess any of the faithful: speak to them from the possessed (Acts 16): in their presence seize, beat, wound men (Acts 19); through the same possessed and by the possessed mock them, spit on, besmear, wantonly and profanely clamor against and contradict their prayers, and as much as is in him impede them: finally attack them with various temptations, especially of blasphemy and horrendous injections: why not by the presenting of specters?

II. Problem. Whether the devil can display the appearance of the faithful, and counterfeit their person? Affirmed, and to prove this thing among the reformed the example of Samuel suffices. And that Satan transforms himself into an angel of light, 2 Corinthians 11, he even displays and counterfeits an apostle of Christ by an external apparition; much less any common faithful person. Moreover, to the Papists examples can be objected to the man from their own histories of apparitions in the appearance of angels, saints, indeed of Christ himself.

III. Problem. Why among the ancient Gentiles, and the Nations of the new world (with Luis Vives book 1 On the Truth of the Faith and Vossius book 1 On Idolatry chapter 16 and Cardano book

16 On the variety of things chapter 93 page 126 as witness), and among the peoples of East India and Japan etc. (with the letters and reports of the Indies, Mogors, Japanese etc. published in the Papacy as witnesses), and among the Northerners, especially the Icelanders and Lapps (with Olaus Magnus book 2 chapter 3 and Peucer in the place cited as witness); and among the Papists also clerics and monks specters so familiarly and potently rage, but not so in England, Scotland, federated Belgium, etc. And wherever the reformation obtains: when nevertheless the power and present remedies against demons reviewed in the disputation on Magic, on Exorcism, on the Energumens, on Specters are at hand among them, are not among us, as indeed they boast. I reply: We attribute that to the light of the Gospel as to the power of God unto salvation. And to it we rightly apply that saying of Luke 10:17-18. Where at the preaching of Christ Satan is said to have fallen from heaven like lightning. Here compare, what concerning the defect of oracles, concerning the extirpation of idols, concerning the cessation of nefarious sacrifices, and concerning the other coercions of demons raging everywhere at the preaching of the gospel by the apostles, are opposed to the adversaries of Christian truth, Gentiles and Jews, by the ancients Tertullian in his Apology 1, Justin etc., and by more recent ones. To all which let the Papists except equally, as they are accustomed to except against our glorying in the Lord, by saying, This is done for this reason because the devil has those reformed most certainly subject to his power, but the Papists not at all; therefore with us dismissed or passed over he infests the Papists.

IV. Problem. Whether from the apparitions and responses of specters anything certain can be concluded or believed, concerning the state of our particular affairs, or happy or unhappy event; likewise concerning the innocence or fault of our neighbor in some deed; specifically concerning the impending death of the living. I reply: No. For the devil is a liar. We confess indeed that it is taught by some examples, and thence observed, that in the death of men specters in the form and appearance of the one dying or dead have appeared; or noises, and beatings have been heard (see Johannes Munster von Vortlage, and Lavater); or in the appearance of parents, friends, and others now dead they have appeared announcing, or threatening death: but from that observation of whatever kind nothing certain can be concluded. For neither is it a perpetual and universal Experience, so that some species of induction can be constructed from it: much less is it a divine revelation. But a demonstration of natural reason does not have a place here: because the devil is a voluntary cause, not a natural one.

V. Problem. Whether from them dogmas of faith and rules of piety can be constructed, or confirmed. I reply: Not at all: against the Papists, who have drawn a great part of their superstition and apostasy from the oracles and responses of the devil as much in the energumens as in specters. Concerning which we have spoken in The desperate cause of the Papacy book 2, section 2, chapter 10. Only see and compare their disputations on transubstantiation and the mass, on purgatory and suffrages for the dead, on Mariolatry, on Rosaries, on the worship and canonization of other saints, likewise the worship of images, relics, consecrated things, on the use of sacred amulets and on exorcisms, on monks, and fraternities etc. As for the responses of the devil in energumens, we have the guilty confessing not obscurely. Compare our disputations on Magic, on the Energumens, on Exorcisms. As for the responses in specters and apparitions, it can be sufficiently proved that they by ordinary

revelation are certain of none by divine faith, by no reason naturally Whether they are angels, or devils, or heavenly souls, or damned souls, or souls of purgatory. And that is evident from the dissertation of Martín Delrio, which he has in book 2, question 12. And from the miserable criteria, which hitherto they have devised, to discern evil spirits from good ones. See, I ask, Thomas with his commentators part 3, question 32, article 3, and on the Master book 4, distinction 45, article 1, question 3, and others concerning whom in the disputation on the probations of spirits.

VI. Problem. Whether specters or demons can appear in the form of Christ, or feign that they are Christ? I reply: Affirmed. Mendoza in his Questions pages 393 and 440. And Delrio book 2, question 28, section 3, where he proves it to us by various examples and authorities. Nor do we see a reason why, we should deny all those things, or call them into doubt. But if he was able to appear to the Lord Christ himself, certainly it is less if to living men, especially with the sending of the efficacy of error for their merits, he appears in the form, and appearance of Christ, or by his feigned and pretended name. But I would want the Papists to extricate themselves, what will become of the various apparitions of Christ and the revelations and instructions adjoined to them, which they relate as truly made to their saints and saintesses, and base the faith or superstitions of the Roman church on them. Whence will they then discern that Christ was more truly, than when the devil counterfeited the appearance of Christ? Let them give certain signs of discretion, from Delrio, Thyraeus, Malderus etc. cited above. But they will not give them. Therefore they are again convinced that they have drawn not a few things which pertain to their superstitious precepts and counsels, from such apparitions, concerning which no certitude of knowledge or faith can be known, whether they are of God or of the devil.

VII. Problem. Whether there are more demons, or one, when a greater number of specters appear in the appearance of many beasts, or men, especially of ships or armed fleets, of military forces marching or fighting, or of men feasting, or conducting funerals. See an example in Pausanias in his Attica page 31 of the Greek-Latin edition in folio, and many of this kind are known, from the book of an anonymous author whose title is Wonderful histories of specters, apparitions etc. published at Eisleben in quarto in 1597 by Henning Grosse bookseller of Leipzig. I reply: There can be many, just as in the energumen Matthew 8 there was a legion, and in Mary Magdalene seven Mark 16:9. Also one can exhibit that whole apparition through the impostures of images or presented species. But which of the two is actually to be determined concerning any apparition, cannot be certain to us, indeed not even probable.

VIII. Problem. Whether all who are killed by specters are damned: or, whether the pious and those to be saved can also be killed by specters. See examples of those killed in the book of wonderful histories book 1 page 205, and in Lavater on specters, Boaistuau and Simon Goulart in their historical collectanea, where among other things they relate that at one time 60 citizens were killed by a specter or demon raging there, and Luther in his Colloquies volume 1 page 125 of the edition of Heinrich Peter Rebenstock, where concerning a shepherd seized and killed by a demon. I reply: The former Denied, the latter Affirmed. The reasons are: 1. because it cannot be proved that they all sinned against the Holy Spirit, or despaired, or died in final impenitence, 2. because it cannot be proved, that God never can or wants to permit, that the elect and truly

faithful be exposed or subjected to the vexations of devils further than Job, whose life the devil, with God prohibiting, could not take. 3. because by the example of the shepherd in Luther in the place cited, it seems to be proved, who was only instructed by the ministers of the church, that he did not doubt concerning the salvation of his soul: whom nevertheless Satan on the eighth day after, just as he himself predicted, seized, and killed. Where Luther soon subjoins this judgment: It seems to me that those, who thus perish, are not to be held for damned, for God can save their souls, and it is most certain, that those, who by a noose or in another way lay violent hands on themselves, that they are dead, and the devil has taken the noose, and implicated it in their hands and neck, proving it by examples. A certain one when thus tempted, riding in the country to the point of desperation, touching the ground with his feet from the horse, hanged himself with a thong, by the name of Maschan. At Goldberg a certain adolescent student of the Bishop of Werden, thus died, who in his room alone, hanged himself from a rather fragile beam, standing upon the ground. I confess indeed that these and similar unusual, grave, and terrible judgments of God, more often and for the most part happen to the impious, despisers, hypocrites, scourges of the human race: but for that reason it must not be concluded with the friends of Job, and the disciples John 9:1, that these things can never happen to the faithful; which happen not ordinarily or often, but rarely or if you prefer most rarely. For who would dare to determine from this so sad event concerning the twelve metal miners at Annaberg in the mine called the rose garland at the same time by a specter in the appearance of a horse, and others killed elsewhere, concerning whom Georg Agricola in his book on subterranean spirits, and he cites, the Anonymous one in his wonderful history book 1 page 250.

IX. Problem. Whether demons always appear to anyone dying? I reply: Bartholomew Sibyl affirms it in his mirror of peregrine questions page 573. But we think this is rashly said. But it is one thing to inquire, whether demons are there to tempt the man invisibly, even the faithful; and another thing is whether they appear there, by some sensible specter. That either can happen, even to the faithful, and that it actually sometimes happens, we do not Deny, and above we have proved it by an illustrious example, But that it always happens we have not yet seen proved, although it is asserted by Sibyl and the authors cited in the same place.

X. Problem. Whether the souls of infants from limbo appear? I reply: Mendoza disputes concerning this question on page 439. But we say that it is a disputation about a non-entity: because there is no limbo. By popular error it was once believed in the Papacy, that wandering or fatuous fires (in Dutch Stalkeersen) were the souls of infants not baptized. Nor hitherto have we learned from the priests of the Papists (who from their meteorology ought not to be ignorant of what fatuous fires were), that this error was very much opposed.

13. Now follow certain problems partly textual, partly practical, partly historical.

Textual problem 1. Whether specters can be solidly proved from the places of Isaiah 13:21 and 34:14, where the word שעיר occurs, which elsewhere signifies a demon appearing in that form, as in Leviticus 17:7, 2 Chronicles 11:15. I reply: Since that word is ambiguous and in most places signifies a hairy animal, and specifically a he-goat, as in Genesis 37, Leviticus 4 and 17, etc., it seems from the force of the word, with the circumstances of the text not opposing but

rather favoring, it can rightly be said that some animal is rather denoted, and so a solid demonstration cannot be constructed from there, although the Targum, Kimchi, and some of the Christian Doctors, and with them Baldwin in his Cases book 3, chapter cited, page 818, interpret the place thus.

Problem 2. Whether from Psalm 91:5-6. I reply: No, for it is a pseudo-grapheme from a bad translation and explication of the text: concerning which we have warned above.

Problem 3. Whether from Wisdom 17:4. I reply: The Papists affirm it, in Tostado and Pereira on Exodus 7 number 66, and Lorinus in his commentary on the cited place. Whom nevertheless Bonaventure, Holkot, the Carthusian oppose (as Lorinus himself confesses in the same place), who take these things only of phasmata presented to the imagination. We judge that theological dogmas can by no means be demonstrated from an apocryphal book: especially since Moses, or any canonical writer, makes no mention of this history.

Let the practical problems be these: Problem 1. Whether internal melancholic deliriums, that is mere terrors or imaginary specters, idols of our corrupt phantasy and ratiocination and produced from mere natural principles, can always be promptly and presently discerned from internal specters, that is from species of demons, the dead, and other terrible faces or phantasms presented internally to our phantasy or imagination: and again whether both internal ones can equally be discerned both from external impostures, and mere illusions made visible through external representation by magi or demons, and from specters properly and most properly so called, which are perceived by the ears, or eyes, or touch, or all at once: finally whether external ones can be discerned from each other? I reply 1: We do not see, by what certain criteria they can be discerned on the spot by those, to whom they appear, and who themselves perceive them only by the internal senses or even the external ones. 2. Nor do we see, how promptly at that same time in which they appear, they can be distinguished from each other, internal or external, by others, who are present, and do not themselves perceive them then. Therefore it is safest, if the peremptory judgment of discretion is deferred for a time, until from consequents after deeds, or gestures or sayings it is further apprehended, whether the devil by internally mocking the phantasy and indeed the intellect (as we have limitedly conceded this in the disputation on demons), or externally by impostures to the external senses, or by infesting through real specters, mixes himself with melancholic or phrenetic deliriums.

Problem 2. Whether personal specters can be certainly discerned, which infest one man only assiduously, or often, or through recurring intervals, from those which infest houses, sepulchers, cities, villages, caves, mountains, woods, metal mines: And which immediately properly and directly infest men, from those which infest brutes, trees and other things. I reply: No. For neither does that which appears once and again, in this place, at this time, in this mode, in this form, and operates thus on this or that subject, make any rule, or a certain difference to be certainly apprehended from its criteria. For the devil is a free or voluntary agent, an artificer of a thousand ways of harming, and turning himself into a thousand forms, nor can his thoughts and operations be penetrated by us.

Problem 3. Whether therefore it is of interest to Christian consideration and conscience, that given the occasion and as far as can be done, one should attend to these things more closely, so that with the apostle one can say that he is not ignorant of his devices, or whether all things are to be held haphazardly. I reply: The former Affirmed, the latter Denied. One must go where one can, so that we may have the forces, stratagems, snares, excursions, assaults of our enemies explored: and at the same time the leading of divine providence in the permission and ordination of evils. Unless with the Epicureans we want to puff away all things, which exceed corporeal nature, and with the Peripatetics, and those, who have followed their foundations (with Augustine Niphus as witness in book 1 on demons chapter 4), to say that demons are amusements and fictions.

Problem 4. Whether we can with any certitude and solidity inquire into the causes of specters, and determine anything concerning these or those objects and places of their infestation. I reply: Baldwin in book 3, chapter 7, case 2, collects these causes why specters are tumultuous and infest. 1. Because specters love places devoted to superstition. 2. solitary and uninhabited places. 3. Because certain children are disobedient, and injurious to parents. 4. Because certain men are tyrants and cruel. 5. Because in certain places many crimes are perpetrated. 6. Because certain bodies were left unburied. But all these things are contingent (although some for the most part) and can only generate conjectures and probabilities: both because the devil is a free agent; and because he is a simulator and impostor, who especially feigns and pretends that, which he least or not thus intends; and vice versa.

Problem 5. Whether for this reason it is permitted to inquire accurately and with care into the form, actions, sayings, effects of specters, the motives and causes of specters, so that we can be so much the better instructed concerning divine things or concerning human things both private and public, from their actions, effects, sayings, admonitions, predictions, and consequently look out for our own affairs and business so much the better. I reply: No. The devil is a liar. Therefore whether he says the truth or the false, whether he does something good (I understand materially, not formally; for in this way he always does evil), or something evil: that is to be left by us in the middle, and nothing thence to be determined to this or that part after deliberation, as to what we should do, or omit. Only in general his infestations and various arts are to be noted, and the mind is to be elevated to the grace of Christ, who has conquered the devil, and to the paternal providence of God. And this indeed is the counsel, as to human things. Concerning faith and divine things we have spoken above: and much less as to what is to be determined in those things from diabolical apparitions. Since we can never be certain in general concerning the apparition of a spirit, whether it is diabolical or divine. And concerning the apparition of specters it is certain, that they by their lies (the Papists themselves confessing) often want to persuade men, that they are Christ, or good angels, or souls of the just. We indicate that examples are to be sought above thesis 12; where also we cite the confession itself of the Papists concerning no certain discretion of spirits. And the Papal Exorcists know this best. See the writers of the Exorcistic art. Girolamo Maggi in his Miscellanies book 4, chapter 12, page 200 most candidly: The Emperors Theodosius and Valentinian in the book of new laws Title 5 say, that souls love the seat of the bodies left behind, and by I know not what lot of hidden reason, are gladdened by the honor of the sepulcher. Lactantius Firmianus in book 2 of

his Divine Institutes chapter 2 says that also in his own age it was commonly believed, that the souls of the dead wander around the tombs, and the remains of their bodies. But the specters and phantasms, which offered or offer themselves to be seen by night around sepulchers or cemeteries, were not, or are not, souls of the deceased, but Demons. Iamblichus in book 1 On the Mysteries of the Egyptians, segment 3, chapter 32, relates from Porphyry that a certain deceitful genus of Demons simulates the souls of the deceased, Gods, and Genii, which Iamblichus himself contends to be Cacodaemons, not good Demons. Philostratus also in book 3 On the Life of Apollonius of Tyana relates, that a certain Demon, who had slipped into the body of a boy, asserted that he was the idol of a man slain in war. Chrysostom in Homily 2 on Lazarus, on Luke chapter 16, and Homily 29 on Matthew chapter 8, says that some in his own age thought, that the souls of the slain became Demons, which nevertheless he himself denies to be true. But he says that the Demon endeavored to persuade this thing, so that he might stab and overwhelm the glory of the Martyrs, who died by a violent death, and so that he might impel malefactors to slaughter the tender bodies of many adolescents, with this hope indeed that they would turn out to be Demons, whom they would soon use as servants, and ministers. The same denies that the souls of the slain or even of those, who are given salvation, wander here. I also have seen not a few Demoniacs, in whom the unclean spirits when they were adjured by the priest, would lie that they were the souls of certain slain ones, and would bring forth their true voices, and certain secret things, and would pray that just things be done for themselves. Sibyl has more in decade 3, chapter 3, question 6.

Problem 6. Whether therefore it would not be permitted to ask from specters adjured or not adjured, of what sort and who they are, whence they come, what they want, etc. I reply: No. Since the devil is the father of lies, and since we neither want nor ought to learn anything true or good from him and through him, and that extraordinary gift of infallibly exploring the spirit has not been given to us. But see concerning this the disputation on Exorcism, and on Magic.

Problem 7. Whether necessarily all dreams or visions in sleep are to be referred to diabolical specters, or diabolical illusions, or diabolical dreams, and none to natural and prophetic dreams, and the admonitions of angels? I reply: If they are concerning future things, or secrets and things plainly unknown to us, or which we could not say and know by our own talent, art, and industry, and it happens just as it was predicted, and it has nothing evil (which we may know) mixed or adjoined, certainly if one is unwilling to reject them, in my judgment one can most safely leave the matter in the middle. See Melanchthon, Peucer, Manlius, and other disciples of Melanchthon, and Baldwin who want to refer these things to angels, and angelic protections. I would prefer that first certain criteria be investigated and established (if it can be done). For since these things happen rarely, and we have been warned that the devil transforms himself into an angel of light, I do not see that he sins against faith and piety who prefers to suspend judgment here, than to determine anything certain. But if those nocturnal visions contain nothing, except what the dreamer can attain by his own talent, art, and ordinary industry, certainly they are to be referred to natural and human dreams. But perhaps something is to be said elsewhere concerning dreams.

Problem 8. What is to be judged concerning panic terror? I reply: We have treated of it elsewhere in the disputation on Signs.

Problem 9. What concerning the confused terror sent to those waking by night or in solitude, which John Downham, a most diligent practical Theologian among the English, describes in volume 1 of his Christian Warfare book 2, chapter 1, which to certain men is the occasion of conversion: of which I myself once had the experience in a certain man immediately converted to the practice of faith, confession and religion? I reply: It is agreed that it is not to be referred properly to specters, that is, external ones whether καθ' ὕπαρξιν or ἐν ἐμφάσει: nor to nocturnal illusions in sleep, or to diabolical dreams; because it happens to those awake, or is first felt by those awaking. It is to be considered whether it is not to be referred to angelic motion; or to violence, and the extraordinary; or to a melancholic effect; or to the preparatory acts of actual repentance and faith, but proceeding from the regenerating spirit and the special grace of God: of which sort nearly Acts 16:29-30, although in this it differs, that the sight of a present miracle would precede this. I will determine nothing certain as yet, until I hear the judgment of others. Downham refers it to the temptation of the demon.

Problem 10. The same could be asked concerning nocturnal visions, through which someone warned betakes himself to repentance, and faith: of which Augustine has an illustrious example, in his On Care for the Dead chapter 12. I reply: Augustine in the same place refers it to the angels. And perhaps it is in some way similar to that apparition Acts 10, through which Cornelius was warned concerning the means of salvation. We suspend judgment for a time: until we will have seen it evinced by a compelling argument, that the devil can or wants in no way to propose anything good or true to men, and sometimes exhort them to it. Examples could be brought forward to the contrary from the Gentiles as to certain good things, to which their Gods, that is demons, were stimulating, and from the Papists, cited by us in The desperate Cause of the Papacy: if indeed faith is to be had by them in this part.

Problem 11. Whether one can rightly desert a house infested without one's knowledge, thus so that one is freed from the necessity of paying rent. I reply: Above thesis 5 it was asked whether in the court of conscience it is permitted to desert that house. But here it is asked, what is permitted in the external court, and concerning the price of the lease. It is Affirmed by the Jurists Covarrubias book 4 of his Various Resolutions chapter 6 number 7 with this limitation, provided that he intimated it to the lessor, with the key returned. The same is Affirmed by Charondas book 2 response 76, Diodorus Tuldenus on the Code book 4 title 65 question 13. Reasons are brought forward, Because he migrated from just fear of danger. And, Because on account of plague it is permitted to migrate. Gaill book 2 observation 23 number 7. This opinion seems to me to be more agreeable to Christian equity, than that of René Choppin, who in book 2 of his Sacred Polity chapter 7 absolutely Denies it, and says that it thus pleased the Parisian Senate. Whatever may be the case concerning his opinion, at least the reasons which he brings forward in the same place, do not compel at all. First, Because the fear is vain. I reply: It is not, as is agreed from this our disputation, and from experience: and surely such a fear can fall upon a brave man. Second, Or if something of the sort happens, they ought to impute it to themselves: for it is from the indignation of God agitating the wicked here by specters. I reply: The Minor is

unsound: for it agrees with the false hypothesis of the friends of Job, and of the disciples John 9, and is directly opposed to Ecclesiastes 9:2-3. Then the consequence is false: one can duly flee, or decline famine, the lacerations of wild beasts, piracy, robberies, wars, the snares of enemies, the bites of calumny, frauds, etc., although these and all other evils are sent upon men on account of sins. Let the reasons be applied here analogically, which are wont to be brought forward by theologians for the flight of persecution.

15. I had decided to add here historico-theological problems, to scripture, to ancient and new history: but because the typographical works are hastening, and all things could not be touched upon in three words; I am compelled to change my plan, content to have proposed one, to have only indicated the other.

Problem 1. What concerning the counsel of Luther in his Colloquies several times cited under the title on Specters, where he was persuading, that they should cast into the water a suppositious boy (namely a demon under the appearance of a boy) exceedingly troublesome to his putative parents and upbringing? I reply: In general it is not to be disapproved, as to the desertion or abdication, or flight from a boy of this kind. What he was persuading in particular, that they should cast him into the water, I think was in his opinion only an indifferent and arbitrary special mode of desertion or alienation or separation, and not as an amulet , or antidote of peculiar efficacy against the infestations and illusions of demons. As for me, I would judge that it would simply suffice, that they depart from the demon, or leave him to himself. But I add this, that nothing of the sort is to be attempted: unless it is agreed by certain indications, that it is a demon, and not a man: lest in some way homicide be committed. But that there were sometimes infants of this kind that were supposititious (in reality demons), which the Germans, and the Dutch call Wechsel-kinder, we have said that experience has taught, and some authors relate, in the disputation on Creation. And the outcome of the infant of Halberstadt (concerning which from Luther, Hondorf in his Theater page 142) cast into the water, demonstrated the same thing a posteriori. Nor does any solid reason seem to evince the impossibility of this thing. Let the reasons for incubus and succubus demons be brought forward here. But we exhibit the history itself described from the Theater of Hondorf and Lonitzer on precept 2, page 142. There was also such a monster in Dessau, which Martin Luther both saw and touched, when it was now twelve years old, representing a human offspring in all its features. Its only labor was to stuff itself with food, and indeed with as much as not even four robust threshers would consume, it was quite foul and unclean in ingesting and excreting food. If it was touched, it cried shamefully, again if anything was disturbed in the house, it raised laughter and guffaws. For which cause Luther then was advising the prince of Anhalt, that he should cast that diabolical spawn into the river Mulda flowing by. But neither the prince of Anhalt, nor the prince Elector of Saxony, who then was tarrying in Dessau, approved the counsel of Luther. Therefore Luther again warned, that it should be sought in the Church of Christians by assiduous prayers, that God would deign to take away that Satanic offspring. Which when it was done daily, in the immediately following year that offspring was extinguished.

In the year 1541, Luther made mention of this thing at Wittenberg at supper, where when it was asked of him, why he had been the advisor to the prince of Anhalt, to drown that filth in the

waters? He responded that he had altogether persuaded himself that spawns of this kind were nothing other than a mass of flesh devoid of a soul. For by the permission of God it is quite easy for Satan to form such a mass, just as on the contrary he destroys a man endowed with reason, indeed with body and soul, in that way, when he bodily possesses him, so that bereft of all senses, he neither hears, nor sees, nor touches, and is mute, deaf and blind. Therefore in those carnal masses Satan himself sustains the duties of the soul, whose power is immense, inasmuch as he even occupies our minds, much less our bodies, with God allowing that very thing to him. Let us not despise Satan, as one who is most skilled in even a thousand arts. From the reports of Luther.

Problem 2. What is to be determined concerning that spirit of Pressburg in Hungary from July 24 in the year 1641 all the way to June 29, 1642 appearing from purgatory to a certain virgin etc., of which admirable thing a narration was published by the authority and order of the Archbishop of Esztergom in the year 1643? I reply: Concerning this, because now we are hastening, we will opportunely inquire separately, or in the disputation on the Probations of spirits very soon, God willing.

ON THE ENERGUMENS.

Respondent: JAMES HOVE of Twisch-Batavia. On the 14th and 21st of October, 1637.

Some knowledge of this evil is useful to Philosophers, Physicians, Jurists, necessary to Theologians. Philosophers cannot complete their speculation concerning Spirits, unless they descend to these and their other operations. Physicians will not rightly distinguish between purely natural diseases, and poisonous ones, and also demoniac sufferings, nor will they institute their care by art, if they are plainly strangers in this knowledge: Lemnius in his Occult Wonders of Nature book 2, chapter 2, Valesius in his Sacred Philosophy chapter 15, 28 lead the way for them, where they inquire into this matter: especially Battista Codronchi in his peculiar book on Poisonous Diseases; to whom add, Weyer on impostures book 4, chapters 16-17, Cardano book 14 on the Variety of things chapter 76, Fernel on the hidden causes of things book 2, chapter 16. Jurists will not detect the deceptions and illusions of impostors, which occur very often, nor will they render to each his own from justice, unless they have tasted something of this speculation: not to say anything about understanding canon Exorcistica distinction 23, etc., "omni die" on Consecration distinction 5, if indeed the care of the Canon Law touches them. The diligence of the more erudite or at least the φιλοίστορες also plucks the ear of Ludovico Ricchieri who in book 2, chapter 13, and of Andrea Alciati who in his Parerga book 8, chapter 23, of Girolamo Maggi who in his Miscellanies book 4, chapter 32; of Jean Bodin, who in book 3 of his demonomania chapter 6, have annotated some things concerning these; and of Barthélemy Faye counselor in the Parisian Senate, who wrote a peculiar treatise whose title is "The Energumen". A not proletarian knowledge is to be sought here especially by Theologians; both on account of the places of scripture Matthew 4 and 8, etc., and others cited below: and on account of the reading and collation of the Councils, fathers and Canon Law, where mention of

them is frequently made: and finally on account of the common places and controversies concerning Exorcisms, miracles, the power of demons, the Temptations of the devil, his infestations and specters, Magic and superstition, etc. From the Papists Thyraeus treats of this matter in a peculiar treatise; with whom can be compared, Delrio in book 3 of his disquisitions, Raphael de la Torre in his tract on the power of the Church of coercing demons. The Exorcistic writers indicated in the disputation on Exorcism. To whom are to be added, the writers on demons, indicated in the disputation on Demons. From ours they do not thus occur, as far as I know, who outside the common places or commentaries on scripture, or the treatise on demons, or on Exorcism have explained this matter ex professo and absolutely. Therefore those are to be seen who by occasion of a deed or particular history, or in controversies, or in practicals treat something of the sort ἐν παρόδῳ, or even more fully. Of which sort are John Darrel in a peculiar little English book, containing a narration concerning seven energumens in Lancashire, and William Somers of Nottingham in the year 1600. Melanchthon in his Counsels cited below. Luther in his colloquies. Baldwin in his Cases book 3, chapter 3. We therefore will not do something irrelevant, if I. in general we set forth ὡς ἐν τύπῳ the doctrine concerning the Energumens and in particular concerning Lunatics, σεληνιαζομένοις etc. II. We respond to certain problems and cases.

1. Ἐνεργούμενος occurs in the said Dionysius the Areopagite concerning the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and signifies one vexed by a demon, or seized by a demon from ἐνεργέω to affect, to move thoroughly: whence demons vexing a man are called ἐνεργοῦντες, in the same place in Pseudo-Dionysius; in scripture δαιμόνιον and πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, by the Council of Elvira canon 29 an erratic spirit. And ἐνέργημα is the vexation of demons. In the same signification in Arethas in his commentary on Revelation ἐνεργουμένη, that is, possessed by a demon. Among Latin ecclesiastical and scholastic writers the use of this word Energumen has remained, although Beza in his notes on Matthew 4 restricts it to those possessed, who had already been received into the order of catechumens. The etymology of Alciati which he borrowed in book 8 of his Parerga chapter 23 from Ricchieri book 2, chapter 13 (as I think), as if ἐνεργόμενος from ἐνεργέω to operate, and ἔργω to shut in, whence also ergastula are named, seems alien to me. Its synonym is δαιμονιζόμενος and δαιμονιώδης, in Latin daemoniacus, Matthew 4:24 and 8:16, Mark 5:18 and 8:36, δαιμονισθείς which occurs in Matthew 15:22. And thus in the said canons of the Apostles canon 79, and in Photius in his Nomocanon title 1, chapter 15, and 3, chapter 13, etc. By Nicetas it is said δαιμονόληπτος in his Isaac Angelus book 1. It is also called Arrepticius, because it was suddenly seized by a Demon; which the Latin-Greek Onomasticon expounds as ἄρρητος. Isidore's Glosses expound it as a soothsayer, one raging. By the Greek Gentiles one thus seized and agitated is also called δαιμονῶν. Among the ancients by Justin Martyr in Apology 2 δαιμονιόληπτος. And by the Council of Ancyra canon 17 χειμαζόμενος. Moreover, one obsessus and possessus, in Greek κάτοχος who is held and possessed by a demon; whose synonym is δαιμονισθείς Matthew 8:27. In Syriac דיוא דאיוא daivono, the Arabic paraphrast of the New Testament circumscribes it: In whom is the devil, As also the Hebrew Interpreter of Matthew published by Munster.

2. But lest we labor in ambiguity, in what sense it is taken among sacred and ecclesiastical writers, it must first be distinguished, then defined. But it is taken either in a good part for the

afflatus, motion, operation, and efficacy ordinary or extraordinary of a good spirit, in which way Philippians 2:13, Colossians 1:29, 1 Thessalonians 2:13, Galatians 3:5, Matthew 14:1, 1 Corinthians 12:6, 13. Or in a bad part, for the motion and operation of an evil spirit and thus it is twofold either spiritual or corporeal. The former is, when the devil is said to possess and fill the minds and hearts of the impious, to come into them and operate in them, Acts 5:3, Luke 22:3, John 13:2, 2 Thessalonians 2:9, Ephesians 2:2. The corporeal is either mediate through purely natural things by applying agents to patients, or through Magic pacts and artifices, or Immediate, which is inferred immediately by the devil. Which again is either from without, and thus comprehends all the vexations brought upon man extrinsically by the devil, or from within, of which genus is the ἐνέργημα, concerning which we must now treat. But we define it as an affliction or vexation not natural brought upon man by the devil immediately and locally existing and operating within the body, and subduing it for a time. Therefore the requisites of this evil are 1. That it be a destructive or corruptive passion (as they call it), adverse to the body and its nature. 2. That it be in man as in a proper subject: not otherwise than an Eclipse is a passion of the moon. For concerning the entrance of a demon into brutes, and their seizure and agitation (of which there is an example Matthew 8), we do not here properly treat. 3. That it be from the devil alone operating immediately. 4. And indeed locally existing within the body, that is, that it not only be in the body, but within the body, which happens, when it operates within the terms of the quantity of bodies. 5. And there remaining as in its own domicile as it were, or at least exercising it. In default of the first condition, any local motion, by which the body is conveniently transferred from place to place by the devil without injury or pain, does not make one demoniac. In default of the second condition, brutes or vegetables or even cadavers of the deceased through which and in which the devil operates something, are not called energumens. In default of the third condition, those are not called energumens who are affected by some maleficium or venificium: this evil is indeed from the devil but not from him alone or immediately. In default of the fourth and fifth condition, not all those are energumens, whose bodies the devil violently seizes, throws down, strikes, wounds, or transfers from place to place. Thus for example, Job was not a demoniac; much less our Savior Matthew 4.

3. But that there is such a demoniac evil and such energumens is proved 1. from the testimonies of scripture Matthew 4:24 and 8:16, 28, 9:32, 12:22, and 15:22, Acts 8:7 and 19:12-13, Luke 4:32, 11:11. Because Christ gave to his disciples the power of casting out those ἐνεργοῦντας demons and liberating the energumens Matthew 10, Luke 9, Mark 16. III. Because certain effects in energumens must necessarily be reduced to the demon there existing and acting. But those are, speech in a tongue previously wholly unknown, revelation of things previously unknown, even absent and hidden, carrying and transferring of great weights and similar operations: which effects since they cannot be ascribed to nature or human industry and art; it remains that they are to be referred to a higher and supernatural and superhuman cause: but that is either God, or a good angel, or the devil. Not the former two, because blasphemies against God and piety, lies against the pious etc. are for the most part mixed with them, which are in no way from God or an angel. Therefore. IV. Universal experience both ancient and more recent in every genus, evinces the same. Add the consent of the fathers, Councils, and of our Theologians, of the Augsburg Confession and the Papists, as also of the writers of Commonplaces, of Casuists, and of those who have published peculiar treatises on this matter.

Among others, we now indicate, from the Papists Thyraeus on Demoniacs, and Raphael de la Torre on the power of the Church, Delrio in his Magical Disquisitions; From the Theologians of the Augsburg Confession Baldwin in his Cases book 3, chapter 3, from ours Casman in his Angelographia, Martyr in his Commonplaces part 4, chapter 9, and if there are any who besides him treat ex professo of Exorcism, as Aretius in his Problems second part page 637. Add Fulgosus book 9, chapter 12, to these Maggi, Ricchieri, Alciati, Valesius, Fernel and others just now cited, and various councils in Photius in his Nomocanon title 1, chapter 15, and title 3, chapter 13, etc. And the Council of Elvira canons 29 and 35. And the histories and authors cited below thesis 4. Let Theophrastus Paracelsus in most things ἄρρητος close the battle line in his seven defenses, defense 2. That there are still today those who dispute against this light of truth, Raphael de la Torre seems to intimate, whom I believe to be Atheists, or absurd Philosophers, or similar ones: from whom the Libertines and Semi-Sadducees of today are not far distant, who explode nearly all diabolical operations, because they do not grasp them or have not experienced them. Compare the disputation on demons, and on Specters. What in Italy partly they were thinking in the time of Cardano, he himself seems to intimate, in book 14 on the variety of things chapter 76, page 959, where after relating the history of 70 girls in the Roman orphanage, he thus speaks: But if anyone with a firm mind considers to himself that all such things are vain and full of deceits, he will easily smell out the trick. But who doubts that it is not vain to be seized by a demon or to be insane? Would that it were. If therefore this happened without trickery, it declares the wickedness of future times and Prelates: for just as an innocent age has passed into a most evil example, so those who ought to be set over religion, will be handed over to a wicked sense. Whence they will be not only execrated, exploded and derided, but also damned. And there are, who attribute all those things to natural causes, and the influences of the stars, or the deceptions and delusions of men and external things; they even go to demonstrate the impossibility of this thing by these little reasons. First, Because demons cannot be present within the images or idols of the Gentiles, therefore less in human bodies. They prove the antecedent from the gloss on Habakkuk 2:20. Second, when the rational soul is whole in the whole, and whole in any part; it follows that demons dwell nowhere in the body: both because they cannot be in the same place with the soul, and because their operations cannot consist there with the operations of the soul, otherwise they would be confused. Third, because to enter bodies to be in them, and to be cast out from there, denotes nothing other in scripture, than thus to operate there and to receive the power of thus operating, and to cease from operation. For if anything beyond is denoted, then obsession would also have to be attributed to good angels while they guard us, and to devils, while they tempt men inwardly or vex outwardly, or in whatever way they operate around men. Fourth, because demons cannot slip into the souls of men, nor be within them (for this belongs to God alone), therefore neither can they be within bodies or slip into them. Fifth, separated souls of the deceased cannot enter and possess the bodies of the living, therefore neither can demons. Raphael de la Torre in the place cited attempts solutions of these objections: we, with his responses dismissed, thus blunt them in three words: because they scarcely merit a response.

To 1. I reply: Deny the ridiculous and straw-like consequence; with the straw-like proof of the minor.

To 2. I reply first by Denying the consequence of the major. For since neither the demon nor the soul, are corporeal and quantified, nothing impedes why they may less subsist locally in the same body: although in a diverse way, the former as an assisting form, and external, in the mode of an adjunct and accidentally; the latter as an act or informing form, internal, and essential, in the mode of an incomplete essence and essentially. Second, As to the latter proof, from the absurd consequent because it would follow then that the operations of the demon and the soul would be confused; I reply: nothing of the sort is to be feared. The vegetative, and sensitive, and rational faculty operate locally in one brain: nor nevertheless are those operations confused.

To 3. I reply: It is denied by us as easily, as it is asserted by others. We add that the consequence of the subjected proof is inconsequent.

To 4. I reply: The consequence from the soul to the body is not valid. It is as much, as if one should say a demon cannot totally corrupt or kill the soul of a man, therefore neither the body.

To 5. I reply: The minor can be denied. For neither would this imply a contradiction, if having entered the body locally it moved it, and acted within it.

4. But what and of what sort this obsession is will become clearer, if we distinctly consider 1. the subject. 2. The efficient and final Causes. 3. The Adjuncts and effects. 4. Comparisons. 5. Opposites. 6. Parts, degrees, and species.

The total or adequate subject is man, and indeed immediately in the body, mediately and by sympathy in the soul. When we say man, we understand of whatever sex, age, condition. That infants, boys, girls are not immune from this evil, Jerome is witness in his letter to Paula on the death of Blesilla: What cause, he says, that often those of two or three years old and still sucking at their mother's breasts are seized by a demon? Cardano has a memorable history in book 15 On the Variety of Things chapter 16. That in Rome in the orphanage all the girls (in number about 70) in one night were made demoniacs, nor could any be cured through a whole biennium. And Bodin has another in book 3 of his Demonomania chapter 6 concerning 30 boys possessed at the same time in Amsterdam in the year 1556. Fernel also has one and another notable history in volume 2 On the hidden causes of things chapter 16. But besides the experience of the ancients and more recent ones, sacred history supports it, Mark 9:21, where someone is said to have been a demoniac παιδιόθεν, that is, from infancy. As for the conditions of men, great and small alike, learned and unlearned, just and unjust, Jews, Gentiles, Christians are liable to this evil. Concerning the Jews it is agreed from the Evangelists and Acts 19, and Josephus' Antiquities book 7, chapter 25, and from the fathers cited in the disputation on Exorcism, who at the beginning of the nascent Church boast that those possessors were frequently cast out by Christians. Let Ambrose's sermon 90 be seen, and the apologetic writings of Tertullian, Justin Martyr cited in the disputation on demons and on Exorcism. Here are to be drawn those things which occur concerning Pythonesses and those possessed among the profane writers. That this evil is frequent among the Japanese, and other recently discovered Nations, the Historians testify, and from them Sanchez in his commentary on Acts 19:13.

Concerning Christians, and among them the most holy, there is no reason why we should doubt, if only we apply analogically to this the text of 1 Peter 4:17-18, and the examples of Job, of that woman Luke 13:16, and of Paul 2 Corinthians 12:7. The partial primary subject is the principal viscera, organs of the natural and vital faculties, and of the interior and exterior senses, namely the heart, brain, stomach, lungs, tongue with the palate, larynx and other instruments of speech.

The efficient causes of this evil, the first and universal is God through efficacious and just providence, without which as no evil can befall man, so neither can any diabolical vexation, Job 1, Matthew 8:31-32 with 10:30-31. The particular and proper cause is the devil who is called the enemy and unclean and evil spirit in scripture, of whatever order or condition he may be: for scripture does not teach us any distinction. We therefore determine, that either one or more can possess a man from Mark 5:9, where mention is made of a legion, that is, 6000, and Luke 8:2, where of seven: and then those many can be said to possess the whole man and ἐνεργεῖν all and each evil as partial causes of one and the same motion, or total which stand for one; or we can conceive that each resides in proper and distinct parts of the body and there exercises their ἐνέργειαν by tormenting and torturing, or finally they can be said to be all indeed in all parts of the man, but that any operate diverse evils or in diverse ways so that this one constricts the viscera, another distends and tears them, another beats and bruises etc. In whatever of those ways we conceive this matter, no contradiction will be implied. The Pontifical Doctors here find, or rather introduce, many difficulties (See R. la Torre disputation 26) and that on account of the authority of Thomas part 1, question 52, article 3, where he asserts, that Many angels cannot be in the same place. What Tostado further inquires on Matthew 12, question 60, Thomas part 1, question 109, articles 1-2, concerning the order which demons observe in procuring the evils of men; and of what order the possessing demons are, and whether those of the lowest grade alone do this, with the others of superior order having been thrust down into hell (Thyraeus on Demoniacs part 4, chapter 12, La Torre disputation 27), that is not without its vanity, and with arguments largely fig-like it is fought on both sides, not a few things are also propped up by the revelation and testimony of demons. For us it will suffice to know that all demons conspire for the destruction and vexation of men, and diligently pursue them according to their powers, Matthew 12:25-26, Ephesians 6:12, 1 Peter 5:8, by tempting, possessing, infesting. But in what order, with which commanding this or that evil is inflicted here or there, scripture does not reveal; and consequently we prefer learnedly to be ignorant of that, than to learn it from the devil. But when we say the devil is the cause of this ἐνέργημα, we understand the cause in act, and indeed moving and operating by a twofold mode of causality, one of which is the motion of alteration, by which it produces a depraved complexion and diseases as for example lycanthropy, epilepsy, melancholy, phrensy etc. The other is local motion which it uses most or always in tormenting a circle, namely by excessively constricting the viscera, or dilating, or stirring up and evoking humors to the brain or other parts of the body, which motion depends on no corporeal disposition as a direct cause, or as an antecedent necessarily and a cause without which not.

The impulsive causes of this evil, the external ones are 1. in general the sin of men whether original or actual, or both: without sin the demon would have no power over men. Specifically, sins and crimes cannot thus be assigned, on account of which God especially sends this evil.

Examples and experience, from which the Papists construct rules, Thyraeus part 2, chapter 29, Raphael de la Torre disputation 21, are sometimes accumulated without judgment from scripture and history. We concede that sometimes, but not always, the peculiar flagitious deeds of the possessed precede: so that that of John 9:1-2 may stand. With which caution we receive the sayings of Augustine concerning the fault of the possessed in book 4 of The City of God chapter 32, book 10, chapter 22. II. The malediction and imprecation of men, which can be threefold, of the saints, of Magi, of the Profane or in whatever way sinning here. That the malediction of the Saints can be an impulsive cause we gather analogically from the malediction of Elijah and Elisha 2 Kings 1 and 2, of Peter Acts 5:4. Compare the disputation on Benedictions. What things are adduced concerning the tradition of Satan from 1 Corinthians 5 and 1 Timothy 1 admit another interpretation. That the command or request of Magi sometimes intervenes here, we would not want to flatly deny, for the nature of the magic art and maleficium persuades this, and the example of Simon Magus, if indeed Anastasius of Sinai says true things concerning him question 23. Fernel also has examples in book 2 On the hidden causes of things chapter 6 collected with the same book 1, chapter 11. And Bodin book 3 of his Demonomania chapter 6. Weyer endeavors to refute this in book 4, chapter 18, but led by no solid reason. Let him see on the contrary, if anyone has leisure, and this is of such importance, Baldwin book 2, chapter 3, case 2. In the meantime we are displeased with the proofs of Thyraeus chapter 6 deduced from the sayings of demons. Which Baldwin in the place cited does not seem to reject. We indicate the same thing, concerning the superior demons, who send the inferior ones; for which axiom Thyraeus thinks he has found an easy victory in the same place. We have learned this by the confession of many (namely of demons). But that the curses and imprecations of the Profane transgressing here have been punished by this evil in themselves, or in their children, the examples of those teach who are noted by the demon as having been bruised, carried off, beheaded, possessed, in the Theater of Hondorf and Lonitzer on the 2nd commandment. Add to them the example from Beza's 26th sermon on the passion: I know a certain head of a family in France to have been endowed with the knowledge of the truth and to have embraced the same, who when through anger he had devoted one of his sons to the Devil, suddenly his son having been seized by the Devil, from whom then although he was cast out by the ardent and assiduous prayers of the Church to God, nevertheless that youth scarcely restored to health was taken away a little after by death. III. The internal impelling cause is, the hatred of the devil against the human race, the affectation of dominion or at least of the shadow of dominion over man, the affectation of divine honor, which indeed obtained among the Gentiles both of old and even today, who vexed by him are accustomed to placate him with sacrifices and divine honors. Here the Question is moved; Whether they perceive joy, and some alleviation of punishments from entering men and how that saying of Matthew 8:29, Mark 5:7, 10, 12, Luke 8:31, 32 is to be understood. I reply with a distinction: 1. as ἐπιχαιρεκακία is rightly attributed to demons in general, so also this special joy, which nevertheless is slight and evanescent: because it is from evil, namely envy and hatred, and will turn out to their greater evil. 2. Their punishment and torment is nevertheless not alleviated, for wherever they are in hell, in the air, in the bodies of men or beasts, they always carry their hell around with them. Hence we see why the demons desired to remain in that region, and not to be sent away into hell, because they enjoy here not indeed a greater good in itself, or a greater alleviation of their punishment, but the vexation of men. Thomas goes nearly into this opinion 1 question 64, article 3, and R. de la Torre

disputation 24, where he also solves objections. The difficulty which he himself and the Scholastics cited in the same place move concerning infernal fire, how it in the air, or in the bodies of man affects demons by the punishment of sense equally as in hell, we relegate to the trifles and inanities of idle men. IV. The impulsive cause, or occasion, which the devil sometimes observes, is a melancholic or any evil complexion, which seems more suitable for certain mediate vexations and maleficia. There are no instrumental causes from the necessity of the acting devil; except when it sometimes pleases the devil as a voluntary agent to inflict torments, and instructions on man through certain sensible things, as fire, water, (Mark 9:22) poisoned or noxious minerals, plants, animals etc. There is no reason why we should recount the Final causes with respect to the vexing devil, since they can be gathered from the impulsive causes just now described. With respect to God sending them the common ones are, that by punishing the impenitent, chastising or proving the penitent, he may exercise the glory of his justice, mercy, power, and wisdom. More special ones, that from this we may know the power of those spirits, their indefatigable envy, anger, lust and endeavor of vexing, that we may abhor sins and their company; that we may flee to the protection of God; that we may learn what great thanks we owe to the father of mercies, if he has preserved us and ours immune from this evil hitherto; Finally that we may think the best occasion of mercy and beneficence towards those afflicted, and of contention in prayers for them, is here divinely prepared for us. Let the example of Mark 9:17-18, 22-24 be considered.

Problem 1. Whether it could be said with R. la Torre disputation 21, that energumens exist for this end, that the truths concerning spiritual substances, and the immortality of souls might be made manifest, nor are they so absurd, as indeed the Epicureans and Atheist Libertines think along with the Sadducees. I reply: I indeed piously think it can thus be judged. Compare below part 2, thesis 5, problem 8.

II. With the true causes of this evil having been set forth, certain capital errors around these are to be detected. There are therefore those who ascribe the cause of this evil. I. to the natural disposition of the body, as if that whole ἐνέργημα were melancholy or madness, or thence emanating: thus often maniacs, the furious and demoniacs are used as synonyms, but wrongly. Aristotle explains all the energumenic effects from natural causes in his Problems section 11, problem 27. For he seems to have acknowledged no portents, no demons. Compare what things have been noted here in the disputation on demons and on Specters. I do not know what Cardano wanted for himself with his dubitation, when in the place cited he says: the cause could have come from the disposition of the place, or from water; for water changes hairs and humors book 16, chapter 93, page 3098, man through evil and sordid thoughts, which come either from evil works or black bile, is made the seat and house of cacodaemons. Levinus Lemnius has something similar in his opinion On the hidden miracles of nature book 2, chapter 2, where he contends, that atrocious and violent humors extort foreign tongues from melancholics, maniacs, phrenetics. He underlays his disputation with these things: That the mind of man is imbued with arts before their use etc. and that our knowing is nothing other than remembering. I now find that formerly certain physicians ascribed the cause of this evil to natural causes. Photius in his epitome of Philostorgius book 8, chapter 10, praises the physician Posidonius under Valens: but whom under that name he reproves, because he was accustomed to say: οὐ δαίμονι τοὺς

ἀνθρώπους ἐκβακχεύεσθαι, that is, Men do not go mad by the force of a demon, but a certain cacochymy of humors works this affection, for there is no power of demons, which affects the nature of men with harm. Serarius, Delrio, Burgensis on 1 Samuel 16 want the entrance and exit of a demon to depend on corporeal dispositions. We touch on their opinion below part 2 in the problems. We confess indeed that sometimes it enters melancholic bodies, and observes that occasion of stirring up humors and disturbing the senses, yet in such a way that its ἐνέργεια is not bound to such a disposition: both because it is a free agent endowed with mind and will; and also because it can act and does act there for the most part through local motion, and not through the motion of alteration. With which caution having been applied, and not otherwise, we admit, what things Valesius chapter 15 and 28 and Conrad Wimpina On Superstition book 2, chapters 10-12, And Weyer On Impostures book 4 philosophize concerning melancholy and possession. II. Others attribute it to the influence of the stars, as those whom Jerome notes on Matthew 4, And Pomponazzi On the Soul, where he reduces that speech of an infant of 24 hours (which the commonly called Commentator refers to in Aristotle's Problems section 11, problem 27) to the influx of the stars, through which various images are imprinted on the phantasy. The same in his book On Incantations pages 124-125 determines concerning all ἐνεργητικοῖς effects, even concerning the prediction of futures. III. Andreas Cesalpino in his tract On the Causes of Wonderful effects (with Maggi citing him in his Miscellanies book 4, chapter 12) posits these three causes: the agent intellect, the celestial intelligences which are joined to man, and the juice of the body responding to the celestial disposition and certain stars. IV. There are those who say that the souls of the deceased enter and possess bodies. And reasons are wont to be adduced for this opinion. First, because they themselves often say this. Second, because separated souls have this power by means of motive power, by which they can move both themselves and bodies from place to place. But that power would be in vain, if it were not brought into act. Third, because they do artificial operations, which the deceased were accustomed to do, and not others. Fourth, because they reveal many secrets which only the men, whose souls they profess themselves to be, could have known. Fifth, They advise that many useful, and holy things are to be done, they seek suffrages so that they may be freed from these or those evils, they persuade the restitution of things taken away; but those things are not from the devil, therefore from separated souls. La Torre responds candidly and sufficiently to these reasons in disputation 28, forgetful in the meantime that by the same work and consequence he overthrows the apparitions of spirits counterfeiting that they are the souls of the deceased from which the Papacy has learned so many things as we have noted in The desperate cause of the Papacy book 2, section 2, chapter 10. Furthermore, how much the demons have profited by this lie, and how many various errors they have disseminated (as la Torre speaks), and how many they have driven into flagitious works, is agreed from the opinion far and wide creeping, by which devils are substituted for souls, or are confused with them. Ricchieri book 2, chapter 13 calls it the vulgar opinion, that bodies are possessed by the souls of the flagitious. Not only were the Jews inspired by this opinion, (Josephus book 7 of The Jewish War chapter 33,) but also Christians, Athenagoras, determines that the souls of the dead giants (concerning whom Genesis 6:1) have been transformed into demons, Justin Martyr in Apology 2, οἱ ψυχαῖς ἀποθανόντων λαμβανόμενοι καὶ ῥιπτούμενοι ἄνθρωποι, ὡς δαιμονιόληπτοι καὶ μαινόμενοι. Among the Gentiles the opinion was common that the souls of men, who had lived evilly, wander here and there and are transformed into demons. See Chrysostom on Luke

chapter 16 and Matthew chapter 8. Isidore book 8 of his Origins under the word Larva. Apuleius in his Apology part 1 and On the God of Socrates. Philostratus book 3 On the Life of Apollonius chapter 2. Plato in his Phaedo, on whom Olympiodorus thus comments: ἐπὶ τῶν φιλοσωμάτων ψυχῶν χωρίζεται μετὰ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ψυχῆς, εἰ μὲν ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ σώματος ἀλλὰ σχετικῶς ἔτι συνῆπται αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἀνάχυτον σχέσιν ἐξ ὧν καὶ τὰ σκιώδη φαντάσματα πολλοὺς τοὺς τάφους περιέρχεται ὡς καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς λέγει περὶ τῆς Πατρόκλου ψυχῆς· ὃν πότμον γοόωσα, λιποῦσ' ἀνδρότητα καὶ ἥβην. From the mind of Plato thus Macrobius book 1 on the Dream of Scipio chapter 9, where concerning the soul of the wicked: But neither after death does it easily leave the body, because corporeal pests do not easily depart: but either it wanders around its own cadaver, or seeks the habitation of a new body, not only human, but also that of a beast etc. Compare the disputation on specters and on demons. But all the opinions now recounted are refuted by the same arguments, by which we have proved above that there are demoniacs. We add these special arguments against the last opinion 1. Because they say and do those things for which separated souls do not suffice. For they say hidden things, which no one of men knew; nor even the deceased, whose soul they counterfeit themselves to be. They do things so difficult and admirable, which the human soul united never could, much less that it could do separated: which is worth less than united. 2. Then Because ἐνεργοῦντες spirits enter bodies locally and move them violently where they want, with the souls unwilling, which vivify and inform them: But souls are equal in essence and species; and an equal does not thus act with full victory on an equal, But if they are said to be unequal in power, then the united soul would be stronger which is in its natural being and receives its vigor from that mode of being. On the contrary the separated would be weaker, because it is outside its natural being, and holds itself only as a mover and assisting form. 3. Finally, Those souls entering bodies, would be of the just, or of the unjust. Not the former, because they are in heaven in the state of rest and glory: but to that state is repugnant that labor of wandering, and vexing, (Hebrews 4, Revelation 14); likewise the desire of tormenting often the most pious, and once in this life most dear to themselves. Not the latter, because in this life as scourges they have sufficiently persecuted their neighbor, and among them the truly faithful: that warfare is terminated by death, so that equally the evil cease to vex and the good to be vexed by them. Ecclesiastes 9, Job 3.

The Adjuncts of this evil can be conceived in the mode of a property, or requisite, or in the mode of effects and symptoms, or in the mode of signs. The Properties or requisites are 1. That the devils afflict and usurp power over the body and not over the soul, by force of this possession namely. For that mediately and by sympathy the soul is also affected by some sad or foul evil, and that many energumens are at the same time subjected to the spiritual power of the devil according to Ephesians 2:2, 2 Corinthians 4:4, this is per accidens. II. That they exist within the body and operate within the terms of its quantity, not within the soul, or the terms of its essence: because God alone can slip into it, and operate within it. III. That the power of the possessing devil which it usurps in the human body, denotes something permanent and more than a transient action: as is agreed from Mark 5:2, 8, Matthew 7:22, Luke 8:2, and 13:11, 16, 11:24, where the phrases of going out, being cast out, entering, of a domicile, of having, of binding are to be noted. But what that may be whether a quality, or a relation, or truly an extrinsic denomination, could be asked. We think that power, which the devil peculiarly claims for himself and usurps in this or that body, ought to be conceived as a relation, not otherwise than Pythonic

enthusiasms, or if it is right to use this similitude, as prophecy and the gifts of miracles. For that the devil remains continually in some body according to his substance for so many years (Luke 13:16, Mark 9:22) and is located there, or at least rarely departs from there which Thyraeus wants, part 1, chapter 8, and la Torre, does not seem likely to me. IV. That as long as the diabolical possession continues, the actual seizure and agitation of it does not equally continue: but the evil like a fever has its paroxysms, and intermissions, either because it does not always act; or because the devil is not always within the body or around it, and consequently does not operate there by local motion: for it is outside its sphere of activity. We do not deny, however, that it can be said that the devil even absent drives and torments the body of the energumen, not immediately but mediately, by means of some effect or symptom which it has impressed and left there. But the intermission and remission can be gathered from Luke 9:39. And behold the spirit λαμβάνει αὐτὸν etc. καὶ μόγις ἀποχωρεῖ etc. 1 Samuel 16 last verse can be compared. V. That by this very thing they are not informing forms of bodies, but only extrinsic movers or from without, (for neither are they of the nature or essence of the composite) and assisting forms (as they call them). VI. That therefore the actions, which they produce in the body are not natural, or animal, or human univocally so called, but equivocally only. For neither is that motion from the devil as an internal principle per se: as is agreed from the definition of Nature in Aristotle. The devil enters an unwilling man, and agitates him by violent motion, and uses his members. VII. Actions in energumens are certain ones proper to the devil, certain ones of the man, certain ones of both. Of the devil are transient operations; which are of two kinds. Of the first kind, wounding, distraction or compression of members, corruption of sensitive organs, debilitation of powers etc. Of the other kind, most swift running, ascent, breaking of chains, carrying of burdens above human powers etc. In all those the man holds himself passively, and his members only passively concur to them. Of the man are immanent actions as intellection, volition, as also sensation both internal, and external, to imagine namely to see etc. the former cannot be attributed to the devil according to 1 Corinthians 2:11 nor the latter, because they necessarily come from a corporeal organ, which demons lack. Speech as also howling, and roaring, laughter etc., can sometimes come from the demon Matthew 8:29, 31, Mark 5:7, 9, 10, and 9:25-26, sometimes from the man. But what certain ones doubt, whether demons can form articulate voices because perhaps they are ignorant of the mode, how this happens: they certainly reclaim against experience and the authority of scripture. See Genesis 3:1-2 and there the commentators. But the demon puts forth speech in a threefold way (as Tostado observes on Matthew 8, question 114) either by assuming and applying bodies, which altogether lack the organs of speech; or by using the animate instruments of brutes, as the tongue and mouth of an ox, or an ass, or a parrot; or by using human organs. But those men are living, or long since or recently dead. That it can speak through the bodies of the former, has already been said; that it can in no way through the latter, because the temperament of the organs has been totally dissipated; that it can imperfectly and impededly speak through the bodies of the latter la Torre affirms Disputation 19. We nevertheless by no means believe this. For if in assumed aerial bodies, if in the Dodonian oak etc., it forms speech, why not in a body? But the question is whether and how the speech of a man can be discerned from the speech of a devil. Tostado in the place cited wants these five signs especially to be attended to. 1. if the demoniacs speak things which they do not know, and never learned, as for example in Hebrew. 2. if concerning things most high, which exceed their capacity. 3. If after they cease to be vexed, they do not

know to respond concerning these things, which they spoke. 4. If they speak concerning secret things. 5. If it is not in their power, that they be silent; although they are induced or compelled to this. In common speeches, in which nothing admirable is present, no certain discretion can be established, nor is it even necessary. It suffices that the energumens be warned conditionally, if they themselves have emitted certain blasphemous, or idle words, that they seriously repent of them; but if not, that they patiently bear this injury brought upon God and themselves by Satan: that his actions will by no means be imputed to them. The testimony of the energumen alone will have to be stood by here. VIII. It is not necessary that they possess and afflict men in a corporeal form, or appearance. For since corporeal things are immediately subjected to spiritual powers, so that they can be moved locally by them, a body, or appearance of a body would help nothing here: Although we do not deny that the devil according to his free will can sometimes appear under some corporeal appearance, for example of a spider or fly etc. under or over the tongue, or in some other part of the body. The conjectures which Thyraeus brings forward part 1, chapter 3 are uncertain and vain. That the demons unwillingly and compelled by God assist them in that vile form so that they may be confounded etc., of which I would say no light argument (certainly most light) is that for the most part, he says, in exorcisms alone, they betray their presence by these things etc. and chapter 16, that they lie hidden in some part of the body namely in the heart, or not far from the heart, or even in the four humors etc. To confirm which thing he calls upon a most vain Exorcism from the Ritual, by which it is commanded to the devils that they not hide themselves in the four humors, in the flesh, bones, sinews, marrows etc. IX. The antecedents of this evil are sometimes 1. words and buffetings, agitations, by which it seizes them, throws them down, bruises them, prostrates them etc. 2. terrible apparitions under the form of the deceased, or of a dragon, and of other horrible brutes, or of a black cat, or he-goat etc. by which those to be possessed are vexed: of which also the Roman Sacerdotal makes mention chapter 1 in the Exorcisms. 3. the sound of winds, the noise of bolts collided, or dragged through the earth. 4. terrible dreams. X. Sometimes with this evil, others are also conjoined, namely desertions and spiritual temptations; likewise diseases, specifically melancholy, mania etc. as Matthew 8 (which we will soon number among the effects); moreover external vexations, apparitions, and diabolical terrors. XI. That the condition of ἐνεργούμενοι is miserable, indeed compared to any other evils of the body, it is most miserable. Directly many evils to the body (concerning which a little after); indirectly and consequently not a few are brought upon the soul. Besides the pain of mind, sin is more inclined to them by this occasion, they are impeded in many acts and exercises of virtues. Yet all things are so governed by the most merciful and most wise father, that it turns out to the good for those who love him, Romans 8:28. XII. That God places a mode and measure on this power of Satan over man; nor allows it to rage according to its pleasure Luke 4:35. Now follow the adjuncts considered in the mode of effects. The Effects and symptoms can be reduced in general to these five kinds, Weakening of powers, distraction or constriction of members, impulse or propulsion of the body, corruption of organs, fascination of fantasy. But more particularly for the sake of better doctrine we thus enumerate I. That they agitate and distend the members of the body Mark 9:20, 26, propel them into solitary places and sepulchers Mark 5:3, Matthew 8:26, Luke 8:27, cast them into water and fire Mark 9:22. They torment men with hidden and exquisite tortures Matthew 15:23. II. That they deprive them of the use of the senses and of locomotion Luke 11:14, hence the rigor and stupor of the members. III. That they change and deform the form, figure, position and bearing

of the body, Luke 13:16, Mark 9:20, here refer inflations and tumors. IV. That by disturbing the humors and suggesting or presenting various phantasms they corrupt the imagination and drive men into rage and madness Matthew 8. V. That they impel men to bring death upon themselves, or they themselves cast them into dangers of death, sometimes also cruelly extinguish them. Of the former there is an example Mark 9:22. Of the latter Isidore and Sigebert adduce in his Chronicle, concerning Gunderic king of the Vandals, who was slaughtered by a possessing demon. VI. That they harm other men whether domestic, or spectators, or any others whom they themselves seek, or into whom, given the occasion, they run; to them they bring blows, wounds and even death. Matthew 8:28, Mark 5:3-4, 6, Acts 19:16. The same is to be understood concerning the beasts, which they enter, from Matthew 8:1-32. Not because they primarily and directly intend this and seek such domiciles, but so that they may inconvenience men by this reason. VII. That they arouse horrendous clamors roarings, howlings, foamings, gnashing of teeth, and other uncouth and enormous gestures. Signs are assigned twofold of entrance or possession, and of exit or liberation. Thyraeus distinguishes the signs of entrance from the signs of indwelling or possession and after his fluctuations and conjectures at length brings forward these from the Roman Ritual chapter 1 on Exorcisms: 1. the external form by which it terrifies the man to be possessed 2. wind and tumult. 3. the affliction and trouble, by which it previously affects him. 4. the admirable appearances of things which it suggests to the dreaming one before. Baldwin has the same things in the book and chapter cited, case 1. But it is uncertain whether these things for the most part precede entrance and possession. Baldwin is not consistent with himself when in the place cited page 618 he thus speaks: Although however it is not so easy to recognize one truly possessed: nevertheless certain signs of this thing can be given. First it has been found, that the devil himself sometimes shows by certain signs his entrance into the body of a man, which indeed is not of necessity, therefore neither always happens, nor can certain and definite signs be given, nevertheless he does this when, and as often as he wants: in which matter, as in many others, he may be the ape of God: for he too sometimes announces his advent by certain forerunners, as among other things the history of Elijah testifies, 1 Kings 19:11. Let us therefore bring forward and select from scripture and experience (with the Papists hitherto cited and Baldwin and John Darrel testifying) signs of possession which seem to make greater certitude, which Baldwin calls, consequent to possession. But they are these: I. The revelation of hidden things past, present, future; and indeed without any honest cause, for the most part to the reproach of God and the injury of neighbor, Acts 16:16-17. 2. Of foreign tongues, to these of singing, writing, reading, of things, and of disciplines acquired by no study. See the examples noted by Baldwin. 3. The carrying of burdens which surpass all human strength, swift and strong agitation or removal of bodies. Mark 1:24 and 5:5, 15, Luke 4:24 and 9:39, 42, yet for the most part in such a way, that the legs, and other bones, or system of the body is not broken Luke 4:35. 4. The admirable weight of the energumenic body, and the rigor and inflexibility of the same. 5. The voices of oxen, pigs, bears. 6. Grave vexation inwardly in the viscera parts of the body Matthew 17:15 and 15:22. 7. That they are afflicted immediately before the dispossession, or exit of the demon Luke 9:42, 8, Mark 5:7. 8. That they are afflicted not rarely but often by the devil. Luke 9. 9. The cessation of the senses both internal and external and of locomotion Luke 8:27, 35, Mark 1:24. Thus certain ones are mute, deaf, blind etc. they fall on the ground etc. 10. That they are cast into water and fire, and they themselves strive, or rather the devil strives to kill them; sometimes he kills;

II. That sometimes terrible apparitions accede: 12. sudden swelling of the belly or other parts. 13. Deformation or disfiguration of the face. 14. Speech, which happens with the mouth opened without the organs of speech. Thyraeus on the possessed part 2, chapter 25 says there are six kinds of corporeal signs, which generate great suspicions, but nevertheless are not certain and indubitable. Chapter 22. He rejects Twelve other signs, as uncertain. Chapter 26. he reviews holy things, which the possessed are ordered to bring forth, or which are applied to them when they are silent, of which sort are the invocation of the divine name, the pronunciation of the name of Jesus (which Baldwin also places in the case cited §7), the recitation of a psalm or of some pious prayer: Or when they rail at, are terrified, become impotent, blaspheme, as often as the images of the saints, Agnus Deis, crosses, holy water, the body of Christ is applied to them: or when they do not bear to be whispered into the ear in a foreign tongue, which they know, Thou hast forsaken the God who begot thee; and Thou art unmindful of the Lord thy creator: Finally, if they do not bear, or bear impatiently, the exorcisms threatened. But these signs are either uncertain, or vain and superstitious. As for the twelve signs placed above, and fortified by texts of scripture, they are not Τεκμήρια by the admission of Thyraeus himself chapter 22 §277. I add, that neither are the signs themselves, which are found in those Possessed, of whom the Evangelical history makes mention; certain and sufficient arguments of possessed men. Certain of them were blind, others deaf, others mute: certain ones were cruel to themselves, certain ones to others, Those seemed to be the works of the possessed, but they were not signs of the possessed, unless perchance we want to call back to the class of the Possessed all blind, mute, and deaf: likewise all barbarous, and cruel men. And to Baldwin in the case cited at the end page 612. These are the principal signs of the truly possessed: but since some can also be found in epileptics, lethargics, phrenetics and similar ones, therefore it is better, when a judgment is to be made concerning the possessed, that it not be judged from individual ones, but from some conjoined, for it is not necessary that all and each always concur. But neither all the signs of Baldwin taken together, nor of Thyraeus, which correspond to the first, second and third recounted by us, evince the certitude of possession: but well someone demoniac, whether of an assisting or appearing demon, or of a possessing one. They are therefore proper those which can and are wont to befit a possessing demon, but not to it alone; if indeed you understand possession strictly taken and defined above. Therefore sure signs of possession ought not to be sought from here. For what John Darrel on page 2 of the little English book just now cited takes to himself, and presupposes, That a demon extrinsically assisting or infesting cannot thus torment the human body, and thus rule and move it member by member and internally; I think that is a λῆμμα too μέγα which is first to be solidly proven. The remaining signs less evince, if those three can be called into doubt. The author John Darrel himself enumerates these signs of departure and liberation. 1. That it tears apart. 2. That it goes out crying. 3. That the energumen after the exit lies like one dead. 4. That they feel something go out from them. 5. Vomiting. But these are not reciprocal, and so neither certain signs.

8. Things compared to this evil, yet specifically distinct from it, and by no means to be confused with it, are both certain affections of the body or of the interior and exterior senses, and other diabolical operations. The former are lycanthropy, Apoplexy or blasting, paralysis, carus, syncope, catalepsy, lethargy, hysteric passion or uterine suffocation, melancholic delirium, with

mania, phrenitis, and paraphrenitis, hydrophobia, Corybantism, the bite of the tarantula or the dance (as he calls it) of St. Vitus. Especially and most closely agree noctambulation, the Ephialtes, and epilepsy or the comitial disease, which are therefore often confused by the imprudent with demonic ἐνέργημα. But what specifically and of what sort those natural diseases are, is to be learned from Fernel book 5 of his pathology chapters 2, 3, 12, and book 6, chapter 6, and from Sennert, or other Physicians: so that possession may be more accurately distinguished from them. Concerning corybantism I do not find it in Sennert, and other common physicians, who indeed are at hand to me. In the disputation on Creation I indicated the polyhistors Scaliger and Salmasius. To whom I now add Alciati book 4 of his Parergon chapter 19. Concerning noctambulation, Horstius etc. are indicated in the same place.

Diabolical operations are either around man, or around other things. Around man they are mediate or immediate. The former, which happen through Magi or applications of natural causes are called fascinationes, maleficia, veneficia and poisonous diseases, among which are wasting diseases, unnamable torments, impotence for generation etc., wounds, fracture of members, dislocation etc. The latter are those which are brought upon man immediately by the devil not possessing inwardly bodily, but assisting extrinsically and infesting either internally, or externally. Internally, diabolical temptations, Suggestions and injections, concerning which we must treat in the Disputation on Temptation. To these add Enthusiasms, seductions to errors, sins etc. 2 Corinthians 4:3-4 and 11:3, Acts 5:3, Luke 22:3. How spiritual Desertions differ from demoniac possession we have said in the Disputation on Desertions. Externally are brought, addresses, local motions, translations, seizures, blows, wounds, bruises etc., apparitions, terrors, and any corporeal and sensible diabolical infestations. Concerning which: in the Disputation on Specters. To these exterior operations we refer the circumgestations of cadavers, and motions and operations in them: Of which memorable examples are at hand in the psalteress virgin of Bologna (concerning whom Peucer on Divination page 14), and in that student table-companion of Cornelius Agrippa killed by a Demon (in the memorables of Pierre Boaistuau Launay, and Delrio book 2, question 29, section 1). Here also pertain familiar or attendant Spirits, who enclosed in glass or a ring (as indeed they pretend) or in any other mode and form attend a man, or evoked are at hand, by whose work men learn and do, what things surpass inferior nature and human art. Concerning which in the Disputation on the Power and operations of Demons.

Diabolical operations around other things, which may have some kinship with possession, are either around artificial things, among which stand out the walking, speaking statues of the Magi and Idolaters, speaking brazen heads, in which demons were sitting or assisting, concerning which we annotate something in the Desperate cause of the Papacy book 1, section 4. Selden is to be seen on the Syrian Gods, essay 1, chapter 2. Of the same kind were the oracles of images in the Papacy, nominally of that wooden crucifix, whose words to Thomas Aquinas are reported to be these: You have written rightly concerning me, Thomas. Or around natural things, from the mineral and vegetable kingdom, as for example the Dodonian oak, and those trees (if I remember well) from which among the Nations of the new world the Devil is said to give responses: from the animal kingdom, when the devil possesses brutes, or sits upon them, or assists them, and acts in them, speaks etc. Genesis 3:1-3. The things are known concerning the

dog of Simon Magus, concerning the ape of Christopher Aurigarius etc. Similar examples can be adduced from the books of prodigies. It will have sufficed now to have indicated that of Virgil Georgics 1 at the end: "And the cattle spoke"; and the history (which la Torre has page 145), concerning the parrot of a certain Cardinal at Rome, from which when the Pope asked, "what do you think?", it responded: "I have thought upon the days of old and the eternal years I have had in mind" (the words are of Psalm 77:5). By which when they were dismayed, the Cardinal afterwards took care that his parrot, which he had held so much in delights, be killed. And another, which Juan Luis de la Cerda indicates concerning the Excellence of the celestial spirits chapter 46, page 489, concerning a raven, which full of a demon was doing and speaking wonders.

9. To the sound doctrine concerning the possessed are opposed I. false opinions, perverse judgments and deceptions. II. A False method of curing or alleviating this evil. III. To the evil itself are opposed true and salutary antidotes. False opinions are, when it is denied that there are possessed, or all that is ascribed to other causes, than the devil, concerning which above. To these add, when it is thought, that all that can be taken away through a purge of black bile and similar medications, Conciliator and with him Pomponazzi on Enchantments page 141, where he endeavors to prove this by examples. Besides, that dream of certain ones, concerning the Devil to be restrained through corporeal things; among them is flagellation, which is also testified to be applied to phrenetics by Bodin in his Theater of nature page 612. But concerning these and other things we have treated in the disputation on Exorcism. Finally the delirium of the same Pomponazzi, concerning the suitability of certain men and the gift of heaven (as he speaks) through which they cure this evil by a certain magnetic reason. On Enchantments page 242. Compare Delrio book 1, page 14. Perverse judgments both of physicians and of Theologians. The former often are deceived here, while they judge it a natural disease and as such cure it, but in vain, with experience as witness, and the physicians Weyer book 4 on impostures chapter 17, and Fernel on the hidden causes of things book 2, chapter 16. The latter, namely the vulgar Theologians in the Papacy are the causes of infinite fallacies, while they number nearly whatever unusual thing and unheard of evil by their ἀπαιδευσία and ἀπειρία among energumenic things or veneficia. Deceptions here are all too frequent, when many feign themselves possessed when they are not. Hence it is that once in the Sixth General Council, at Constantinople, a decree was established against such, canon 60. Weyer has examples book 4, chapters 26-27. The papal synagogue is especially infested with those fallacies according to the text 2 Thessalonians 2:10-11. Both Clerics and their laity deceive and are deceived: and one fallacy there thrusts another, namely of superstitions, idolatries, Magic etc. We have spoken concerning the Tragic-Comedy of Martha Brossier agitated among the French in the Disputation on Exorcism. There exists and is in the hands of a learned man a little book previously (but by what author I know not) published, concerning the falsely possessed, and false fasts. But it has not happened to see it. I indicate it nevertheless, so that those who are curious investigators of these things may inquire after it. Here ought to be referred, the absurd and inept narrations, concerning certain possessed, which are wont sometimes to be published in the Papacy, such as for example concerning Three energumens at Paris; concerning the nun possessed by Johannes Fery and afterwards liberated at Mons in Hainault in the year 1584, which by order of the Archbishop of Cambrai was published at Douai by Johannes Bogardus, in French in octavo.

Among ours most rarely do such impostors appear, because they would make no reward for their work, besides stripes, and brandings; which that woman experienced, who some years ago at Amsterdam for the sake of lucrative alms for a long enough time and artificially feigned herself demoniac: whose history with the miracles of St. Raspin de Ergasterio an Anonymous one published in the native tongue.

II. We have touched upon the perverse method of curing this evil, magic, Jewish, Pagan, Papistic in the Disputation on Exorcism. We now add, the pilgrimage to St. Dymphna, and the adjunction of the possessed to her shrine where she is worshipped in the village of Geel in the territory of Bois-le-Duc in Brabant, because she is believed to be the peculiar patroness of energumens, indeed also of maniacs and similar ones moved in mind. Augustinus Wichmans also makes mention of her in his Marian Brabant, book 2, chapter 6, he says that she is worshipped not only throughout Brabant but throughout the universal church and hears "Demon-scourge", and "whip of the devil" and that deservedly of her guarded virginity. Compare concerning the same Surius in his lives of the saints on May 15, And Molanus in his Nativities of the saints of Belgium. Wichmans in the place cited attributes a similar power to St. Agnes: especially also to the Blessed Mary to whom in this name there is a concourse of people in the hospital of energumens in the village of Herenth. He adds page 275: And therefore mother Church in the Exorcisms of energumens, first and most powerfully implores the aid of the most holy Mother of God, with her sacred Litanies, which are accustomed to be said at Loreto, having been premised in the ordinary way, and all the mysteries of her life having been recounted. Which special prerogative, I think was also conferred on the Blessed Virgin Mary, in view of that exceptional virginity of hers, which she first of all consecrated to God by a vow, called the Virgin of Virgins, and who in virginity

"Neither first like her, has been seen, nor to have a follower:"

so that namely she may prevail most of all against the devil, who is a most unclean spirit, a sworn enemy of all virginity and purity and a perpetual instigator to lust. Whence also most of the Saints, who are endowed by God with the singular privilege of casting out unclean spirits, have shone forth peculiarly in chastity and virginity: finally I would not want to pass over the pseudo-medical method of Paracelsus, which he himself boasts in the tract whose title is Seven Defenses, defense 2, page 25: "Tell me, I ask, does medicine consist only in herbs, roots, woods, stones, and gems? is plainly nothing to be attributed to words? and after this also, I will speak my opinion concerning the word. For what is it, that the word cannot effect? Of what sort the disease is, of such sort also the medicine: if it is entrusted to herbs, then it is cured by herbs: if it is destined for gems, then it is also healed by gems: if the disease is ordained to fasting, then it is necessary that it be taken away through fasting. That someone is possessed by an evil Demon, is the utmost evil and the worst disease. But if Christ promises and exhibits a remedy, and medicine against such a disease, why would I not investigate that medicine, so that I might know what is in the disease, and what is contained in the prescriptions? Heaven brings diseases to man, the physician drives them away: if heaven itself is compelled to yield to the physician? therefore also Satan, therefore also evil demons will yield, if the medicine is rightly and justly ordained." Melanchthon in his Counsels volume 2, pages 115, 117, 118, where he

treats of energumens. But he seems even today to concede to ordinary ministers the command or power over possessing demons and consequently to approve the use of Exorcism. But concerning this in the disputation on Exorcism.

III. Therefore the true antidotes, as against all the evils of this life, so against those seizures of demons, are the spiritual practice of repentance, faith, prayers etc. Ephesians 6:12-14, 1 Peter 5:8-9. No natural ones can be applied, because they avail nothing against demons; except indirectly against diseases, symptoms, wounds, plagues, and other effects left by the possessing devil. Thus it is permitted for example, when melancholy has preceded possession, or follows from it, which is observed to happen for the most part by Weyer in the place cited, to attack it medically; it is permitted to cure inflicted wounds, to restore a dislocated leg, to soothe with lenients the pains arisen from constriction or dilation and extension of the members (in nearly the same way as the pains of one giving birth or of one who is tormented on the wheel or the rack). Which we judge to be rightly inferred from 1 Samuel 16 last verse. But concerning this question in the disputation on Exorcism. What things remain concerning the division and species of this evil, we reserve for the other Part of the Disputation along with some problems.

ON THE ENERGUMENS, SECOND PART.

Respondent: ANDREW DEMETRIUS of Dordrecht. On the 26th of October, 1637.

1. Energumens can be variously distributed. I. from the subject both total, and partial. And they are infants or adults; faithful, or infidel, pious, or impious; healthy or diseased, for example melancholics, maniacs, epileptics etc., men, or women; Magi, contracting of course, procuring for themselves possession, and that for predicting wonders; to whom are opposed those who innocent, or at least unwilling suffer possession, etc. II. From the principal efficient cause, some are possessed by one demon, others by many; who again are divided by the diverse operation of many (concerning which we have treated in the former part); some possessed by a worse devil, others by a less evil or at least less maleficent one, from Matthew 12:43-45, Luke 11:26. Here refer the divisions from the impulsive cause, or instrumental, or occasion. Thus some are cursed through legitimate, or illegitimate malediction: others fascinated, or evilly-artificed etc. Seek other divisions according to the impulsive, and instrumental causes from the things above. III. From the end or intention of God, some are possessed to punishment and vengeance, others to paternal chastisement, both so that the glory of God may be manifested in them. IV. We will not pursue divisions from the adjuncts and effects, since they can easily be taken from the things already said. We only note here three species, concerning which a few things are to be said, namely lycanthropes, Pythonesses or ἐγγαστρίμυθοι, lunatics. V. From circumstances of time; 1. some for a long time indeed from infancy, others for a shorter time. 2. some by a paroxysm of seizure more frequently or more rarely recurring, and the same lasting longer or more briefly are possessed. 3. some are seized only once or twice: Of place; some are solitary and more wandering, tarrying in deserts, woods, caves (such as that one Matthew 8), others remaining in the society of men.

2. As not all energumens are lycanthropes, so neither are all lycanthropes energumens. For some labor under a mere natural melancholic delirium; concerning whom the Physicians; Others moreover suffer a disturbance of phantasms, by the devil operating extrinsically, so that they imagine, that they imitate certain lupine things, which meanwhile Magi through the devil, or the devil himself perpetrates. Others suffer the same deliriums and disturbances of phantasms and seizure by the devil operating intrinsically and possessing, and extrinsically abusing their body to certain inhuman actions, namely the bite and destruction of men, or beasts of burden. And these threefold lycanthropes are innocent. There are also others distinct from them, namely noxious ones, who with a pact entered into with Magi, or immediately with the devil through impostures seem to assume a lupine form, and in it exercise lupine savagery towards men or beasts of burden. Concerning whom we have treated in the Disputation on Demons. Only the third species pertains here, which is an adjunct and peculiar effect of certain ἐνεργουμένων. Valesius chapter 28 thinks, and rightly in my judgment, that the demoniac of Luke 8 and Matthew 8 was from their number: his words are: From this narration it will easily be agreed to anyone, who has tasted medicine even with the highest lips, that this man labored under that species of mania, which is called by Physicians Lycanthropy, or lupine madness. For this disease is defined especially by these accidents, that those thus affected cannot be contained at home, but frequently wander around sepulchers. There are also ἐνεργούμενοι from the adjunct, some prophetic, others not prophetic. The former are called such, not because the possessing devil divines in them alone (for concerning absent things, or hidden past things, or futures if not for the most part at least sometimes he is wont to chatter in any energumens); but because in them more, than in others, ex professo, from institution, and by a certain and composed form and species of divining he does this, and thus constitutes there a workshop of divinations. And these are wont to be called pythons, and female pythonesses (Acts 16 it is circumscribed, a pythoness: γυνὴ Πύθωνα), whose synonym is ἐγγαστρίμυθοι ventriloquists Deuteronomy 18:11 etc., by synecdoche of species, because the Hebrew אוב (as if to say, a wineskin) is transferred to the cited place and Leviticus 19:31 and 20:6, 27, 1 Samuel 28 etc. And there is also another synonym, γρυλλοι concerning whom see Peucer in his book on divination page 258 last edition. But the word Πύθων in Hebrew אוב can be taken broadly by synecdoche of genus, either for every diabolic or magic art of divining, 2. or for the spirit itself, that is for the πάρεδρος spirit assisting or possessing, through whom they divine. You can apply either signification to 1 Samuel 28:8. 3. or, for the man himself through whom the devil, or who through the devil divines. Strictly it can be taken 1. for him who has a familiar divining spirit; who may respond to one consulting. 2. for him who has extrinsically sometimes assisting, and approaching; by whose access, and afflatus he may divine. 3. For him who affected by an internal rapture of the spirit, and diabolic enthusiasm divines. Concerning diabolic, and divine rapture, and their distinction from each other, see in the disputation on prophecy. 4. For him who willing and through the provocation of a magic pact and incantation is corporeally possessed by a divining devil, and is seized to divine. 5. For him, who unwilling suffers the possession, seizure, and diabolic enthusiasms conjoined with it, and divinations. The two last species pertain here, because they contain in themselves ἐνέργημα properly so called. We think such Pythonic energumens to have been those mentioned by the ancients Corybantes, Bacchantes, Maenades, Sibyls, Colophonians, Trophonians, Soractine Gentile priests among the Indians: or

if some fables are mixed in here, that they had occasion from such diabolic raptures, possessions, agitations, and prophecies: although it can be said with difficulty, which species of Pythonism had place in each. But concerning Enthusiasms, Pythons, Sibyls etc. elsewhere. Meanwhile let those who desire these things see Macrobius book 4 of his Saturnalia chapter 2, Peucer on Divinations page 259 and those who after him have gathered on the same things; Girolamo Maggi in his Miscellanies; the Sibylline Oracles with prolegomena and notes of Obsopœus; Delrio in his Magic Disquisitions book 4, Reynolds in his prelections on the apocryphal books; Selden on the Syrian Gods essay 1, chapter 2, Battista Codronchi on Poisonous Diseases book 3, chapter 8, Ulrich Molitor, who wrote dialogues on Pythonesses but whom hitherto I have not been able to see; and others noted in the disputation on prophecy.

4. Lunatics in Matthew 4 σεληνιαζομένους in Hebrew בני ירח in the Hebrew gospel published by Munster, Hutter translates בני לבנה sons of the moon. In Syriac בר אגרא, which Tremellius translates "son of the fields"; Fuller, "those who live outside houses": against whom Ludovicus de Dieu disputes on Matthew 4 and wants it translated "son of a roof", as if you should say, "loving roofs", "addicted to roofs": for this, he says, is proper to lunatics or noctambulists, while they sleep, to rise, and like cats to climb the roofs of houses. But just as he thinks Fuller hallucinates, because he confuses the lunatic of Matthew 4 and 17 with the demon-possessed maniac: so I think the noctambulist is not rightly confused by him, with the lunatic epileptic. Let the Physicians only be read concerning each affection. I think it has never been heard that by epileptics equally as by Noctambulists roofs are climbed. Whatever may be the case concerning the Syriac interpretation, at least it is agreed that lunatics are expressly distinguished from demoniacs in Matthew 4. Hence a doubt could be moved, whether an evil is intimated composite from supernatural and natural; or whether it is simple either demoniac, or natural, namely the comitial disease. The latter opinion is embraced by Cl. Heinsius in his exercitation on Matthew 8 and he thinks it is to be understood concerning that disease which Trallianus and other physicians call comitial, and that it is the same disease with the sacred one; To which they are accustomed to append to the neck of boys that amulet called ῎Ιυγξ (in Hesychius): He seems to be nearly of the same opinion as Euthymius, who refers its natural cause simply to the moon. But it is better with all others or at least most interpreters to expound here concerning demoniac and composite evil. Especially, if we compare δαιμονιζόμενον Matthew 17:15 concerning which it is expressly xad xò narrar. And Mark 9 verse 25 πνεῦμα ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν and in the same place πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον. Therefore lunatics are energumens, who labor under epilepsy or mania at the same time. But the word lunatic, can denote 1. Him who with the moon waxing is afflicted by a natural disease or exasperation of the disease: in which way any epileptics are called lunatics. Whose disease is also called comitial, caducus, sacred, Herculean, great, Childish Affection. Serenus Sammonicus chapter 57, which is concerning the comitial disease, seems to bring forward another reason for the lunatic denomination. "God himself mentions through the doubtful times of the moon, Conceived, whom often such a ruin has poured out." And thus Julius Firmicus book 4 of his Mathesis: "If the moon will have been badly placed, it makes either spastics or caducous." 2. him who with demonic ἐνέργημα, or seizure has conjoined manic or epileptic evil: Which again can happen in a twofold way; either so that the possessing devil produces that symptom, namely by stirring up, disturbing, mixing the humors of the body, and thus vitiating them; or so that finding such a disease in the body, it

observes the occasion of its paroxysm, and joins and mixes its ἐνέργειαν to it. Which it is not unusual for it as a freely operating cause thus to do: so that from here it by no means follows, that the Devil is affected by, bound by, or subjected to natural things, or drawn by them, depends on them, is determined by them. For all this is arbitrary in such a way, that the devil acts with the moon on the body not however the moon immediately acts on the devil, and thus mediately on the body. Compare the Disputation on Demons. Furthermore, that lunations, or the moon by its light waxing and waning, or even by occult influences acts on these lower things; nominally on the bodies of men; and thus produces diseases, or the causes of disease or exasperates symptoms through intemperance of humors, is so known among physicists and Physicians, that here it is not at all necessary for it to be explained by us. See Pliny book 2, chapter 41 and book 9, chapter 2, and Aristotle on the Generation of Animals book 2, chapter 2, and on the parts of Animals book 4, chapter 5. But that peculiarly I here establish mania and epilepsy (when nevertheless other diseases can be observed by the devil, or be induced by it, as reason and experience teach, and Codronchi in his book 3 On Poisonous Diseases chapter 5), the reason is this; because the description of that lunatic Matthew 17:15 agrees with Mark 9:20, 26 to epilepsy. It is agreed, says Valesius chapter 28, page 224, that he was epileptic, for thus it is said, And they brought him, and when he had seen him immediately the spirit troubled him, and being thrown on the ground he wallowed foaming. But it is agreed that to be thrown on the ground, and to wallow, and to stir up foam around the mouth, are most certain marks of epilepsy. Then, because the evil grows for epileptics and maniacs with the moon itself: For maniacs indeed and epileptics from black bile or burnt bilious juice, with the waxing moon; but for epileptics from phlegm and raw juices, with the waning moon. The reason for the former is, that with the light of the moon increased, its heat and calefaction is also increased and thus by means of that heat the burnt melancholic humors are more aroused and poured out. But the reason for the latter is; that the phlegmatic and vitreous humors, with that light and heat of the moon diminished, that is, by a greater moderate cold are greatly increased: as Valesius demonstrates in his sacred philosophy chapter 71. The Arabic Interpreter (whoever he is published by Erpenius in quarto and at Rome the four Evangelists in folio Arabic-Latin in the Medicean press in the year 1619) Matthew 4 and Matthew 17 thinks that epileptic demoniacs, are then simply agitated or thrown down; then greatly vexed as soon as the moon begins to wax. For thus concerning him, who without doubt because he is said فانه يعرض حراً في راوس الاحلة Matthew 17, was epileptic: he is vexed greatly in the beginnings of the lunations. It could perhaps be conjectured, that by the ancient Gentiles such demoniac-epileptics or maniacs were called lunatics: because they believed a Magic power of harming to be in the moon, indeed drawn down from heaven by magic songs, and driven to that point, that it would foam on the herbs, and pour strengths into them, by which the Magi might use them more efficaciously for vexing men. Concerning which Virgil Eclogue 8, Horace Epode Ode 5, Ovid Metamorphoses 8 and 14, Seneca in Medea act 4, Lucan book 6, Martial book 12, epigram 57 are to be seen. Especially also Pliny book 2, chapters 9, 12 with their individual commentators. Hence also it happened that they succored the laboring moon, by clamors and the clanging of brass, lest it hear the Magic names. Concerning which see the notes of Dalechamps on the cited place of Pliny. Alexander of Aphrodisias (with Dalechamps citing him in the same place) thinks that by that clangor the depraved demons are driven away, then fierce and insulting, when the failing star cannot send its power salutary to man to the earth.

7. Practical problems follow; which we divide 1. into moral. 2. ascetic. 3. ecclesiastical. 4. political. 5. medical. The moral ones are these. I. Whether all the speeches and actions of the seized, are to be imputed to him as sins formally performed by him. I reply: if indeed they are of the devil abusing the organs and members of the body, with him himself unknowing or unwilling, No. But if he himself has done something, or has consented to certain evil actions and of the devil. Yes. Let him compare, who has leisure, Thyraeus part 1, page 41, number 261. And Raphael de la Torre question 93, article 3. II. What if internal diabolical raptures and enthusiasms accede? I reply: if through them you understand mere injections and suggestions to ἁμαρτίαν, blasphemy etc. which he constantly detests, nor in any way yields to them. No. for he holds himself purely passively; just as when the devil extrinsically presents to our senses through sight something horrendous; or when he showed to Christ the kingdoms of the world, tempted him, carried him to the pinnacle of the temple, onto a mountain etc. But if some operation of the intellect of the one suffering, or some thought of the energumen himself (whether formed or unformed) intervenes, now it is not without sin. III. What spiritual remedies are to be applied to this evil, and not? I reply: See the disputation on Exorcism, and above part 1, last thesis. IV. Whether those yawning, according to the old custom, rightly have the words, "O Lord, O Lord", in their mouth and thrust forth and proclaim them with the act of yawning (and indeed without attention or devotion); likewise fortify their mouth with the cross. I reply: This happens from false persuasion; that the devil enters through the mouth or open parts of the body, and is driven away by the sign of the cross; and with the name of the Lord, or Jesus having been pronounced. It is therefore superstition. La Torre defends that custom page 152, disputation 25. Compare our disputation on Superstition. IV. Whether that universal method of the exorcists in the Papacy is to be approved, by which first of all adjuring the devil they ask from him what was the special sin, on account of which he entered the man? I reply: No. For so that I may not now examine that whole choregy of superstitions, it rests on that false axiom Job 9:1-2 collected with the perverse disputation of the friends of Job, and with the opinion of the Melitans Acts 28:4. V. Whether it is to be asked from the devil, or learned from him, Who he is, and what his name: likewise through the merits of which saint he is to be cast out: as the Roman Pastoral, the Exorcistic books have it, and the Roman practice described in histories concerning the possessed (nominally concerning the nun of Mons in Hainault). I reply: No. For none is commerce to us with the devil. See the Disputation on Exorcism. VI. Whether all his sayings are to be responded to, or whether simply to be silent? I reply: Distinguish. It is not to be responded either by approving, if he says something good and true (for we do not want to hear the truth from him, or for it to be confirmed by his testimony) or by refuting, if something false and evil: Pearls are not to be cast before swine Matthew 7, for we will never convince him passively, or render him better. It is therefore better by the example of Hezekiah to prescribe to all bystanders, that they respond nothing: unless perhaps the necessity and edification of the infidels or weak, who are present, and who could be seduced by his speeches or deeds, persuade that his lies and blasphemies be blunted by the word. See the example of Christ Luke 4:35, 41 and Paul Acts 16:17-18. VII. Whether the actions of energumens, as for example, to leap upon men, to wound them Acts 19 collected with Matthew 8, likewise to profess the truth of religion, to worship or pray to Christ Matthew 8 with Luke 4, are human actions, and consequently morally good or evil? I reply: No. For neither do they proceed from the principle of

human actions, namely the mind and will, but from the mere arbitrary will of the devil, abusing the body of the unknowing or unwilling man for their execution. See and compare la Torre disputation 20, Thyraeus chapter 23 and 27, Baldwin in his Cases page 627.

7. The practical ascetic problems are. I. Whether it is permitted to seek this evil from God? I reply: No, for there is no command of his in scripture. II. With what grief will the energumen deplore things badly said or done in the seizure. I reply: His own which were either directly or indirectly and by participation, he will deplore with the grief of repentance; the alien, that is, which are of the devil alone, with the grief of detestation and just indignation, because they were perpetrated against the glory of God; and with the grief of commiseration or condolence, if indeed to the damage and vexation of a neighbor. As for the damage and vexation brought upon himself, he will possess his soul in patience, indeed also give thanks to God in this part, as is gathered analogically from James 1:2-3, 5, 10-11 collected with Job 1:21, 2:10-11. III. What is to be done by friends, and others standing by before and after the seizure? I reply: Let them raise up and confirm his spirit with consolations drawn from the word of God: besides, let them commend him to God by their prayers. IV. Whether it is expedient immediately when the seizure ceases to relate to the energumens all the absurd, ridiculous, blasphemous, terrible, noxious and sad things, which during the paroxysm of seizure the devil designated in the body, or through its members? I reply: No, because for those miserable ones the powers of the body are so prostrated, the members as if broken and bruised, the humors especially the melancholic ones and through them the phantasy is so disturbed that by the relation of sad and terrible things affliction is not to be added to the afflicted. But the mind is to be refreshed with joyful, and sweet consolations, the body also to be cured. However, the relation of those things can and ought to be made at another time in some clear interval; both so that they may be humbled so much the more under the mighty hand of God; and so that they may seek God so much the more ardently with true faith and repentance, and contend with him by prayers. Especially all that tragedy is to be set forth to them, after they will have been totally liberated from the evil; so that they may give so much greater thanks to God, and in the future take so much more heed to themselves from sins. V. Whether it is fitting during the seizure to read the word of God; as certain ones are accustomed with great straining of the voice, as if about to dismay the devil? I reply: No. The word of God has no use except of institution or information, as a moral instrument 2 Timothy 3:15-16. But that does not have place in the seized, who neither hears, nor understands: nor in the bystanders, who by that disturbance of things, by those tossings of the body, by the horrendous bellowings, and clamors, cannot bring the attention due to the sacred reading. VI. Whether contention is to be made by prayers, while the devil exercises savagery in those miserable ones? I reply: Concerning mental and silent ones, no one doubts. But that anyone whether a minister, or another should lead there in a clear voice, can scarcely happen with edification: unless either the friends or bystanders withdraw into another place, or the seizure be without clamors, and vehement noise. Briefly, whatever of reading, of consolation, of prayer is applied: this is to be taken heed to sedulously, lest we make of them a work wrought, or an exorcism; but let the whole be directed to the instruction of the seized, or of the bystanders, or of both. VII. Whether chiding, curses, upbraidings, threats are to be cast upon the raging demon. I reply: No. See the Disputation on Exorcism.

8. The Ecclesiastical problems are. I. Whether energumens are to be brought into temples? I reply: We deny it concerning empty or brick buildings or temples: For no power inheres in them, no efficacy. See the Disputation on Benedictions: and on Temples. Concerning ecclesiastical assemblies. Distinguish: If indeed they themselves now free from seizure, want and can conveniently be present at the public assemblies and prayers there conceived for their liberation, let it be done. But that seized ones be led or carried there to disturb the exercises, is by no means fitting, as it renews disorder, 1 Corinthians 14, which is required in ecclesiastical affairs. That once they were accustomed to spend the night in churches, so that they might be freed from the terror and fear of demons, as Albaspinaeus notes on canon 27 of the Council of Elvira from canon 93 of the Council of Carthage, that indeed was too unexamined. II. Whether they are to be admitted to the supper? I reply: in the paroxysm itself. No, both because the whole public action would be disturbed, and exposed to the scandal or mockery of the infidels; and because they themselves cannot bring that preparation of mind, that attention and devotion of spiritual meditation, which is required in the legitimate perception of the supper. But when the diabolical vexation intermits for a time, Yes. For nothing excludes from the Lord's supper, except infidelity and impenitence. That once they did not admit energumens, catechumens, penitents to the perception, indeed not even to the contemplation or spectacle of the eucharist (concerning which below); but ordered them to go out before the consecration, that is to be referred to the chaff. They seem to have imagined for themselves a certain as it were ceremonial uncleanness, not befitting sacred and spiritual things. Which those fatuous statutes of the Councils teach, concerning Menstruating women to be abstained from baptism or supper, (Photius' Nomocanon title 3.18 and title 4.16), concerning lepers to be separated from the assembly of the faithful praying, Council of Ancyra canon 17, and concerning Energumens Apostolic Canon 78. And lest the names of energumens be recited at the altar with the oblation. Council of Elvira canon 29. Where see the commentary of Gabriel de l'Aubespine. What Baldwin wants book 3, chapter 3, case 5, I do not sufficiently grasp: The possessed, he says, who are vexed by the devil from first infancy as it were without cessation, are not to be admitted. If indeed he understands those laboring under a perpetual symptom of mania, in any case it is beyond controversy. But if those perpetually possessed; I do not see why they are to be kept away, if indeed they examine themselves. For that through their whole life they suffer continuous paroxysms of seizures, and thus disturbance of reason, I do not think is agreed from experience. Albaspinaeus indeed has in his commentary on canon 37 of the Council of Elvira this distinction: Of those who were infested by unclean spirits there were two kinds: certain ones were perpetually agitated, others enjoyed lucid intervals. But by ἐποχή. III. Whether an adult prepared before the paroxysm and offering himself to baptism, is to be baptized in the paroxysm itself, if indeed death seems to be imminent? I reply: I see no necessity. Photius notes Nomocanon title 4, chapter 15 that it was defined by some canon, how the possessed and out of their mind, were to be baptized. But what sort that canon is, and how it determined, is not clear to me from there, nor is there leisure now to inquire further. The Council of Elvira canon 37 has something similar. IV. Whether they are to be promoted to sacred orders, or ecclesiastical ministries? I reply: No, with the Apostolic Canon which Photius notes title 1, chapter 15, and with the Canon Law distinction 33, where the statutes of Gregory I, Pius, Nicholas, Gelasius are exhibited. The Council of Orange chapter 16 adds, that not only are they not to be taken up, but also those already ordained are to be repelled from the office imposed, and the reasons are manifest: because they suffer those

things which are often ascribed to them by the unskilled or concerning which the more skilled doubt, whether they proceed from the demon alone, or truly also from them. Which indeed does not at all vindicate the ministry from indecorum, scandal, contempt. It is added that those vexations render them inept for performing ecclesiastical duties, at least often impede them. But that the Council of Elvira chapter 37 forbids lamps to be lit by them, is of no moment: and Albaspinaeus confesses that he cannot attain by any conjecture or divination, why that is prohibited to energumens rather than to others. For he himself understands the lamps, accustomed to be lit in the festivals of the Gentiles. But what prevents them from being taken concerning the lamps, which by a certain ἀκρισία they were then accustomed to light in the temples of the Christians either in the feast of lights, or on another occasion. That the Canon Law distinction 33, canon "the husband", and canon "Clerics" determines with it Toledo book 1, Instruction chapter 64 that they are not to be promoted, either to major or to minor orders, even if they were vexed only once, that seems to me too harsh. As also the other; if such vexed ones were promoted in minor orders, when they are seized, even if healthy and free they never ascend to major orders; according to canon "Clerics" distinction 33. V. Whether baptism or the Lord's supper is to be conferred on energumens: so that by the power of the sacrament itself they may either be fortified from the incursion of demons, or be purged, as the First Council of Orange wants canon 1 in Bochellus in the Decrees of the Gallican Church. I reply: No, if from the work wrought, the sacrament directly and immediately is understood to produce such an effect. VI. Whether it is of the Church, or of ministers to cure this evil, and indeed by another and more peculiar reason, than poisonous diseases, or any bodily evils. I reply: No, see the Disputation on Exorcism.

9. The political problems are. I. Whether fictions of this evil for palliating illicit begging, or for some other end, sometimes happen, and whether they are to be detected and coerced by the Magistrate? I reply: I affirm the first member: and experience teaches it. See Weyer book 4, chapters 26-28. I affirm the same, as to the latter member. II. Whether on those simulators or deceivers such, and so great torments are to be imposed in punishment as are imposed on the truly possessed so that they may be freed by the devil. I reply: The Second Council of Constantinople (which is the Sixth General) indeed has this canon 60. But nothing is more absurd. For what sort of canonical, or ecclesiastical punishment is that which is inflicted through blows and rods (truly carnal arms, against 2 Corinthians 10)? Add that it is cruelty conjoined with Magic superstition to want to expel the demon by blows and whips brought upon the body of the energumens. Political punishment does not pertain to the ἀταξίαν of the synod. But we ask here whether punishment is to be inflicted by the Magistrate, and of what sort. Concerning the former no one doubts since it is a delict, and indeed a grave one. The latter is to be left to the judgment of the judge; who aggravates the punishments in such cases, or mitigates them, by reason of circumstances. III. Whether Exorcists (whether under pretext of the ecclesiastical order, or of both they sell that art) are to be tolerated in the Republic. I reply: No, from the titles "On Sorcerers" and "On Mathematicians" collected with Deuteronomy 18, Exodus 22, Leviticus 20. But now that any exorcists whatever, even Papal Clerics, are guilty of Magic, and of familiarity and society with demons, we have proved in The Desperate Cause of the Papacy book 1, disputation on Magic, and on Exorcism. But against this there is a vulgar Instance: But yet often, at least sometimes the devil is cast out by them. I reply: The devil feigns, and

deceives, and thus yields of his own accord, but is not compelled by the Exorcist. We add, that demons feign their binding, coaction and subjection, to any mutterings and magic ceremonies. Thus also from a possessed man they depart at the ceremonies and command of the Magi, whom they call sorcerers; as Sprenger is witness in the Malleus Maleficarum. Add that custom once received in Germany; concerning which soon from Bodin. Flavius Josephus book 8 of the Antiquities chapter 2 relates that he saw a demon extracted from the nostrils of one possessed by Eleazar the Jew in the presence of Vespasian with his sons Titus and Domitian, and that through an applied ring, under whose seal a root discovered by Solomon had been placed: and that the same demon was proscribed by a certain conjuration. What then? Will you conclude from the success that those arts are not forbidden? John of Salisbury thinks far otherwise, Policraticus book 2, chapter 27. VVierus transcribed that excellent dissertation on impostures book 3, chapter 23, and Baldwin in the book cited chapter 3, case 9. I marvel nevertheless that that Eleazar, and Flavius Josephus are defended so seriously and with such great contention against Weyer by Faye in his energumenicon pages 98-99. IV. Whether therefore ordinary Papal Exorcists are to be coerced, and punished by the Magistrate: notwithstanding that from the persuasion of their religion, and for its good and propagation they protest that they do these things? I reply: I affirm 1. Because the world is not ruled by opinions. Soothsayers, mountebanks, and impostors to a man will all pretend their depraved and prejudiced opinions. Should the title "On sorcerers" etc. from the Code of Justinian, and title 13, chapter 20 from the Code of Canons of Photius therefore be plucked out? 2. Because by this reason, they wipe men of silver; and bind them so much the more tightly to their Roman-Hispanic faction (of which sort are the Clerics among us). 3. Because their exorcistic practice involves, and promotes abominable superstitions, Idolatries, and sorceries. 4. Because a broad gate is opened to frauds and fictions of exorcists of every kind: which those who have been versed in the Papacy, or who have read in the histories of Sleidan and Thuanus and the letters of Cardinal D'Ossat, indeed in the Jesuit Delrio himself in his Magic Disquisitions concerning the specter of Orleans, concerning Marthe Brossier, concerning the Dominicans of Bern, concerning Elizabeth the English girl in the time of Henry VIII (whom they called the sacred virgin of Kent), concerning Magdalena de la Cruz, know frequently to run between here. 5. Because occasion is left to them, of demented simpler men; of compelling and retaining others now smelling out their trick, and aspiring to a saner sense in religion, by chains, whips, and other torments: of which fraudulent tyranny they recently gave an example at Leiden. 6. Finally because they take away from Physicians constituted by public authority a great part of practice, and from miserable men health, while they feign that most diseases, and symptoms are poisonous, energumenic, so that of course they may promote their own gain. See among the Papal Physicians Codronchi and Valesius cited above. V. Whether it is permitted to allow, that someone compel a witch, suspected by him by blows, to bless the energumen or one evilly-artificially affected? I reply: No. For such while they seem to persecute Magic, in reality exercise magic, because they seek aid from the devil and the devil's clients. Bodin in his Demonomania book 3, chapter 6 relates that it was accustomed to be enjoined on witches by judges in Germany, indeed through the Imperial chamber itself, that they should pronounce those words in the presence of the one affected; "I bless you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in your goods, blood, and herd." Which having been done they were healed immediately. VI. With the wife having been made demoniac, whether dissolution of the marriage is to be conceded to the husband. I

reply: No, ordinarily at least, no more, than on account of leprosy, epilepsy, mania, or another incurable disease. Photius refers in his collection of canons title 13, chapter 30, and Balsamon in the scholia in the same place; In the Digest on account of long-lasting madness without hope of restitution, it is conceded in a certain case: but that that is abrogated by Novel 117, where among the causes of repudiation, no mention is made of madness. Again nevertheless in constitutions 111 and 112 of Leo, after three years have passed it is conceded to the man, after five years to the woman. VII. Whether energumens can perform public duties? I reply: if indeed they are hereditary, or have devolved to them by legitimate succession, and they can use a substitute or assistant in them, and they themselves have lucid intervals, it does not seem to be denied. It is not fitting for other duties to be imposed on them, or for imposed ones to be left to them as long as they have not been freed from this evil. VIII. Whether it is advantageous for energumens to be relegated to solitude and certain places, and to be confined in them; or whether promiscuous and public frequenting of places and men is to be permitted to them. I reply: A middle course is to be held here: so that it may be looked out for the good of many of the public, and of themselves. IX. Whether they can be witnesses, make wills, enter into contracts, undertake guardianship etc. I reply: The solution of these things depends, on the determination concerning the mad through lucid intervals. For whatever can be conceded to them, can also be conceded to these. Except that energumens are to be preferred to the mad, because few of them labor under continuous mania or madness.

10. The Medical problems are I. Who ought to judge concerning Energumens and poisonous diseases and to cure this evil. I reply: Physicians: in some way also Theologians, and Philosophers from their Metaphysics and Pneumatology. Physicians indeed, because they know from their art concerning the causes of diseases, Therefore here they determine whether the near, and proximate causes are purely natural, or not. If they judge that they are not; then thought must be had concerning the supernatural cause: and here Theologians and Philosophers have their parts, who comment on it from scripture and reason. Concerning the diseases and symptoms, which the ἐνέργεια of the devil either finds or increases, or excites anew, the Physician judges, and he alone cures them. The Theologian does nothing here, that immediately and directly through some specific remedy restores health. For prayers with God, and consolations from the word of God do not have another reason in this evil, than in any other disease of the body. Beyond that, whatever we read to have been done by the apostles in both places, was from a peculiar privilege and Charism. Which in poisonous diseases Theologians now ought to imitate no more, than to say to the lame: Arise and walk. Here therefore is the capital error of the common people: Because they think that men affected by evilly-artifice are to be cured by Theologians or Ecclesiastical men either in whole or in part. Nevertheless, they judge far otherwise concerning epilepsy, wounds, fractures, dislocations brought upon them by the demon itself: for then they call a surgeon, not a Theologian. Baldwin has this opinion concerning the judgment to be deferred to Physicians book 3, chapter 3, case 1. From the Papists Codronchi the Physician, book 3 On Poisonous Diseases chapter 13, whose words we exhibit in the disputation on Creation. Compare the same On the method of testifying chapter 1. Valesius chapter 28 of his Sacred Philosophy after he has seriously discussed that demons are not affected by corporeal things, thus at length concludes through a distinction page 231. With these things thus having themselves it is agreed from all these things which have been said,

that it is likely, that most of those, who are brought to the exorcists by the opinion of a Demon, do not have a Demon; but are held by some of those diseases which have been mentioned, and on account of poverty of counsel, when other cures have been tried before, and do not suffice, are brought to them, which thing is rightly reprehended by Hippocrates in his book on the sacred disease - - that nevertheless there are also some to whom the cause of such diseases is a Demon, and that for them a natural cure is not enough, it nevertheless confers, not on account of the Demons themselves per se, but on account of the diseases themselves, or their Symptoms, or internal causes, which the Demon arouses. The example is Saul, who when he was tormented by a Demon, was soothed, afflicted more mildly by the sweetness of David's harp; doubtless, as one occupied by a melancholic disease. For it is not that anyone should persuade himself, that it was the Demon who mitigated, seized by the sweetness of music, and thus allowed him to torment. For this has already been refuted before, and disputed concerning this matter against certain Platonists in chapter 15 of this work in the explication of chapter 2 of Leviticus which I have now cited twice. Only perhaps it remains, that someone may doubt in this place, by what reason it happens, if Demons have nothing in common with any body, that they invade melancholic men for the most part - - or bring in melancholic diseases themselves. To me indeed it seems to be referred to their wickedness, not to their nature: doubtless the melancholic juice is most of all prepared to drive into insanity and desperation, which those wicked ones most greatly desire. Where he prudently limits the art and care of Physicians, lest anyone think with Paracelsus that through the piety, prayers, fasts of the physician (and indeed markedly Paracelsian), as through a specific and peculiar remedy conceded to no others or through whatever mystic art the energumenic evil is to be cured. Fernel also ingenuously confesses book 2 On the hidden causes of things chapter 16 that Physicians most often err here in their judgment and cure, and that this happened to him with others, around a youth from an equestrian family, whom agitated at least ten times daily by a concussion and as it were convulsion of the body, applying all remedies they strove to expel that evil as if bordering on convulsion. But in vain: because, he says, we all were far from the cognition of the true. For in the third month a certain demon first apprehended to be the author of the whole evil revealing himself by an unwonted voice and sentences both Latin, and Greek (although the one laboring was ignorant of the Greek language) was uncovering many secrets of those sitting by and especially of the physicians, laughing that he had circumvented them with great danger, and that with useless drugs they had nearly cut the throat of this body. II. Whether poisonous diseases are naturally incurable, or energumenic symptoms. I reply: The vulgar error of many thus judges: Hence it is, that they do not call Physicians; but either Theologians, or mountebanks, or wonder-working empirics, or delirious old women, sometimes also Magi and soothsayers: in whom a δύναμις or something is thought to lie hidden. Which the author of the Book on the sacred disease, which exists under the name of Hippocrates, touches upon. Valesius exhibits his words chapter 28. Incurable is this whole disease, which otherwise outside ἐνέργεια or evilly-artifice is held incurable, among Physicians, as for example absolute dropsy, perfect leprosy, confirmed gout. 2. Difficult or scarcely curable is every disease, which outside this case is such; for example inveterate melancholy, epilepsy etc. 3. Absolutely incurable is every even least disease, of which the synectic and proximate cause is either the local motion of the devil, or a certain physical cause produced and continued through the local motion of the devil and thus through the application of a natural agent to its patient. For as long as the cause

of the disease does not cease, the disease cannot be cured. But now against the demon continuously operating within the body, the physician operates in vain extrinsically with his natural antidotes. For example while it constricts or distends the viscera, while it arouses, agitates, transfers, confounds, perturbs the humors or spirits, how will the Physician restore? See in Fernel book 2 On the hidden causes of things chapter 16, and Weyer book 4 on impostures chapter 17, how in vain the Physicians labored in a cure of this kind. 4. Certain symptoms of the seizure itself, as clamors, laughter, contorted face, swelling of the belly, roaring, and what similar things are incurable: and only speculatively does the Physician hold himself around them equally with other bystanders. 5. If he can or ought to apply any remedy to the tossing of the body and limbs; that is to be sought not from the Hippocratic dispensary, but from chains, fetters (Mark 5:3-4), and the Herculean hands of men. 6. An evil complexion of the body, or whatever evil morbific, with the paroxysm of seizure ceasing, can be cured elsewhere and here: whether it was in the body before the possession and the devil used it, or arose from the possession, or took increase from there. The reason is; because the spiritual affection or possession does not entirely take away nature, or the natural balsam, by which diseases are healed, and of which the physician is the minister. Experience is added; which among others Codronchi alleges book 3, chapter 15 and book 4, chapter 2, where nevertheless he confesses that on account of the reasons alleged in the same place, the cure is often maimed and imperfect. Compare also Valesius chapter 28. III. Whether energumenic and poisonous diseases differ in species from those similar to them infesting the body without the interceding ἐνέργημα, or evilly-artifice: for example epilepsy from epilepsy, wasting from wasting, wound from wound, mania from mania etc. I reply: No. We acknowledge a difference of origin, mode, and degrees, but that does not infer a difference of form and species. What I have said concerning the difference of origin, and thence of mode and degrees, we learn from Codronchi most experienced of these things book 2, chapter 13, where he observes, that natural diseases gradually as for the most part acquire strength, until they arrive at a state, but poisonous ones frequently immediately from the beginning with no peccant humors existing in the cause betray themselves by most grave symptoms and pains, to these they are inconstant, and rarely preserve periods, although they bear a periodic nature. He adds book 4, chapter 2 that demons use a certain thinner and more subtle substance elicited from natural things for inflicting diseases: and because particular poisons of this kind lie hidden from us, particular or specific alexipharmics of them also lie hidden (which the same thing we have related concerning the poison of the plague, from the Physicians in the Disputation on the Plague) therefore from general and approved antidotes those are to be used which agree more with the spirits, can be mixed with them, and thus penetrate them, and alter them. IV. Whether the energumenic diseases and languors differ in species, from other demoniac ones, likewise from poisonous ones? for example wasting from wasting, bruise from bruise etc. I reply: No. For the devil as a cause acting directly and physically brings in all, although those within the body acting and possessing it; those assisting the body; these likewise assisting but with an interceding pact, operation, and demand of the Magi. V. Whether evilly-artifices and poisonous diseases are to be ascribed to the natural disposition of the body alone; and consequently health can be obtained by purge of the noxious humor, and correction of the complexion. I reply: No. And not a few Physicians seem to be held by this error (as Codronchi notes book 3, chapter 13): whom nevertheless he testifies in the same place to have fatigued themselves in vain, and to have

increased the evil. Compare the same book 2, chapter 1. Weyer book 5, chapter 30, and Levinus Lemnius book 2, chapters 1 and 2 seem in a certain way to favor this error, perhaps having followed the judgment of Hippocrates or Aetius, or Avicenna: whom see cited in Valesius chapter 28, unless perhaps they wanted to touch upon excessive and old womanish superstitions, and vulgar errors. In which way Hippocrates can be taken Valesius does not deny. Jacobus Gothofredus has a nearly similar conjecture concerning Posidonius the celebrated Physician under Valens, whom Philostorgius taxes, in his notes on book 8 of Philostorgius chapter 10. Perhaps he only said this, that the Incubus is not a demon, as Aetius attributes this to Posidonius in his Tetrabiblos 2, sermon 2, chapter 12. And whether Philostorgius drew this opinion of his by no means evil, to this place. If indeed the devil is the author of this evil, (who is a freely acting cause, nor obnoxious to corporeal things) certainly it follows, that with all the peccant humors having been purged, he himself nevertheless is not expelled at the same time, unless he wants: or unless he is expelled by other and fitting remedies. See Valesius and Codronchi in the place cited. Who nevertheless are not to be followed in this that by the error of their religion they admit ecclesiastical exorcisms. Barthélemy Faye in his energumenicon veers too much towards Pontifical superstition, while he touches upon the opinion of Weyer just now cited pages 100-101. VI. What are the symptoms, what diseases, which before others devils for the most part send in. I reply: I think this can scarcely be determined: since they are a thousand arts of harming. Codronchi nevertheless enumerates them in the place cited. And here and there particular histories of the possessed. But concerning these things it is rather to be treated elsewhere, where concerning Magic, or evilly-artifices. VII. Whether all those diseases are to be cured by the same method; which mountebanks, and delirious old women do. I reply: No. This is repugnant to Medicine and all easily perceive it, to whom the brain is not in the heel. Now it will have sufficed to have warned in a word, from philosophical principles although the common cause of all is one and the same (namely the devil); nevertheless the particular and proximate causes, which it uses, are not the same: and consequently the same antidotes are not to be applied, and one particular method of curing. VIII. What therefore are the most excellent antidotes specifically cathartic, anodyne, confortative. I reply: This is for the Physicians to determine; who everywhere hand down common ones: and whatever particular thing is to be observed here, Codronchi seems to have indicated: except that against his art, captivating it with noble talent to the exorcistic and other superstitions of the Papacy, he admits that suffumigations profit the possessed; that rue defends from evilly-artifices, fennel, clary especially the eyes from the entrance of the devil, because from these with odor a certain halituous substance is exhaled etc. book 4, chapter 2. Which compare with Menghi's Scourge, and Cudgel of Demons, and similar Exorcistic Doctors. Valesius in the cited place is by far saner than he in this part. Faye in his energumenicon is more impotent than all Papal Physicians, where pages 98-99 he defends Flavius Josephus (related of course by Jerome in the catalog of ecclesiastical writers) book 8, chapter 2 of the Jewish Antiquities breathing cabalistic magic superstitions. Compare the disputation on Exorcism.

We only indicate rather than explain the textual problems briefly, because the Typographer warns that it must be broken off. The places of scripture which most of all pertain to this and to which many things could be asked philologically, historically, philosophically, theologically, are Daniel 4:33-34, Matthew 17 collected with Mark 5:2-6, Luke 13:11, Acts 16:16, and 19:14-16. I.

What is to be determined concerning the Mania of Nebuchadnezzar. I reply: We have treated of it in the Disputation on Demons. We now add this, that an ἐνέργημα seems to have been mixed in: so that he seems to have been extruded first from men by the devil and himself, and thus deserted by the men themselves, willing or unwilling: not otherwise than the Gadarenes Matthew 8, Luke 8, compare both histories. For it is not likely, that on account of pure mania, or melancholic deliriums, he was either extruded, or fleeing deserted in woods and deserts by his ministers and subjects. II. What concerning the evil spirit of Saul, and the Music of David? I reply: It has already been determined in the Disputation on Demons. Let him compare besides the authors cited in the same place, who has leisure Maggi's Miscellanies in Gruter's Critical Thesaurus page 1429, Brodaeus' Miscellanies book 4, chapter 31, Valesius chapter 28. III. What concerning the lunatic Matthew 17 with Mark 5? I reply: Above thesis 4 we have explained briefly. Let those be compared by occasion by those, who have leisure, besides the Commentators, Cameron's prelections volume 2, or Myrothecium on the cited place, Scultetus' Exercitations book 2, chapter 48, Lemnius On the Hidden Wonders of Nature pages 136-137, Delrio book 3 of his Magic Disquisitions section 5, Valesius chapter 71, Heinsius in his Sacred Exercitations on Matthew 4, Vossius book 2 On Idolatry chapter 19, Ludovicus de Dieu in his notes on Matthew 4, Fuller book 2 of his Miscellanies chapter 17. IV. What concerning the spirit of infirmity by which the devil had bound the woman Luke 13? I reply: It was a disease sent by the devil, as a cause not possessing, but assisting as in Job 2:7. Whether it continuously assisted, or truly once assisting inflicted an incurable disease, or left a disease after itself, which by progress of time was made incurable, could be disputed. We prefer to say that the devil was not continuously assisting at least then when Christ healed her: because otherwise he would have rebuked it, or commanded it to depart and cease from maleficium. Furthermore, that diseases are inflicted by devils, is to be taught elsewhere. Concerning which the commentators on the cited place. And Pineda on Job, Delrio in his Magic Disquisitions, Codronchi in the cited place, Valesius chapter 28, Fernel book 1 On the hidden causes of things last chapter and book 2, chapter 16. V. Whether from Psalm 78:49 it is certainly proved that diseases are sent by demons? as it is wont to be commonly cited for this. I reply: No, if indeed the proper Hebrew text is inspected. Which Simeon de Muis acknowledged in his commentary on the place: Ezra, he says, and Kimhi want מלאכי that is, of the angels to be syntactic for the absolute: which sometimes otherwise happens. I seem to myself to be able to take this name in the construct state, as they call it, and to translate it, a sending (delegation) of messengers of evils, that is, of evil things, and through messengers of evil things to be able to understand Moses and Aaron, through whom so many evils were announced to the Egyptians, and even inflicted. VI. Whether Sirach 27:13 alludes to lunatics; as Valesius wants chapter 28. It seems sought from too far, especially since the analogy of the moon itself is obvious, and of the fool, which A Lapide learnedly and prolixly explains in his commentary in the same place. The commentators on Revelation 12:1 can be compared.

There remain the historical Problems: which we distinguish into those which concern antiquities, and into those which concern ecclesiastical novelties. Of the former genus we now indicate these few. I. Whether and why there were more ἐνεργούμενοι in Judea in the time of Christ and more among the nations in the time of the first propagation of the Gospel through the apostles and their disciples, and successors, than either before, or after. I reply: We gather that there

were more from ecclesiastical history. The primary cause was, so that Christ and his Gospel might be glorified by the ejections of demons. II. Whether the ancient church always and everywhere excluded energumens from the communion of the eucharist, and of ecclesiastical prayers. I reply: It would indeed seem to be thus established from Apostolic Canon 78, Pseudo-Dionysius in his Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. And from the Council of Elvira canon 29; and thus Micrologus determines Observations of the Ecclesiastics chapter 5 book 51, Maximus, Cabasilas, and Germanus in their Liturgical books. Durandus in his Rationale book 4 folio and book 6 folio 129, Albertus Magnus On the Office of the Mass tract 3, chapter 23, Alcuin On the Divine Offices. Thomas part 3, question 80, article 4. But against this we adduce the First Council of Orange canon 1 And the Council of Elvira canon 37, how it does not contradict canon 29, I do not yet see; nor can Albaspinaeus Bishop of Orleans extricate himself, in his Commentary on the said Council. So that from here you may see, how safely certain ones flee from scripture, to the fathers, and the ancient church. Whatever the case may be, this statute concerning the Energumens, (even if ancient) was not catholic. And yet six hundred similar ones are wont to be obtruded by the ostentatious of antiquity. If there is any place for conjectures I would think that this error arose from this, that they wanted energumens seized to be excluded from baptism, eucharist, prayers and public exercises, even Gentile energumens, but seeking liberation and awaiting it in the Christian church from the faithful endowed with that charism. But it is a conjecture: yet nearly as certain, as the greatest part of conjectural Theology, which is so speciously sold from the consent and ancient practice of the universal Church. III. Whether the said Sibyls were energumens? I reply: If indeed they were such, as Virgil describes one Aeneid 6: "The prophetess rages" etc., in any case they were Pythoness energumens. But concerning them elsewhere, in the disputation on Prophecy. IV. Whether an ἐνέργημα was present to the epilepsies, and maniac deliriums or diabolical enthusiasms of Mohammed? I reply: I do not see why this is to be denied, if we look at his life and actions, And John Andreas the Moor expressly proves this concerning him in his Confusion of the Mohammedan Sect chapter 1, when he was held by the citizens of Mecca for a fatuous and possessed one, and by his own wife for a Phrenetic and deluded one by the temptations of Satan. The same in the same place and Philip Guadagnolo in his apology against Achmed Alabadin chapter 10, section 1 prove from the Saracen books Agar and Assisa that he from the eremitic life, and excessive fasting was made sleepless and furious, and tarrying in a cave heard voices and discourses but saw no one speaking. Thus he can be compared with the furious and demoniac Enthusiasts, and the Münster prophets whom the age of our fathers saw, in this.

From the ecclesiastical novelties let the historical problems be these. I. Whether a diabolical enthusiasm and ἐνέργημα cannot equally be attributed to Francis of Assisi, and the Anabaptist Prophets of Münster, and in Holland (whose lives and icons have been published in a peculiar little book), as to Mohammed? I reply: it does not seem improbable. Concerning the Anabaptists thundering and perpetrating homicides, I would scarcely doubt. I would think that Francis ridiculously μωρολογῶν is at least to be reckoned among the maniacal and delirious. II. Whether there are more energumens today, and evilly-artificially affected ones among the Gentiles in Japan etc., than among Christians; and again among the Papists than among the Reformed. I reply: I affirm both. III. Whether the Enthusiasm which and an ἐνέργημα is to be attributed to Joan of Lorraine (commonly called the Virgin of Orleans). I reply: The ecclesiastical

Theologians and judges, who devoted her to be burned alive, judged that something Diabolical and Magical intervened. But learned men defend her cause from the other part neither few nor ignoble; among whom from the more recent ones Delrio in his Magic Disquisitions, where see more authors cited. Recently a Lotharingian Jurist endeavored to purge Joan from the crimes charged in a peculiar book. I as yet cannot be led to ascribe to her the divine gift of prophecy and miracles. Nevertheless, I would not want to affirm concerning Magic. But, because she is believed to have accomplished something in battles not only with an undaunted mind, but with strength of body above common soldiers: what prevents from suspecting an ἐνέργημα; and indeed an innocent one, if indeed they evince her faith and piety against adversaries. Or, let it be said that there was a vehement and singular impulse, and fortitude in her, to which nevertheless something of dementia, or melancholy was mixed: by which it happened that she by no means feared. But into this history we inquire more prolixly and accurately in the disputation on Miracles. III. What concerning Luther's attempted exorcism which the Papists clamor turned out so unhappily for him? I reply: It is a mere lie: which the doctrine and practice of Luther strongly bruises. See the genuine history of the energumen led to Luther in Baldwin in his Cases pages 646-647 and the authors cited in the same place. IV. What is to be thought concerning the history of the truces, which the demons were giving to all energumens at Louvain, on that day, on which they had set out for the funeral of Luther; which la Torre page 152 and Thyraeus page 15 object to us from Bredenbach? I reply: The analysis of this Papistic faith is into the veracity of the devil. From that place of invention the Papists not rarely argue, The Devil said; therefore. Thyraeus chapter 6 says that they were taught: namely from the testimony, or confession of the possessing demons. It is a wonder that this place is not inserted by them in the Dialectic of Fonseca, or Hunnius. There is not therefore, that we should bear so heavily that the stigmata of Calvin are proved, from the testimony of Bolsec alone: for he is no more intestable, than the devil. COROLLARY. It is worthy of disquisition, what that novel and particular constitution made by Philip Rovenius the pretended archbishop of Philippi and apostolic Vicar through the united Provinces of Belgium on the 12th of December in the year 1638 and printed at Louvain by Bernardinus Masius, under the green cross in the year 1638 page 12 may mean for itself and how it may agree with the doctrine and practice of the Exorcistic art in the papacy, and with the sacred orders, which are conferred on Exorcists according to the formula of the Roman Pontifical "Let no one at all without our license, or of our subdelegates presume to exorcize Energumens, nor use other exorcisms than those approved by the Church, or contained in the Roman Ritual. One about to apply an exorcism to an energumen woman, let him do it with at least two persons of proved life present. Nor let Priests be easy to exorcize them, but let them examine all things diligently, lest place be given for evil suspicions or scandals."

ON THE USES OF SINS PER ACCIDENS.

Response by JOHANNES LE FEVRE of Middelburg, Zealand, November 18, 1643.

The amplifications of practitioners and the disputations of dogmatists on the common topics concerning the Providence of God in evil, the permission of sin, and predestination, very often suggest the opportunity to inquire about the use or abuse of sin. At the request of some, we will contribute our share to the explanation of this controversy.

I. With the prerequisites and hypotheses put forth, II. We will determine the question. III. We will add some problems.

I. The terms which must be known beforehand in this controversy are evil, sin, use, per accidens. 1. The nature of evil is nothing, but the loss of good has taken the name of evil, Augustine lib. 11 de Civitate Dei cap. 9. No evil as such is a positive being, metaphysically and properly accepted. 2. Evil is in good and toward good. 3. It does not properly have an efficient cause but a deficient one, 4. There is no evil through essence, or highest evil, 5. Nor is any evil eligible. 6. Nor appetible under the aspect of evil. 7. The evil of fault is greater and more such than the evil of punishment, 8. The evil of fault and of punishment, although they are distinguished specifically and by formal reasons, and one cannot be the other, nor can one be predicated of the other: nevertheless they can concur or be subjected in one subject or substrate; so that one and the same act concretely taken can be called both fault and punishment, as it were sustaining the form (so to speak) of both. Concerning these and other axioms, see Augustine against the Manicheans, Thomas in each summa and in q. disp. de Malo, as well as the common Scholastics and Metaphysicians. Cf. below, and the disputation on the propagation of original sin. 1.

Sin is sometimes taken abstractly, sometimes concretely: in the former way it denotes ἀνομία or deformity from the law of God formally and as such; in the latter way, it denotes a certain whole complex consisting of the underlying act, and ἀνομία or vice and sinfulness, and from ordinability or actual ordination to good.

2. The substrate, or material and subject of sin, that is, the natural action, in which is ἀνομία, as it is precisely and abstractly considered in the genus of nature, is metaphysically and naturally good; but as it is considered in the genus of morals, it is neutral and indifferent. 3. The divine permission of sin which is opposed to divine impedition, by which God prevents the creature from being able or willing to produce the act of sin; as well as the whole providence of God concerning the whole complex of sin concretely taken, namely with the underlying subject and outcome and all consequences, must be accurately distinguished from sin itself as such, or ἀνομία itself in itself, per se, and precisely accepted. The same we say about the decree of permitting, and about the decree of executing the whole actual and efficacious governance of sin complexly taken. 4. Similarly also the underlying act as it formally proceeds from the creature as a proper and particular cause; is to be distinguished from God acting, and His providence, concurrence, precurrence, as the first cause. 5. The ordinability and ordination of sin whether concretely or abstractly accepted can be distinguished into active and passive: or its active and passive attainment can be distinguished: or ordination is distinguished into ordaining and ordained. 6. Ordinability passively accepted, denotes obediential potency (if it may be so said), or non-repugnance, in relation to the power of God, who can convert every evil into good,

or elicit good from evil: so that "from" denotes an antecedent, presupposed, and occasion (namely per accidens) to which God produces some good. 7. Ordination passively accepted, expresses the term and as it were the subject of divine operation: in almost the same way as nothing, from which God produced heaven with the elements; and darkness, from which light; and earth, from which man and terrestrial animals. 8. Ordination actively accepted, or as it is considered on the part of God, is God Himself considered with a relation of reason to things to be ordained or ordinable. 9. Some consequences and outcomes of sin are and are called its effects per se, some per accidens or rather in no way effects, if you consider sin itself as such, and intention and operation through causes. III. The use of a thing is identified with its end, both principal and less principal, both per se and per accidens. 2. As therefore every end is good, and of good; so also every use: for use properly regards useful good and is denominated from it. For it expresses a twofold respect, to some good as a means, which one uses or can use; and at the same time to some good as an end, to which one uses that means. 3. To use is opposed abuse, namely when one uses a thing beyond and against its nature and end. IV. Per accidens is opposed to per se, in itself, from itself, of itself. But how, and in how many ways it is said per accidens is explained by the common formalists and lexicographer Philosophers: whence the juniors may learn or repeat those things. It will suffice for us here to presuppose: 1. Almost anything can be predicated of anything per accidens; provided that the combination and connection is of a concomitant, antecedent, consequent adjunct, with some subject or principle, or object. 2. On account of this concretion and connection of heterogeneous things there are various predications Logically improper, Rhetorically metonymic, indeed even catachrestic; which properly accepted are false, improperly accepted, are true? Because they are not verified, except by an extrinsic respect alone, namely in another, through another, and on account of another; and in relation to another, but not as they are accepted and predicated of the subject itself in itself and per se.

2. With these things known beforehand, it is asked whether there is any use of sin, or whether sin can in some respect and in some way be said to be conducive to someone and to something, or to be useful, or to be good, or to be better. Or whether at least authors, if any have said such a thing, can be excused, and vindicated from error, heresy, impiety, against rash slanderers. But there are from our side 1. Dogmatists (see the Leiden Synopsis of Theology, chapter on original sin). 2. Elenchtists in our vernacular book against Daniel Tilenus, and in the disputation on slander, That God is the author of sin and what is indicated 3. Practitioners such as Du Plessis and others noted in our book against Tilenus. And we there passim, as on p. 90, 106. And p. 83, 84, 86, but with a distinction. We now add Paul Baynes, eminent among the English practitioners, in a sermon on Revelation 2. And among the Belgians the most excellent William Teellinck in the vernacular treatise whose title is Exercise of Piety p. 36, 44. Nor should the notable catechetical explication of question 115 be omitted, where it treats of our imperfection. We determine with these conclusions. I. Conclusion. All concomitants and consequences of sin (except those which are sins formally so called) in themselves and per se are good and useful: and the reason is, because they are produced by God, either immediately, or mediately operating and cooperating in and with creatures as second causes. II. Conclusion. Sin itself abstractly and precisely accepted for ἀνομία or sin as such, in itself, and per se, and from its nature and intrinsic formal character is only evil, and to evil; consequently it is useless,

harmful, damaging, it has no use, nor does it conduce to anything. The reason is, because evil is neither an end, nor to an end, or does not have an end; and that because it does not have an efficient cause properly so called. IV. Conclusion. Sin is improperly or catachrestically said to be useful, and there to be some use or good outcome or effect of it, but per accidens, namely both of the underlying act; and of divine permission, which permits ἀνομία itself; and of divine ordination, and intention, by which and according to which He ordains ἀνομία or the sinful act and converts it to good. So that that utility and goodness 1. Inheres per se primarily in the operation, permission, ordination, and divine intention, or in all acts of God's providence concerning sin; then, in the effects of divine providence, namely in the subject underlying sins, and in any good effect or outcome from sin, or rather by occasion of sin, or drawn forth and produced to and after the existence of sin. 2. Consequently it is per se and properly predicated of them: on the contrary it does not inhere in formally so-called viciousness, or in the vicious act qua vicious, in any way, nor is it predicated of it; except per accidens of the good thing or action connected with ἀνομία itself; or through another and on account of another adjoined to that evil, that is, on account of the goods συνέχοντα with ἀνομία: so that the production of good is attributed to evil as a passive occasion, but by improper predication. To confirm this conclusion those things avail which Bonaventure subtly and distinctly determines, with his commentator Peter Capullo on I, distinction 46, question 6, points 1 and 2. Namely that the evil of fault, as good is elicited from it, is beautiful in order. And it contributes to the beauty of the universe occasionally, namely and per accidens not insofar as it is evil, nor by reason of deformity, but in a threefold way; 1. as good is elicited from it. 2. inasmuch as punishment is due to the evil of fault itself. 3. insofar as the opposite good appears more good from comparison with evil. Thomas in the second writing to the Master I, distinction 46, article 3, where to the question whether it is good for evils to happen, he thus responds: It must be said that we can speak of evil in two ways. In one way according to itself. In another way according to order to another, and this in two ways. In one way according to order per se. In another way according to order per accidens. Therefore goodness cannot be said of evil considered according to itself, nor of evil according to the order by which it is ordered per se to something. But in the order by which evil is ordered per accidens to something, some aspect of goodness can be found, inasmuch as evils are occasions of goods: And therefore all agree in this that it is not good for evil to happen, because through this goodness is removed from evil absolutely. Similarly also in this, that to do evils is not good, because through this the order of evil per se to its cause is designated. But in this which is said that evils happen or exist the order of evils to other things in general is implied: to per se and per accidens, because when we say that evils happen or exist we signify nothing other than that evils are found among things. If therefore it seems it must be said that for evils to happen, per se speaking is evil, but per accidens is good, inasmuch as some good is occasioned from evil: and because what is per se, is said more truly than what is per accidens, therefore the opinion which held that for evils to happen is evil, is truer than the one which held that for evils to happen is good. V. Conclusion. Hence also those uses per accidens so called by reason of God and His providence per se are and can properly be called abuses of sin: because as God, as by an extrinsic respect and to Himself and in a good way and to a good end uses sin well, so by an intrinsic respect and in relation to the very nature of sin and the intention of the sinner, He abuses it, and turns and diverts it (whether the devil and sinners want it or not) to good. In the way that by betrayal, perfidy, ambition, avarice or any other sin, a man can

sometimes rightly use, and at the same time abuse, namely in a different respect. In the same way also some evils in the Republic (which are called and really are necessary), have their use not in themselves, per se, or properly; but per accidens, and improperly, namely by reason of due toleration, when that is in itself and per se good and laudable: with the virtue and prudence of the Magistrate versated and exercised immediately and directly about the toleration of evil, but not about the evil itself. So that per se and properly the laudable use, and utility is of toleration; but not of abuse: on the contrary truly of the evil itself in itself there is not so much use as abuse: because it uses it beyond and against its nature, and beyond and against the intention of those who foster that evil. On which below in the problems. VI. Conclusion. Hence nevertheless it does not follow that sin is good, or in some respect eligible, or laudable, or excusable, or that one should not seriously repent of it, or that it should be less studiously avoided. For God alone is the author of the good which follows sin or which God produces by occasion of sin, and therefore all praise is to be attributed to Him alone entirely: but all the blame for evil remains with the sinning creature alone. For so far is it from being possible for God to participate in any appearance of evil, that He rather shows that He is so infinitely most perfectly good, that He even converts evil into good. Thus the Holy Spirit Himself distinguishes in Isaiah 10:5-7, Luke 22:23, Acts 2:23, Romans 3:3-5 and 6:1-2. Which places if they are considered, more than sufficiently blunt the atrocious slanders of the Remonstrants, and others, by which they confirm not a little the hands of Atheists and Epicureans against the most holy providence of God, and the authority of Scripture, whether they are prudent or imprudent, I will not say. See the vernacular writing of Tilenus, on the practice of the doctrine of the Synod of Dordt, and the recent wish of Grotius for the peace of the Church, and the same one's vindications of his notes on 2 Thessalonians 2, and the anonymous note in the vernacular language scattered in Holland some years ago, whose title is Recapitulation of the sermon of Festus Hommius then Pastor of Leiden, and many others cited in the disputation on slander, That God is the author of sin etc. Therefore it is and is called useful or good with respect to sin as namely the underlying act of sin is good, both in itself and per se, namely with natural goodness or in the genus of nature, or metaphysically considered as it is a being; because good and being are convertible: and considered as it is ordinable and is ordained to good, that is to the attainment of some end. For useful good is what leads to a good end, or is the way to good: as the definition of the said Areopagite has it, chapter 4 on the Divine Names. But because in three ways something can lead to a good end (as Bonaventure rightly observes on I, distinction 46), either as its cause, or as chance, or as an occasion; but occasion is twofold, as active, and as passive: we say with the same Bonaventure that the substrate or material of sin is for God an active occasion for eliciting good; but its formal aspect or ἀνομία is only a passive occasion (on which above).

VI. Conclusion. With this caveat, and with these restrictions indicated by us, ecclesiastical writers everywhere both ancient and new, of whatever profession in Christianity, do not fear to attribute something to some thing or action, namely utility and use to sins, which however belongs to it only per accidens, not in itself, or per se and properly, but to another thing or good joined to those sins. Thus speaks 1. Scripture. First, in the matter of sin, Romans 11:11, 12, 15, 31, 32. Which is to be taken per accidens, and per and on account of something else joined to that sin, and consequently in a certain respect, by an extrinsic respect only, and therefore

improperly and catachrestically. Which nevertheless it denies elsewhere, with a distinction and explanation added, Romans 3:7-8 and 6:1-2, 15, compared with chapter 5:20-21, Isaiah 10:7, Genesis 50:20. There are those who here cite the passages Romans 8:28, Psalm 83:17. But whether those are to be taken of sin, will be inquired below. Second, in the matter of sad evil to which it attributes goodness, utility, and desirability, Philippians 1:11, 23, Romans 5:3, 2 Corinthians 12:9-10, 2 Peter 3:12. That all this is to be understood per accidens, and per and on account of something else, is clear from the excellent distinction by which the apostle explains this matter, 2 Corinthians 5:4. Third, in the matter of things good in themselves and per se and only good, e.g., Christ, the Gospel, the law, the prophets of God, Luke 2:34, 1 Peter 2:7, Isaiah 6:9-10 compared with John 12, John 9:39, Romans 7:5. To which evil is attributed causally. But that this is to be understood per accidens the distinction and caution of the apostle teaches, Romans 7:10-11, 13. Fourth, in other Scriptural and theological paradoxes, a list of which is to be exhibited elsewhere, such as e.g., Death is life, cursing is blessing, see also 2 Corinthians 6:10-11 and 12:7, 10, 11. The Fathers speak thus especially in this matter, Augustine, City of God, book 14, chapter 13: I dare to say that it is useful for the proud to fall into some open and obvious sin, whence they may be displeased with themselves, they who by being pleased with themselves had already fallen. For Peter was more beneficially displeased with himself when he wept, than pleased with himself when he presumed. He has something similar in volume 7, book on Correction and Grace, chapter 9: To such people (namely the predestined) God works all things together for good, even absolutely all things, so that even if some of them deviate and go astray, He makes even this very thing beneficial for them, because they return more humble and more learned. For they learn in the very just way that they ought to exult with trembling, not arrogating to themselves a confidence of abiding as if by their own strength, nor saying in their abundance, I shall not be moved forever. And ibid., chapter 1, p. 1325: But what the enemy has attempted for the subversion of some among you, by the mercy of God, and by His wonderful goodness turning his treacheries to the advancement of His servants, has availed for this rather, that none of yours should be destroyed for the worse, but some should be instructed for the better. The same in volume 1, Confessions, book 5, chapter 7, p. 104: Thus that Faustus, who had been for many a snare of death, had now begun to loosen that by which I was held, neither willing it, nor knowing it. But Thy hands, O my God, in the secret of Thy providence, did not forsake my soul. And book 9, chapter 8, p. 154, where he speaks of the vice of drunkenness which had crept upon his mother in childhood: Whence didst Thou heal her? Whence didst Thou cure her? Didst Thou not bring forth from another soul a hard and sharp taunt, like a surgeon's knife from Thy secret stores, and with one touch remove all that foulness? For a maidservant with whom she used to go to the cup, quarreling with her younger mistress, as happens, when alone with her alone, cast this in her teeth with a most bitter insult, calling her a wine-bibber. Stung by which taunt, she perceived her foulness, and immediately condemned and put it away. As flattering friends pervert, so reproachful enemies mostly correct. Yet Thou renderest unto them, not what by them Thou doest, but what themselves intended. For she, being angry, desired to irritate her young mistress, not to cure her; and did it in secret, either because the time and place of the quarrel so found them; or perhaps lest she herself should be exposed to danger for disclosing it so late. But Thou, Lord, Governor of heaven and earth, who convertest to Thy purposes the deepest torrents, and disposest the turbulent current of the ages, healest one soul by the unsoundness of another; lest any man, when he remarks this,

should attribute it to his own power if another, whom he wishes to be reformed, is so through a word of his. Nazianzen, Oration 1 against Julian, citing the words of Psalm 119, says: Thus he places humility midway between sin and repentance, as arising from the former, but the parent of the latter. For sin is the parent of humiliation (note well), but repentance of humility. Theodoret, Cure of Greek Maladies, book 6, p. 97, Greek-Latin edition of Commelin, praises the doctrine of Plotinus, who states that even evil contributes not a little utility to the universe, etc. But although Plotinus seems to be speaking mostly of sad evils, yet his words could be extended to shameful evils, if one attends more accurately. Gregory the Great on Job, book 33, chapter 16: Behold, he who exalts himself from virtue, returns to humility through vice. And chapter 18: By the secret order of dispensation, whence the iniquity of the devil is permitted to rage, thence the kindness of God is piously perfected. Well known is that common saying of Gregory, by which he calls the fault of Adam happy, which deserved to have such a Redeemer. Here let there be added from later writers Anselm on Romans 8:28, p. 61, who extends "all things" to the falls of the faithful; because thereby they become more humble and more prudent. And to those who love God all things work together, that is, all things become at the same time for good: because all things that happen to them are turned to good for them, not only those things which are desired as pleasant. Absolutely all things, so that even if some of them deviate and go astray, even this very thing profits them for good, because they return more humble and more learned, and afterwards more robustly and cautiously persist in good deeds. III. From the Pontificals, Lyra on Romans 8:28: For thus even sins turn out for good, because they rise again stronger and more cautious. And even in glory the memory of sins contributes to their good, as scars to the glory of a soldier who has finally triumphed in war. Thomas on Romans 8, lecture 6: But do even sins work together for them for good? Some say that sins are not contained under this which he says "all things" because according to Augustine sin is nothing and men become nothing when they sin. But against this is what follows in the gloss: To such an extent does God work all things together for good for them that if any of them deviate and go astray, He makes even this very thing profitable for them for good. Whence also in the Psalms it is said: When the just falls, he will not be ruined, because the Lord puts His hand under him. But according to this it seems that such people always rise again in greater charity, since man's good consists in charity, which if he does not have, the apostle recognizes that he is nothing, 1 Corinthians 13. But it must be said that man's good consists not only in the quantity of charity but especially in its perseverance unto death, according to that in Matthew 24: He who perseveres to the end will be saved. But from the fact that the just man falls, he rises more cautious and more humble. Whence in the gloss it is added, after it said that He makes this very thing profitable for them for good, that they return to themselves more humble and more learned. For they learn that they ought to exult with trembling, not as it were arrogating to themselves a confidence of abiding as if by their own strength. Bonaventure on I, distinction 46, the only article, to the question raised by the Master, whether it is good for sins to happen, thus in question 3, section 20: For the understanding of the aforesaid, it must be noted that in works, that is to be called good or useful or conducive which leads to a good end or is the way to good. But something is said to lead to good in three ways, namely by way of cause, or by way of chance, or by way of occasion, and these three differ. For a cause per se leads with respect to that about which it is posited, which is producing and intending. But chance deprives of intention but not of operation, as is clear in one who digs and finds a treasure beyond his intention. But occasion deprives of both, for it

does not express a producing principle, but rather expresses something which affects the principle so that it may effect, as someone from a word heard strikes another, the word heard was the occasion not effecting the striking, nor cooperating with the one effecting, but in a certain way affecting. And this occasion is in two ways: For there is a certain one which in a certain way has the aspect of active which in a certain way excites the one effecting, as a bad example to sin. Or which has the aspect of passive, as from which someone takes a reason, as someone from the evil of another excites himself to doing good through this understanding, that evil expresses two things, namely privation, and a nature able to be ordained. And by reason of its malice it is related to the good which is elicited as a passive occasion, by reason of the good which is underlying as an occasion in some way active, on account of which evil is called the occasion of good. Therefore, when something leads to good in these three ways, it has a difference in leading. Something can also lead something else to another, either from itself or through something of itself, and then it holds the aspect of a cause per se. Or it can lead through another to which nevertheless it is not ordained, but that ordains it to a third, taking occasion from it, and thus it holds the aspect of an occasion. Or it leads with another to which nevertheless it is not ordained, nor that to a third, but both at the same time, and thus it holds the aspect of chance which is from the concurrence of causes. From this, therefore, it is clear that that which leads by way of cause has in itself the aspect of ordination to an end, and therefore in it is goodness, and therefore it is rightly denominated good. But what leads by way of occasion has in itself no aspect of ordination to an end, nor goodness, and on account of this it cannot be denominated good per se except with the addition of that through which it is ordained, in which, namely, consists the aspect of ordination and goodness, and about which goodness is posited. Since therefore evil does not lead to good from itself, but through that which is elicited from it by the wise God, absolutely speaking, for evil to happen is not good, indeed all similar [statements] are to be denied, because goodness is noted to be posited about evil itself. But if the good which is elicited, or the one eliciting Himself, is added, then statements of this kind are to be conceded: for evil to happen is good for Him who knows how to ordain it to good, similarly for evil to happen is good so that the elect may be proved. Peter Capullus in his commentaries on Bonaventure, cited distinction, question 3, p. 777: Saint Bonaventure in doubt 3, letter, most subtly and most learnedly examines this, distinguishing that working together for good for someone can be in three ways, in one way by helping, in the way that grace works together with free will, and vice versa, secondly by exciting, as poverty and misery which excite to the love of God, thirdly by resisting, as hot water is more strongly congealed, because while it resists, the action of the contrary is invigorated, and thus evil is said to work together, either because it makes a man be more excited to good, or more, because while it resists, and man prevails, the strength of grace is invigorated and grows fervent.

Or in other words, and it amounts to the same, but expanding and declaring something, something works together with another for good in three ways.

First as more directly, because per se it is ordained to good, as virtue, grace, and things of this kind are per se ordained to good.

Secondly something works together with another for good, as more quickly or more easily, as poverty or infirmity make one move to good.

In a third way as more fervently, and thus sin, for as the more vehemently cold recedes, the more fervently is heat left behind, so sin receding induces a vehemence of sorrow and a greater ardor for working better, whence the Apostle in Romans 8: To those who love God all things work together for good, for him who recedes from Him.

If they are evil angels, then they also work together for good because the evil angel by tempting promotes, exercises, and fabricates eternal crowns, as St. Gregory testifies, it is useful for the saints to be tempted, proved, and examined, so that when they have been proved they may receive the crown, James 1: Blessed is the man who endures temptation; or it is our own good, as our soul, and this also works together for good, for there man finds things illuminating and inflaming, when he sees himself to the image of God, but if it is evil, it works together for good because punishment purges from guilt, and guilt helps in bearing, whence he uses well the evils which he does, who thereby becomes more humble in conscience, more fervent in patience, more solicitous in caution, this most clearly testifies St. Augustine in book 1, On Correction and Grace, saying thus: To such people, namely those loving, to such an extent does God work all things together for good, that if any of them deviate and go astray, He makes even this very thing profitable for them for good, because they return more humble and more learned, as Peter, even those evils which the faithful piously endure from the wicked, as Augustine says in the book On the Trinity, certainly profit them, either for deleting sins, or for exercising and proving justice, or for demonstrating the misery of this life, and therefore both Job felt the hand of God, and the Apostle the goad of Satan, and both profited well, because they bore evil well. Dionysius the Carthusian on Romans 8:28: All things, both good and evil, etc. For good things, that is, virtuous works, work together in them for good directly, but evil things indirectly. For both iniquity abounded, and grace abounded, Romans 5. Therefore it is written of the truly just man, all things whatsoever he does will prosper. For it often happens that the more gravely they consider themselves to have sinned, the more humble and more fervent they are rendered. Titelmann in his elucidation on the epistle to the Romans 8:28: But we know that for those who love God, by the benefice of the same Spirit, all things, whether prosperous or adverse, whether joyous or sad, turn out for good, and grow for the fruit of merits: So that they can in no way (note well) be hindered from that glory to which they are predestined: to these (he says) who according to the purpose of divine predestination are called to the faith of Christ in holiness. Cajetan on Romans 8:28: And by saying "all things," he excludes nothing pertaining in any way to the saints, etc., to whose good there is no doubt that God ordains all things, even hell. Cornelius a Lapide in his commentary on Romans 8 approves the exposition of Augustine, Anselm, Thomas, and adds for the sake of explanation: Thus on the contrary St. Augustine, sermon 78, On Time, Soliloquies, chapter 28: To the wicked, he says, and the reprobate all things work together for evil, and their very prayer is turned for them into sin. Understand this not properly and per se, but per accidens, namely because all grace, and all the gifts of God, and consequently even prayer itself, turns out for the reprobate for guilt and more grave damnation, by this very fact, that they abuse these gifts of God, while they do not want to use them and through them to convert themselves and procure their salvation. Pererius on Genesis,

book 1, on chapter 1, verse 31, p. 209, 8th edition: The evils of fault are truly and simply evil, nor do they have anything of good in themselves, these are sins: yet so great is the goodness, wisdom and power of God, that even these are ordained and perfected to some good. For God is so good that He wills, so powerful that He can, so wise that He knows how to convert all such evils to good: so that even those things which He Himself does not do, nor wills to be done, He nevertheless wonderfully applies and adapts to that which He is going to do. For either He pardons sins, in which He shows His extraordinary clemency and mercy; or He avenges and chastises with eternal punishments, and in this He demonstrates the rectitude and rigor of His justice; and He causes that even sins profit His elect for good: namely that from a fall they rise more humble and more cautious, and more eager and more fervent for good works. An illustrious argument and at the same time example of this matter, the sin of Adam exhibits to us, which how grave it was, how far and wide it diffused its poison and destruction, how severely it was avenged, is admitted by all: yet this so great evil, such is the goodness and power of God, was wondrously converted to the greatest good and the most illustrious of the works of God, namely to the incarnation, passion, and death of the Son of God. So that not rashly or at random Gregory exclaims in a certain place, O happy fault, which deserved to have such and so great a Redeemer. Lorinus in his commentary on Psalm 83 approves the opinion of Augustine, book 14, City of God, chapter 13, and of Nazianzen, Oration 1 against Julian, which we just now cited; and adds: And so ignominy and confusion is either the fault, into which God allows one to fall, or arises from the turpitude of sin considered, or extrinsically from some other cause of infamy or loss. In all these ways ignominy contributes (note well) to seeking the name of the Lord. Thomas à Kempis, book 3, Imitation, chapter 8: They have become poor and vile, abandoned, who placed their nest in heaven: so that humbled and impoverished they may learn not to fly on their own wings, but to hope under mine. Peter Montanus, Minorite, in his exposition on the passion of the Lord, thus notes on the fall of Peter: Thus note and see, how true it is what Paul said, that for those who love God all things work together for good. Louis of Blois, chapter 8, Spiritual Institution, consoles the pious against vices and defects, which they cannot conquer, that they are like dung, by which the field of the soul, fertilized, brings forth so many more fruits. The same utility of sin is explained by Capullus in his commentary on Bonaventure on I, distinction 1, article 1, question 2, point 3, p. 55.

Whether vicious works are useful.

This doubt is touched on by the Holy Doctor in the third and fourth argument, to which it must be satisfied thus, that vicious works can be considered in three ways, in one way according to themselves, in another way insofar as they are elicited by the sinner, in a third way as the will can have some act about them, for example of displeasure and detestation, in the first way they are not useful, because they are not referable to God, in the second way similarly they are not useful, because thus they deviate entirely from the ultimate end, in the third way they can be called useful for as the Apostle says in Romans 8: We know that for those who love God all things work together for good; from which it is clear, that the evils of fault work together for good for the elect, and thus through them they are helped to good.

Which, so that it may be clearly understood, it must be noted that the evil of fault does not have from its nature, that it direct us to God or work together for good, but only accidentally and occasionally inasmuch as by the inspiration and prevenient grace of God from the consideration of our own excesses we are more compunct, and rendered more humble, more cautious, and more fervent, so that where iniquity abounded, grace also abounds, and thus the martyrs used well the cruelties of tyrants.

The Holy Doctor observes, that the aspect of ordination in good things is on the part of the one ordaining and the thing ordained, because good things from their nature are useful and ordinable, but in evil things the aspect of ordination is not on the part of the things ordained, but rather on the part of the one ordaining.

For the elucidation of which saying it must be noted, that the order of a thing is twofold, one is of the particular thing itself, to which it is ordained according to its particular nature, the other is the order of universal divine providence, which never fails, but is infallible, for example, man by the order of his particular nature is ordained to God through grace, which he has, and through the ability and capacity of his nature, this order is lost through sin, because grace is lost; but nevertheless by the order of God's universal providence the sinning man is ordained to punishment, and to the manifestation of divine justice,

Again it must be noted according to the Holy Doctor in I, distinction 46, question 5, that although evil is not ordinable per se, nor in itself, because it does not have goodness in itself, nor ordinability, nevertheless by reason of the material good, in which it is sustained, it is said to be ordained per accidens. The same in distinction 1, article 1, point 1, part 55, we exhibited the words just now. IV. From others, partly adversaries of the doctrine of the grace of God, and providence, partly accusers of our religion, partly authors of such a kind as the adversaries approve. Erasmus in his paraphrase on Romans 11, concerning the fall and apostasy of the Jews, affirms that it conduces happily, etc. Luther in his commentary on Genesis 52, pp. 249-250, Latin edition in folio, elegantly expounds those words: You thought evil, etc., and adduces Romans 8:28, he also resolves the bad consequence, which some deduce from this. His words are:

Thus God effected the highest good out of so great evil. I therefore easily forgive you, when I see that God has profited me and infinite others very greatly by your worst counsel.

And this is what Paul says in Romans 8: We know that for those who love God all things work together for good, for those who are called saints according to His purpose. And Augustine somewhere says: God is so good, that He would not permit evil to be done, unless He could elicit immense good from it.

But from this it does not follow, what profane men collect, and is refuted by Paul in Romans 3: For if the truth of God has abounded through my lie to His glory, why am I also still judged as a sinner, and not (as we are slandered, and as some affirm that we say) let us do evil, that good may come? For Paul adds: Whose damnation is just. See also Brentz on Exodus 4, pp. 60-61,

8th edition: And I will use this hardening not for your destruction, but for your salvation, and for the glory of my name, etc. When therefore God in this word: I will harden Pharaoh's heart, has regard most of all to the consolation of the Israelites, it ought not to be understood, that God is the author of sin in Pharaoh, but rather it ought to be understood, that God signifies that He is so industrious, that He uses well the evil hardening of Pharaoh for illustrating the glory of His name. And Chemnitz in his Examination of Session 6, chapter 6: Often also that malice, which arises from the will of men themselves, and is inflamed by the devil, God uses for inflicting deserved punishments on those, whom He wills to visit by His just judgment. And first also Arminius disputes on the justice and efficacy of God's providence in evil, thesis 15:

But when the act, although permitted to the power and will of the creature, is taken away from its power through legislation, and on account of this it will often be the case, that the creature not entirely hardened in evil, does not want to commit the act because it is joined with sin, unless certain arguments and occasions are proposed, which are like incitements to commit it; the administration of that proposition also belongs to God's providence, who proposes those irritants, both so that He may test whether the creature wants to abstain from sinning, even when incited by irritants, since there is little praise of abstinence where they are absent, and so that, if the creature wants to yield to those incitements, He may accomplish His work through the act of the creature, not impelled by necessity, as if He could not produce His work without the intervention of the creature's act, but moved by the will to illustrate His manifold wisdom. V. From Christian writers in general of whatever profession they are, 1. All those who write for the truth of the Christian religion against Atheists, Gentiles, Epicureans, Manicheans, etc., when they defend and explain how it is good, for evil to exist. See Eusebius, book 3, Preparation for the Gospel, last chapter, Augustine, book 1, City of God, chapter 8 and following, and book 11, chapter 18, Thomas, Against the Gentiles, book 3, chapter 9. The same in disputed questions on evil. And the Sententiaries on I, distinction 46, when they determine those questions: Whether it is good for evils to happen: Whether evil is ordinable by God's will: Whether evil belongs to the adornment and complement of the universe: Whether it can be called beautiful: Whether it contributes to the beauty of the universe. Du Plessis on the truth of religion, chapter 12. The same in French meditations, part 2, on the text of Proverbs 16:4. 2. All writers of commonplaces and controversies, where they treat of the permission of sin, of God's providence in evil, of sin the punishment of sin, of the fall of Adam, of original sin, of the fall of the devils and their abandonment in sin. 3. All practical writers on temptation, on the consolation and incitement of the pious against imperfection in this life, distractions, insensible devotion, etc. VI. Finally, from the axioms and maxims of philosophers, orators, and other wise men, commonly used, which are to be explained through that per accidens; such as for example, the generation of one is the corruption of another, From bad morals good laws, Privation is the principle of natural things.

3. VIII. Conclusion. We distribute the special consequences of sin and uses per accidens thus, that some are considered properly or more in relation to God, others in relation to men, and these both to be saved, and not to be saved. The uses per accidens in relation to God in general are, the illustration of glory, wisdom, power, mercy, justice. Which is proved and

professedly explained by authors, when they treat of providence, of predestination and of the permission of sin, and the permission of the fall of Adam.

Sin (says Ursinus in his volume of theological treatises, disputation on providence, p. 187) therefore per se or by its nature, since it is perpetrated out of unbelief and contempt of God, by the intention of those sinning: affects God with insult and by its merit brings eternal death to those sinning: but it serves the glory of God and the dejection of the elect before God and the imploration of God's mercy and justice per accidens, that is, from the mercy and justice of God pitying or punishing. Here therefore are to be noted distinctly and part by part, 1. The illustration of the glory of mercy in those same ones to be saved who have sinned, Romans 11:31-32, Galatians 3:22. And here applies the example of the fall of Adam, which was the occasion for exerting that infinite divine love and mercy by which the only begotten Son was given as a sponsor, and our sins were placed upon Him, reconciliation and satisfaction were furnished, and this was applied to us for the remission of sins, Romans 8, John 3:16, 2 Corinthians 5:18-19, Ephesians 1:6-7. Which is amplified by practical writers and preachers both ancient and recent, to the cited texts, and to the history of the nativity and passion of Christ. And hence that common hyperbolic and catachrestic saying of Gregory the Great: O happy fault, which deserved to have such a Redeemer. 2. The illustration of the glory of mercy in the first conversion of the sinner from death to life, and his reception into grace. And here apply the examples of the thief on the cross, the sinful woman in Luke 7, the persecutor Paul in Acts 9 compared with 1 Timothy 1:16, the jailer in Acts 16:27. Whose profound falls, and illustrious and splendid sins, by which they excelled above other sinners before and which were often proximately before conversion excellently sinning, illustrated the glory of God's immense and unmerited mercy, Romans 5:20, Luke 7:47. Thus contraries placed next to each other shine forth more. 3. The illustration of the glory of mercy and long-suffering in the restoration of the faithful from grave lapses, and on this occasion in engendering, increasing, and exciting the acts and Christian virtues of the new creature; namely profound sorrow and shame and humiliation over sins, Zechariah 12, 2 Corinthians 7, joy and consolation in the renewed sense of divine grace, prudence and solicitude against sins in the future, zeal and abundance in good works, lavish charity, toleration, gentleness, and commiseration toward a neighbor still living in sins, or fallen and relapsed into them. Consider the example of Peter, Matthew 26 compared with Luke 22, John 21, and Acts 2. And of the Corinthian church, 1 Corinthians 4 compared with 2 Corinthians 7. Where the commentators and preachers are to be seen: besides the sayings of the preceding authors cited in the thesis; and the commentators on Romans 8:28 and Psalm 83:17. Where among others Lorinus cites and approves the saying of Augustine from book 14, City of God, chapter 13, and of Nazianzen, Oration 1 against Julian: Fault is the mother of humility, Augustine in his Confessions, book 5, chapter 7, and book 9, chapter 8, demonstrates all the uses both with respect to the sinners themselves, and with respect to others excellently in his own example. We exhibited his golden words above. 4. The illustration of the glory of mercy toward others, whom by occasion of the sins and falls of others, He preserves from falling in a wondrous way, or sustains and raises up those falling, or leads back those fallen to salutary repentance, and through it to Himself. Concerning all those ways of the Lord, just now recounted, one may rightly exclaim with the apostle, Romans 11:33: O the depth, etc. Hence His mercy is an abyss of justice, and His justice an abyss of mercy. Here pertains that common

saying, I would have perished, if I had not perished. And two similar ones, one of which is taken from theriac, which is made from poisons to overcome poisons, the other from lethargy, to overcome which physicians are said to leave a fever in the one laboring, if indeed it is present, or to excite the same, if it is not present. 5. The illustration of the glory of divine wisdom, power, and justice. God shows His manifold wisdom by occasion of sin, when He wondrously permits, tolerates, governs it, in the beginning, in progress, in egress or outcome. Concerning which the authors on God's providence in evil are to be seen, especially also Arminius in his disputations, under a peculiar title. He shows His power and justice, when with omnipotent facility He breaks and conquers sin by mercifully forgiving; or conquers and crushes the sinner either by justly and severely punishing and avenging, or by paternally chastising and correcting; or terrifies other sinners. Here pertains the example of Pharaoh, Romans 9, and of the Sodomites, and of the first world. In relation to men the uses can be easily taken from the things already said and applied. Those to be converted are converted on this occasion, and having fallen into the abyss, the profound mire, are drawn out from there; those who are far off draw near through the way of salutary shame and desperation to the desire, seeking, and apprehension of the grace of God in Christ by striving. Acts 2:37 and 16:30, those fallen and having suffered a relapse, rise again so much the more promptly and eagerly, and with youth as it were renewed like the eagle's hasten to perfection, Isaiah 40. Which can be deduced and amplified through the individual conditions, parts, acts, degrees of sanctity, or new obedience. But concerning these things in Ascetics, under the title The Practice of Repentance. 2. The pious even the strongest in faith, hence have the matter of patience, fortitude, humility, vigilance, striving in prayers, trust and hope in God, dependence on his grace alone, etc. Here applies the example of Paul, 2 Corinthians 12. And the saying of Blosius cited above, by which from experience he affirms that God sometimes leaves in spiritual gymnasts certain troublesome defects, by which like dung the field of their soul is fertilized, etc. 3. Those not to be converted, are more confounded, and convicted in themselves, and in themselves feel and sustain the deformity, stain, vileness, guilt and all punishments of sins. Which the apostle excellently teaches, Romans 1:24, 26, 27, 28. 4. Other sinners both to be converted and not to be converted, are confounded either salutarily or to insensibility. The adversaries themselves are forced to acknowledge these and other uses and effects per accidens, whatever else they may prevaricate against, as often as they run against our harmless doctrine of providence and predestination. Let Arminius against Perkins, sections 7, 8, 9 be seen. The same in the disputation on God's providence in evil, theses 5, 16, 23. And in the disputation on the first sin of the first man, thesis 10. For from there it necessarily follows that sin can be said to be conducive or ordinable to good, indeed even actually to conduce and be ordained to good, when namely it is the matter or occasion of exercising divine mercy, justice, power: which good the sinning man does not intend, nor does it follow from sin itself naturally and per se; but God freely intends and wills it, and consequently seizes that occasion, and no less rightly uses it with respect to His intention, than He abuses it with respect to the intention of sinners, and with respect to the nature of sin itself. And hence sin, which comes into existence with God freely permitting, exists necessarily by a necessity, namely of consequence: which is solidly deduced from the very words of Arminius, p. 157. See also pp. 167, 161, 162. Concerning which more in the disputation on the Method of responding to slanders, about God the author of sin. But to all slanderers and adversaries, who indeed still acknowledge the authority of Scripture, I propose those questions, to which if they respond categorically, they will

see even their slanders wiped away. 1. Whether God permits sin. 2. Whether He decreed to permit it from eternity? 3. Whether He does both in vain; or truly for some definite end? 4. Whether He also ordains or converts sin to good, that is, whether by occasion of sin He works some good. 5. Whether by seizing sin and making it the matter and occasion of the good produced by Him from there, He Himself becomes the author of that sin; or that sin ceases to be sin. 6. Whether the permission of sin, and its ordination and conversion to good, is good, and useful, as being per se the means of illustrating divine glory? 7. Whether in this respect sin itself can in some way, improperly namely and catachrestically be called useful, and as a means: which is such per accidens, or becomes such, per accidens namely of the admirable wisdom and governance of God, although otherwise in itself and per se it is merely evil, consequently neither useful, nor a means, nor an end, nor to an end. 8. Whether and how God can be said to have willed and intended this use of sin per accidens, either directly or indirectly. 9. Whether at least use and utility cannot be attributed to sin concretely and complexly taken with all circumstances in some respect. Where they will have taught us what is to be responded here, I do not think any controversy will remain, but mere and inveterate slander, which is to be revoked by them, if they have regard for conscience: or at least mere trifling and idle wasting of time; such as Arminius commits against Perkins, pp. 124-125. For neither Perkins, nor any of ours has philosophized so crassly, as to say that sin as such is good, or to find some good in it as such; or even to contend that sin is good per se, or is ordained to good per se.

4. We add a few problems. I. Problem. Whether Romans 8:28 properly deals with all evils, not only sad ones, but also shameful ones. We answer negatively with our interpreters, and some Pontificals. For we do not think the circumstances of the text permit it to be extended to shameful evils: although with Augustine, chapter 9, On Correction and Grace, Lyra, Anselm, Thomas and other Pontificals cited above, thesis 2, extend it there. If anyone wants to apply those words to this matter by accommodation or allusion, we do not object. II. Problem. Whether Psalm 83:17 is to be understood directly and properly of sin, and whether the interpretation of Augustine proves this. No, as is clear to one inspecting the passage. III. Problem. Whether it can be said that God wills sin for the sake of something else, namely the good of the universe (as they say) and for the sake of His glory? There are those who affirm that God wills for sin to happen, or has decreed, that sin exists or that it happens: not indeed, that He Himself would do it, but that He would permit it. For which opinion Twisse subtly disputes in Vindication of Grace. Others prefer to say, that God wills or decrees the permission of sin, or that sin exists, but not the very existence of sin, or that sin is. Others think it must be said, that God's volition does not directly concern sin, but the permission of sin. Thus Arminius against Perkins. Yet the same one in the same place, p. 162: God wanted to punish Israel, and for Ahab to fill up the measure of his crimes. We, although we think those opinions can be bent to a sound sense, and reconciled, yet prefer that the matter always be expressed with this limitation: God wills or decrees to permit sin; And God wills sin not as sin but as ordinable, or insofar as it is ordained and converted to the good of the universe and the glory of His name. For thus for example God wills the punishments of sin, which as Arminius says against Perkins, p. 127, are not permitted by God, but are inflicted by the just Judge, have God Himself as author. But now sin is the punishment of sin. Romans 1:23, 24, 25, 26. IV. Problem. When God is the author of punishment, is He also the author of that sin, by which another sin is punished? No. For God producing the act

underlying sin, and moreover converting and ordaining the sinful act or sin concretely accepted into and to the good of justice, is the author of the good both presupposed and underlying ἀνομία, and consequent or concomitant drawn forth from sin already posited or committed through His wisdom, justice, and power, that is, produced by God by occasion of sin: which is properly called the good of justice. Therefore one and the same act has adjoined or adhering to it both ἀνομία and penality, and therefore is at the same time both vicious and penal. But for that reason there is not the same formal aspect of both punishment and guilt; nor is one the other although both are in one and about one. As quantity is not quality, although one and the same body is quantified and qualified; nor is whiteness sweetness, although one and the same milk or sugar is white and sweet. So that the argument of Arminius against Perkins is ridiculous: The evil of fault and punishment are distinguished by their whole essences; Therefore sin is not punishment, nor ought opposite attributes to be enunciated distinctly of sin as fault, and as punishment. See Twisse, and the Scholastics passim. Also Arminius himself in the disputation on God's providence in evil, and on the first sin of Adam, and on original sin. V. Problem. Whether every sin has the aspect of punishment. Affirmative, concerning every original sin, and concerning every actual sin: except the first sin of the first parents. VI. Problem. Whether sin is the means of reprobation, or of the illustration of divine glory? Properly or per se, No, but the permission of sin. VII. Problem. Whether guilt, and other consequences or effects of sin per se, have the aspect of fault or of punishment. The latter, Affirmative. VIII. Problem. Whether the saying of Gregory the Great: O happy fault, etc. can be excused and defended. Affirmative, at least no less than the ἀκυρολογία of Grotius, who in his dogmatic elenctic writing on satisfaction says that sin is the impulsive cause of the satisfaction of Christ. For whatever Arminius may quibble against Perkins, Gregory wanted to indicate nothing else by this hyperbole and catachresis than that the outcome of that sin was happy and useful to us through the sending of Christ; in which we gained more than we lost in Adam. Martyr on Romans 5, concerning this same saying, thus judges: Which words I would not easily say; since I see nothing in that cause, which is not miserable and lamentable. For that so great a salvation followed, that is to be ascribed to divine goodness, not to the fault of Adam. For from it so great a good was derived only per accidens. But with the peace of so great a man having been said, it is not permitted to suspect that Gregory was so stupid, that he understood anything else or otherwise. IX. Problem. Whether it can be said that God permits sin, as sin? If it is understood of malice formally so called, and as it denotes for its own sake, No. See Bonaventure on I, distinction 49, cited above. And the writers of common places and the scholastics under the title on the permission of sin. And in this sense we think Rollock denied such permission, noted by Twisse. For whatever he seems to dispute to the contrary, yet he thus explains himself in chapter 24, On Calling, p. 144: But now that evil, as evil, with respect to God permitting and deserting happens per accidens, not per se; since God in deserting evil as it is evil, did not propose it, but on the contrary as it has the aspect of good, and is a means of His glory to be obtained, especially through mercy. For all means, whether God Himself does them, or permits them to be done by evil instruments, are in the first place both destined by God, and directed to the glory of mercy, which is from the salvation of the creature: God has shut up all in stubbornness, that He may have mercy on all. But in the second place on account of the hardness of man, and the heart which does not know to repent, sins and evils which are done by an evil instrument, serve the glory which He acquires for Himself from His justice and just punishments. But if it only denotes malice itself, or

sin considered in itself, Affirmative. Because God does not place an impediment either to the will or to the power of the one sinning, or to sin itself as such: and this is to permit. X. Problem. We add on account of some affinity of the matter, although it properly pertains to the moral part of theology: Whether and in what way man by the example of God can use the sins of other men, for his own good, or the good of a neighbor, especially of the Republic, or of the church? 1. He can use sin or if you prefer some indifferent act of man, indeed even a good and useful one, but which is joined with sin: with this distinction, that he is directly concerned with the act, event, or good or indifferent effect; or thus, that he is directly occupied with the moral efficiency of the indifferent or good act, and directly intends and executes to the best of his ability the use and application of it to his own honest purpose and work; But per accidens, indirectly, and by necessity of consequence, he is concerned with the vice joined to that event and effect, through the fault of another, not his own. Briefly, he uses the good or indifferent act of another notwithstanding that it is joined with sin: as the act is per se useful or necessary, not as contaminated by vice or defect either adhering or conjoined; or as considered in itself, not as conjoined in and with sin, which whole thing is per accidens. 2. But how he can use the sin of another without participation of sin, I briefly determine thus: namely if he himself does nothing either physically or morally about the beginning of the vicious act; but only licitly permits or tolerates it; and ordains and converts it to good. But when and how far it is or is not licit to omit acts or to cease from acts by which sin may be impeded, and that for the public or private good, spiritual and temporal, absolute or comparative, that is, a greater good, and for the avoidance of evil, absolute or comparative, that is, a greater evil, must be determined in general in the moral or casuistic part; and there specially applied to cases, concerning borrowing from usurers, concerning using a traitor or treason, likewise the rebellion, sedition of others, moreover drunkenness, swearing by false gods, And also the defense, jurisdiction, and political judgment of tyrants, pirates, or the Pope, or a monk, or a Papal Bishop, etc. We ascribe here the determination of Durandus on I, distinction 2, question 4: But there is another reason concerning the evils of fault: for they are disordered from God: on account of which they do not seem to be referred to God: but because it is written, Romans 8: All things work together for good for those who love God: and the gloss extends this word to evils: saying that if any deviate and go astray, He makes even this very thing profitable for them for good: because they return more humble and more learned. Therefore it must be said otherwise, namely that that which we use is said in multiple ways. That by which as a using power, and this is the will, as is clear from the preceding question, that by which as a habit, and this is charity by which everything that is loved is referred to God, referred by which as a formal act, and this is using itself. And in neither of these ways do we use sin, because sin is not a power nor a habit. But it is an act: but disordered from the end: on account of which it is not use properly speaking, but abuse. And in this way the instance proceeds. In another way we use something as an object nevertheless: and thus we now inquire: and in this way we can use sin: not indeed by sinning: because sin would be not only the object but the act: but by referring sin committed by another or by us to our utility: not indeed through a cause, but through an occasion: and this suffices for use: For God also in this way uses evil: as Augustine says in the Enchiridion that since God is supremely good He would in no way permit evils to happen unless He knew how to elicit goods from evils. Thus therefore man can use the evil of fault objectively inasmuch as from a sin committed by himself or by another, his own frailty having been known he is made more cautious and more humble.

ON THE PROPAGATION OF ORIGINAL SIN

Response by SAMUEL LYDIUS of Dordrecht, July 2, 1636

The Gentiles are ignorant of, the Jews and heretics deny original sin, and consequently they take away the necessity of the grace of Christ either entirely, or for the most part. Of the Jews, R. Lipman, author of the poisonous book Nizzahon, bitterly assails Christians, because they say that God, on account of a small matter, namely the bite of one apple, destroyed Adam, who did this from error, with all his posterity, in this and in the future age, see his words cited in Munster in the notes to Matthew in Hebrew, chapter 1, although Aben Ezra in his commentary on Genesis 3 makes this sin more grave: and the author of the Fasciculus of Myrrh confesses, that all born from Adam, are made impious and of a hard forehead, on account of the sin of Adam: and other Rabbis also sometimes make mention of Tietzer rang, the figment of evil, for so they call indwelling sin. Yet today's Jews take it away not obscurely. For thus R. Judah of Modena, chief of the synagogue of Venice, in the Italian treatise on the doctrine and rites of the Jews, chapter 50, [says that] the sin of Adam does not damn souls, but only harms the soul, insofar as it brings in the body of Adam: hence it is that to do good is more difficult for posterity born from Adam. It is not required therefore that there be another justification from original sin, than that the Messiah is going to take away its difficulties and bodily impediments, by rendering our corrupt nature less imperfect and more apt for worshipping God. Of the heretics the Pelagians denied Original Sin, Augustine, On Heresies, chapter 88, John of Laet, and Vossius in the treatise on the Pelagians: whom today the Anabaptists follow, Coornhert, Socinus. See also the Remonstrants in their Apology, p. 84, 87, and Response to the Reverend Professors of Leiden, p. 97-98. Against all those the knowledge of this truth, and right faith must be retained in our Churches, that we may acknowledge our misery, despair of ourselves, be humbled in ourselves, long for the all-encompassing grace of Christ, firmly apprehend it, rely on it alone, ascribe our salvation to it, and worthily give thanks for it to God our Father of mercy. That this may be done, we, about to contribute some symbol for the measure, will attempt to explain more precisely in these theses that perpetual and principal doubt concerning the mode of propagation, if perhaps some φιλομαθεῖς [lovers of learning] can be led to a more accurate investigation and more evident knowledge of this matter, or at least to a more learned ignorance.

1. We will not expressly explain Whether, What, of What Kind, original sin is, lest we do something already done, or snatch from the hands of students the authors of common places and synopses accessible to anyone. We only premise some assertions, and lay them as hypotheses under the determination of our question. Let these be our hypotheses concerning sin. First, that there is evil, and that evil is something. Second, that evil has no nature, but the loss of good has taken the name of evil, as Augustine speaks, City of God, book 11, chapter 9, that is, evil as such is not a positive being, but privative. But distinctly with William of Auxerre in the Golden Summa, book 2, treatise 26, question 2, folio 85, we take privation here not as it expresses the absence of something, but as it expresses that which deprives and corrupts

something. Augustine philosophizes thus about evil, Enchiridion, chapter 11: What else is it, Which is called evil, than privation of good? for just as for the bodies of animals it is nothing other to be afflicted with diseases and wounds, than to be deprived of health, etc. See there chapters 13, 14, and City of God, book 11, chapter 18, book 14, chapter 13. And the consensus of the other fathers, whom Suarez cites, Metaphysics, part 1, disputation 11. Add Thomas in I, question 48, 49, and question 71, article 6, with Cajetan, Valentia, Bañez, Sylvius, and the rest of the commentators. And book 3, Against the Gentiles, chapter 10, with the commentary of Ferrariensis, and in the disputed questions On Evil. And I-II, question 61, article 6, William and the other Sententiaries on II, distinction 46, where they teach that sin is nothing or non-being. Bonaventure on II, distinction 37, where he explains the Master saying with Augustine that sin is nothing, that sin is nothing in another way than that which in no way is. Especially from the more recent authors, Suarez, Metaphysics, part 1, disputation 11, Rada in the controversy between Thomas and Scotus, part 2, controversy 16. Compare our authors, such as Du Plessis on the Truth of the Christian Religion, chapter 12. And from him Eilhard Lubinus in Phosphorus; Martyr in the common place On Sin. Rollock, On Effectual Calling, chapter 24. Melanchthon in the Common Places. And from him and with him Victorinus Strigelius, part 1 of the Common Places, p. 28. Peltius, part 3, arguments and responses, p. 397, 409, where these things are accurately and perspicuously treated. Zanchi, book 1, On the State of Sin and the Law, chapter 2, where he briefly and philosophically determines these things. So that those essential predicates are thus subordinated, 1. original stain. 2. sin or the evil of fault. 3. evil. 4. privation, or privative being or non-being. And vice versa, they are thus divided and descend. Privation, or evil is either of fault, or of punishment. The evil of fault is sin. Sin is either original or actual. Original sin is sin. To this second hypothesis received among all the fathers, scholastics, today's philosophers and theologians, Marcus Friedrich Wendelin opposes himself besides Daneau cited below, book 1 of Moral Philosophy, chapter 3, question 7, because namely the sin of omission is pure privation, but of commission, for example theft, is a positive action to which deformity is added. And so, he says, there is a great difference, between being pure privation, and something which by its formal nature is privative: But this difficulty can be removed in one word, because the question here is about sin in the abstract, or about ἀνομία and viciousness formally so called, but not truly about sin in the concrete insofar as it is considered together with its material and substrate. For that division of sin through material differences, which is considered according to the natural species of acts: as Viguerius rightly says in Institutions, chapter 18, verse 2. Third, sin does not have a positive cause, as such directly and per se effecting, and properly so called, but rather a deficient one, or per accidens effecting. See Thomas with his followers, I, question 75, article 2, and 3, Against the Gentiles, chapter 12, and question 1, On Evil, article 3. Durandus on II, distinction 2, 5, question 3. Martyr in the place On Sin, Du Plessis and Lubinus just now cited, all of whom follow Augustine, book 12, City of God, chapter 7. Again Wendelin opposes himself in the cited place, question 4. But by that distinction which Keckermann opposes, having been attacked by him, book 1 of Logic, chapter 15, and in the System of Theology, book 2, chapter 4, especially also Suarez in the cited place, from the scholastics, this controversy is easily settled. Fourth, on account of its diminution and imperfection an evil thing is understood by us with more difficulty, and therefore we conceive it, and speak of it not rarely as of a positive being: Yet so that the ἀνομία, ineptitude, and vice of a positive thing, which is as it were the formal aspect of sin, or formally sin itself, ought to be

accurately distinguished from the thing itself, or the action, or the quality, as from its material and subject, which is the good to which evil inheres or adheres (so let us speak): lest we ignorantly confuse evil with the action itself, or natural quality (which is a good creature of God, or if you prefer, a concreature), against the new wanderers, who say: Malice is essential to things themselves and they deny that in sin the underlying act or natural or vital motion, is always to be distinguished from the vice of the act. See the authors just now cited, and all the disputations of all the Scholastics and more recent Philosophers, and the common places of the Theologians, and the Metaphysical books. Fifth, evil is rightly distributed into fault and punishment, of which the former is called base evil, moral evil or in the genus of morals, and by the appropriate name sin, which is defined in 1 John 3 as ἀνομία, and by Thomas, I-II, question 61, 4, 6, a wandering from the rule and goal. Sixth, one and the same thing can be, in a different respect, the evil of fault and the evil of punishment, yet so that the evil of fault and of punishment do not coincide, against the unskilled coccysms, and the inept beggings of the question of certain ones, who dare to judge magistrally about these matters, and indeed in the public theater of the world, before they have learned the terms of art. See my Thersites Heautontimorumenos, section 1, chapter 4, and the disputation On the Uses of Sin per accidens: with all our systematic and polemic authors, where they treat of sin, of the providence of God, of the first sin of Adam, and of original sin. Compare also the Sententiaries on II, distinction 36, and the scholastics on I-II, question 87, article 2. Although they disagree on this, Whether the very defect of sin as justly permitted by God, insofar as it is formally the privation of good fitting to nature (namely of honest good) is the punishment both of preceding sin, and of itself. But they state and defend the affirmative, as more probable, with many others, as Valentia in I-II, disputation 6, question 17, point 3. So that according to them the defect of sin as it is a certain loss to the soul, avenges sin formally, insofar as it is a voluntary defect of due perfection. And thus this loss is referred to God as cause not so much effecting as justly deserting, Becanus, Scholastic Theology, part 2, 1, treatise 2, chapter 4, question 4. Seventh, sin is rightly distributed into original and actual. Eighth, That original sin is and is called such not by imitation but by propagation, and that it is properly sin, with the whole of Christendom, against the Pelagians. See the Catholic Treasury of Coccius, volume 2, book 2, article 2, the history of the Pelagians of John Latius, and of Gerardus Vossius, with the Harmony of Confessions, and the public and private catechisms, to these the commentators all on Romans 5, and the writers of common places; finally the Antagonists of Coornhert, the Socinians, the Remonstrants, Francesco Pucci, Samuel Huber, Albert Pighius, Ambrose Catharinus. Their opinions are indeed distinguished in certain parts, or formalities: but as to the sum of the matter, they agree. Who the authors were who opposed that error, we indicate in our Library. Here I only add, that Pighius and Catharinus, are refuted not only by our authors, Calvin (namely in his Opuscules), and Whitaker in the treatise On Original Sin, but also by the Pontificals, Gregory of Valentia on I-II, disputation 6, question 12, point 1, p. 761. And Bellarmine, book 5, On the Loss of Grace, chapter 16. The peculiar opinion of Dominic de Soto, which he offered to the Council of Trent (concerning which see the History of the Council of Trent, book 2, p. 199), is related by Zanchi, book 1, On the State of Sin and the Law, chapter 4. Ninth, This sin is twofold, or if you prefer double-membered (if it may be so said), imputed or first, and inherent or arisen from the first: of which the former in one suppositum destroyed the whole human race to be propagated by the ordinary law of generation from that one, as original fault corrupting and infecting the whole

nature in its root, and meriting the privation of eternal happiness, as much for the first parent, as for his posterity, as the Carthusian says in the refutation of the Koran, book 1, chapter 13, but the latter in and through the common participation of the common nature, infects and destroys each suppositum; because according to the most free and most just will of God, original justice had been given to Adam, not only as a singular suppositum, but also as a generative (I add, and federal) principle of the human race, as the same Carthusian says. Tenth, The first or imputed sin is the meritorious cause of inherent sin, and consequently the latter is a just punishment of the former: which among and after many others Tilenus dexterously explained and defended in the manuscript collation with John Corvinus, before he lapsed into Remonstrantism. Moreover this imputation of the first sin of Adam is held by the common consent of ancient and today's Christendom, as Andrew Rivet proved by induction in a peculiar little book entitled The Decree of the National Synod etc. held at Charenton, December 26, 1644, etc. Which is to be seen. Yet neither is it to be concealed, that with that principal thesis remaining, nevertheless the question can be raised, even is in fact raised by some, among whom John Maccovius in the disputation On the Mode by which original sin is derived from Adam, to all his posterity, in the year 1643, Respondent Nicholas Arnold, a Pole, Whether it is imputed for that reason, because each one sinned that sin in Adam with him; or truly only from the mere good pleasure of God; so that each one is understood to have sinned in Adam not subjectively, but only causally, because namely through that sin of Adam the guilt of the same is subjectively in us and consequently inherent original sin: to which question, coheres or is subordinated the hypothetical or textual question, Whether in Romans 5:12, ἐφ᾽ ᾧ is to be expounded "in whom". Concerning which things we will perhaps sometime act in problematic disputations. Eleventh, inherent original sin is at the same time, but in a different respect, both a just punishment inflicted on account of the first sin of Adam; and an unjust fault; because each one ought to have rectitude and conformity with the law dispositive and habitual, or an inherent inclination and modification, of all his faculties and powers to serve God in all things always, promptly. Whence it is not badly said by the Theologians in each precept of the decalogue, especially in the tenth, inherent original sin of nature is forbidden and its opposite is commanded, the image of God, or habitual rectitude, promptitude, and disposition to every due good through thoughts, words, deeds. But if you say, that man is not bound to the lack of that, which by natural necessity is in him from birth, and cannot not be in him: nor is bound to the possession or having of that, which was already lost in Adam before he was born: I respond that the image ought to have been conserved by him in Adam, the head and federal root of the covenant of works. Twelfth, That inherent sin is the root, seed, fount, principle and origin of all actual sins: in which respect it was truly and piously said by our Catechism, that we are prone to all evil. Concerning which we spoke in the dissertation against the innovators in Thersites Heautontimorumenos, section 1, chapter 5. Thirteenth, it is by nature a divine punishment before it is a human fault. For the former precedes: the latter follows in the order of reason, or the order of consequence. For because God thus punishes (whether justly by denying His image, or by withdrawing it, or by inflicting it by a positive action, concerning which below) for example, Titius, hence it is that he is necessarily subject to those original darknesses and disease, by a necessity of consequence: just as with light not present or bestowed, darknesses occupy the air, and cover the earth; with health not given, disease is present and inheres. Fourteenth, its parts (so it may be said) or moments to be considered in it are these two, aversion from good, and conversion to evil, or (as others prefer to say), lack of

justice and depravity of nature, which they also call disease, evil disposition, disposition to evil, propensity, proclivity; for where the principles of human actions do not have the light of the divine image nor the rectitude of original justice, there it is necessary that darknesses and irregularity succeed. And thus the Scholastics on I-II, question 82, article 1, say that it is not pure privation, but inordination of the parts of the soul. Fifteenth, Original sin is not the substance of man, nor qualities, or first natural powers emanating from the form of the subject, nor second powers, nor acquired or infused habits; but an evil affection or malignant disposition of nature, and moral corruption, or permanent disorder, which supervenes per accidens, and now inheres and resides in the powers and impedes and perverts their activity, as often as they are going to go out into act: not otherwise than infirmity and languor of body; and just as an infant born into the light with a lame foot is prone to limping, and limps as soon as it actually moves its foot. But first mediately and per se it is subjected in the powers of understanding and willing, not indeed the first ones nor absolutely and considered in themselves but in order to objects both natural and supernatural. In order to the latter they are plainly dead; and thus Luther rightly said that free will is pure nothing: in order to the former they languish, because they can be borne to them neither in the due mode and end, nor fully. Sixteenth, But what many of our authors determine, that original sin is not pure privation or defect and lack of original justice; but also an inclination and depravity of nature, contrary to that justice, and succeeding in its place, and thus also a positive quality; and that under this name Daneau reprehends Augustine in his commentary on the book On Christian Doctrine, chapter 11: this must be so accepted 1. that they speak in opposition to certain Pontifical Doctors or other Neo-Pelagians, who here dream of a pure absence of justice without any guilt or aspect of sin, and man as a middle subject in pure naturals, and therefore original sin as pure negative non-being: concerning which error see Whitaker, On Original Sin, book 1, chapter 1, 9. Chamier, Panstratia, volume 3, book 1, chapter 2, section 9, 10. Timothy Bucer, book 2, On the Image of God, chapter 1, 2. Or it can be said that they want this, that this privation is not idle, such as is rest, celibacy, virginity, but is such as affects the subject with an evil disposition as tyranny, anarchy, disease: to which last simile many use, when they urge the positive (Daneau in the cited place, Keckermann in System of Theology): but now disease is a privative being not a positive one, if we speak properly, and attend to the definition of disease; Disease is an injured action; or as Sennert says more fully; It is the impotency or ineptitude of the living parts of the human body for exercising natural actions having its origin from their constitution beyond nature. Medical Institutions, book 2, part 1, chapter 1. For disease is to be posited in impotency to act, as is in Galen, 1, On the Difference of Diseases, chapter 2. Thus also the formal and essential aspect of sin is, privation of due rectitude in being in act or in an active principle, in order to the law, or privation of conformity to the law. Surely Keckermann, book 2, System of Theology, chapter 4, by equal reason says that sin in general is not a bare and simple privation (such as is rest) which brings in no evil impression and disposition; but is a privation evilly affecting and disposing the subject just as disease. And chapter 5, where he wants original sin to be a positive quality, he here advocates and praises the saying of Thomas, question 3, On Evil, article 1: It is not simple privation, as blindness, but retains something of that which is deprived, as disease. Matthias Martinius in Method of Theology, p. 388, explains the privative aspect of sin in general in almost the same way. III. What if we should say, that they meant or could have meant nothing else by positive or positive quality than what the Ethicists do, when they say that

vices as inhering qualities are opposed to special virtues not privatively but contrarily. How this happens Thomas explains, 3, Against the Gentiles, chapter 9: Evil does not repugn good positively, except by reason of some goodness. Compare the same, 2, On Evil, article 1, 2, 3, 4, and question 3, On Power, article 6, 11. And from the more recent authors Suarez, part 1, Metaphysics, disputation 11, section 1, § 17, 22. Where he learnedly shows that evil by reason of the act, which it includes, is contrarily opposed to the act or good of virtue and proportionally to a habit. So that these things do not prohibit, that sin as such or ἀνομία formally accepted and distinguished from the being or good substrate, be formally and properly so called privation; and not be a positive being properly and strictly so called, but on the contrary be distinguished from that whole genus and. VI. Finally, it can be said that the positive is here accepted comparatively and therefore improperly, but not properly and strictly: in the way that one privation comparatively to another has itself in the mode of habit or positive being. Thus virginity is formally a privation, and yet in order to the opposite deflowering or devirgination and all fornication, it is a habit; and again deflowering and fornication with respect to virginity is not only a pure and ineffectual privation, but also an active one, namely of an act and as it were something positive and that by reason of its substrate. Thus tyranny with respect to the ἀναρχία succeeding it has itself in the mode of a positive habit: and yet here is the privation of a privation. Polygamy is related in the same way, with respect to divorce, or repudiation, through which all those wives are dismissed. And lethargy or a disease of the chest, which is impeded and partly cured through fever, and gangrene through the removal or mutilation of a member: here a privation is taken away through another privation, disease through disease (how this happens, and with what distinction this must be said, I leave to be explained by Physicians), and the deprived privation has itself in the mode of a habit; yet it does not cease to be a privation in itself and absolutely considered. But I will bring forward another simile most familiarly known to theologians. The sin of commission is formally and remains a privation, according to the definition of evil and sin, and yet by the writers of common places and the scholastics, it is said to consist in an act (which is something positive), and not in pure privation; oppositely namely and comparatively to the sin of omission: and all that is to be understood by reason of the underlying act, See the Scholastics subtly inquiring about the sin of omission. Therefore let it be and be called a habit, or a real and positive quality metaphorically and improperly, because in the mode of a habit it is something inhering and permanent, and as an elicitive principle or by which it produces from itself all vicious acts: nevertheless in itself, formally and abstractly considered it is a privation, of which God is not the cause. Bonaventure not badly explains this distinction of privation on II, distinction 22, concerning the second principal, question 2, § 33: It must be said that it is possible to speak of concupiscence itself in two ways. Either according to what it is a punishment, or according to that which is concupiscence. If we speak of it according to what it is a punishment, thus it expresses order to fault, and in this way it has a cause meriting and a cause ordaining. For man merits to have such a rebellion from his own fault and disobedience. But God ordains this evil to another preexisting one from His justice. In another way it is possible to speak of concupiscence according to that which it is, and thus concupiscence expresses two things. For by expressing appetite, it expresses excess in the act of appetite. I say that underlying appetite is good and is from God, but that excess in appetizing although it seems to be position, is nevertheless more privation, nor does it have an efficient cause but a deficient one, and therefore because God is the deficient cause of nothing, in this

way it is not posited to be from God, but is rather from free will deficiently through fault, and from the Devil instigating. But that concupiscence with respect to excess expresses privation, although it seems to express position, this is plain. For this is concupiscence with respect to the appetitive power, which is paralysis with respect to the motive. And just as a paralytic member trembles and moves most quickly, and this does not come from an increase of power, but rather from a loss of power nor from a strengthening of power, but rather from a dissolution, so also in concupiscence it must be understood, that the appetite burns in love of a temporal thing, nor can it contain itself, indeed it consists in a continual motion and repetition of concupiscence. This, I say, must be understood to come from a defect of a restraint, just as beasts are moved with their chains having been broken, and ships with their rudders having been destroyed. Therefore the reasons showing, that concupiscence is not from God, must be conceded, as they conclude concerning concupiscence according to that which it is. The mind of our theologians can be explained by this or a similar reason, indeed also it ought to be. The reasons are these: 1. Reason, because otherwise they would depart from the theses and hypotheses of the Fathers, Scholastics, Philosophers, indeed also from their own principles and axioms about the nature of evil and sin. See the authors cited above, thesis 1, hypothesis 2, and add the writings of Augustine against the Manicheans, and Rada in the cited place. Becanus, Scholastic Theology, part 2, volume 1, section 1, chapter 5, question 1. And Du Plessis on the Truth of Religion, chapter 12. And the Phosphorus of Eilhard Lubinus On Evil. Especially also Peltius; Zanchi, etc. Finally all the reformed and Lutheran Logicians and Metaphysicians in the chapter on Evil and on privation. II. Reason. Because the odious consequences, with which above thesis 1, and just now below reason 4 Bellarmine, book 5, On the Loss of Grace, etc., chapter 1, burdens our authors, otherwise cannot be solidly refuted and cut off, nor the suspicion or slander concerning affinity with Manichaeism, and concerning God the author of sin perspicuously removed. For thus Bellarmine, book 5, On Grace and the State of Sin, chapter 2, p. 448, 8th edition: But in reality both the Manicheans and Illyricus, and his Lutheran adversaries seem [to say this], but he more. They indeed while they define original sin to be a real and positive quality, are entirely forced to say, either that God is not the cause of that evil quality, and through this is not the cause of all things, which really exist, which is one of the errors of the Manicheans: or certainly is the cause of sin, which is a graver error, than was that of the Manicheans. I would like someone to attempt a solution of this consequence. III. Reason. Nor also could the consequence of Illyricus, by which he urges the orthodox, be accurately and expeditiously refuted. But it is this: Those who posit in man a good substance, and an evil quality, they are Manicheans: But the orthodox do this; Therefore. It is added, that too much would be conceded to Illyricus, indeed also to the Manicheans, if some sin were stated to be a real and positive quality. Because that would necessarily have to be from God: for God is the first cause of every entity. IV. Reason, because otherwise the common definition of original sin from Anselm could not be retained and defended, that it is the lack of original justice that ought to inhere. Which nevertheless the Apology of the Augsburg Confession retains and defends, etc., the Colloquy of Worms, Melanchthon, and with Pezelius in the cited book, pp. 438-440, and Martyr, Commonplaces, class 2, chapter 1, § 19. V. Reason. Nor could the definition of sin in 1 John 3 be defended, that it is ἀνομία. For Alpha privative manifestly indicates privation from the usage of the Greek language. And our authors defend that definition, as a true and legitimate explication of the essence. Therefore a real and positive quality is not of its essence. VI.

Reason. Because otherwise these absurdities of absurdities would be committed: first, that whatever inheres in the genus both proximate and near, nevertheless does not inhere in the species, and whatever is of the essence of the genus, is not of the essence of the species. Evil and its subject species, namely sin, would essentially be privation, or privative being; and yet that species of sin and evil, which we call original sin would not be essentially something privative, but positive. And to the question, what is original sin, it would have to be responded, that it is a positive quality and a positive being properly so called, as privation is opposed. Which, secondly, Because it would follow that the opposite genus is predicated of the other disparate species, namely positive being of original sin, which nevertheless is contained under privative being, as if someone were to predicate sensitive or animal of a stone. Which absurdity VII. Reason. Because it would follow that the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, and Melanchthon, and our other theologians when they everywhere refute the more recent Pontificals Pelagianizing concerning pure naturals against the corruption of original stain for free will from Bonaventure, Thomas and the scholastics on I-II, question 82, and approve their truth suitable for determining this question, ascribe something to them. It is certain that Thomas with the scholastics understands no other positive, except with a tail, and said comparatively (as we just now explained); but not positive being properly and absolutely so called, which is opposed to privative properly so called. For Thomas is not accustomed to call any sin thus, as is clear from I, question 48, 49, 3, Against the Gentiles, chapter 10. And the disputed questions On Evil. If they were attributing anything else to Thomas, certainly they would be manifestly torturing him, and would pervert his mind. He meant nothing less by his positive, and in the mode of a habit than a real and positive quality. For they openly repudiate this, as can be seen in Bellarmine, and Valentia in the cited place. Compare the Leiden Synopsis, disputation 15. VIII. Reason. Because concerning every sin, and specially concerning actual sin of commission the theologians say that it is a quality or action, and that it is something positive. See Zanchi in the cited place, and Rollock, On Effectual Calling, chapter 24, p. 142, where he thus defines: sin is a quality or other ἀνομία of a rational creature, or repugnant with the law of God. Compare the same, chapter 27, p. 161. Which no one does not see must be understood of sin concretely, as it consists of the substrate and ἀνομία. Unless he wants them to contradict themselves shamefully. The sin of commission is formally a privation: and yet oppositely to the sin of omission it is called something positive. IX. Reason. Let the consensus of the most excellent theologians be added, who either openly and on the contrary distinctly determine it to be a privation or at least so explain its positive, that it is not opposed to privative properly so called, but coincides with it, or is reduced to it. Melanchthon in Counsels, part 1, p. 533: It is rightly properly and truly said that original sin is the privation of justice, which God bestowed on man in creation. Στέρησις here signifies, what it is usually accustomed to signify for the Dialecticians, as when we say: Darknesses are the privation of light, or confusion the privation of order. And afterward, Therefore when we say that it is privation, or loss, or spoliation, we speak plainly and properly, and understand that στέρησις is of a form, which can be present. And p. 534: Thus dissolve that cavil: Nothing is not to be punished. Sin is nothing. Therefore it is not to be punished: It is one thing to be nothing negatively, another to be nothing privatively. For nothing privatively is in an existing subject; corruption and confusion: as the ruin of a house is the confusion of that orderly edifice. Then it is true, that after the privation of light and justice, many wandering motions and errors follow, as the will averted from God burns with love of self, and of

evil pleasures without God. The blind mind, ignorant of God plays with opinions about God, one feigns one thing, another another, as the ἀπονοήματα of all the nations show. Thus after privation positive things follow, as they commonly say, and yet the deformity or ἀταξία in that positive ἔργον is also στέρησις.

As far as I can see, these things are perspicuously and dexterously said, and have nothing of absurdity, and are the genuine opinion of Prophetic and Apostolic doctrine. Perhaps caviling natures find many things: which they can acutely object: But those cavils can easily be explained by more skillful men. For true things are firm, as Demosthenes says. Christopher Pezel on the Examination of Melanchthon, part 1, p. 442, says that it is a privative accident not a positive one. And p. 432, he praises these definitions of Bonaventure: When it is asked, what original sin is, it is responded, that it is immoderate concupiscence: It is also rightly responded that it is the lack of due justice, and in one of those responses the other is included. Hemmingius in Syntagma of Institutions, title On Sin, thesis 19-20: Now since it is certain that original justice (the lack of which is original sin) includes two things, namely the integrity of all the powers in Adam, and the approbation, by which Adam was accepted by God, it follows, that original sin, is defect, corruption, and guilt. But what sort of defect, and what sort of corruption original sin is, cannot be known more rightly, than from the partition of integrity. For since the integrity of human nature, was the image of God, obedience and εὐταξία of all the powers, of mind, heart and body toward God, it follows that that defect and corruption, is the removal of the image of God, and ἀταξία of all the powers, of mind, heart and body. Zanchi, cited book, chapter 4, thesis 25, §. Here I include first, the privation of all original justice by saying that all are made unjust, that is, deprived of all justice and rectitude, which would have been propagated in them, if Adam had not sinned. In the second place I also include the whole corruption of nature by the name of corrupt. For it could not otherwise happen, than that with original justice removed, by which Adam was whole and right, the corruption of the whole nature would follow. For this reason I also added those words, as much as they all are, in soul and body, so that I might show that the whole man was both despoiled of original justice and all rectitude, and consequently, was wholly corrupted. And afterward at the end of the paragraph: By Augustine besides other things it is also called ἀταξία, an affected quality, and disease: He especially wanted to signify the corruption and depravity of nature. We then began to explain the effects of this sin. Aretius in Examination of Theology, place 3, which is On Original Sin, p. 105.

What is original sin?
It is the depravity and corruption of the whole human nature. The ancients defined it, that it is the lack of original justice, which ought to have been present. Polanus, book 6, Syntagma, chapter 3, p. 337. We understand positive here not as a subsistent thing created by God, but as that which is not simply nothing, nor simple privation as death is the privation of life or shadows are the privation of light; but which is at the same time the defect and destruction of a positive thing created by God, and a vicious habit exciting and begetting internal and external motions wandering from the law of God and displeasing to God. Nevertheless that concupiscence is rightly called privation, because it is a wandering from the Law of God. Rivetus in the Synopsis of Theology of the Professors of Leiden, disputation 15, thesis 26. Scripture certainly as often as it intimates original sin to us, is accustomed to inculcate not mere privation, but something in a

certain way positive, that is, affirmative: namely such a vice by which the flesh lusts against the spirit, that is, through which man is prone to evil, and contrary to the divine law; as in Romans 6:12. Amesius, book 1, Medulla, chapter 13, thesis 5. This sin is called the exorbitance or deviation of man, because it is in man the habitual privation of conformity due to the law imposed on man by God, in which he ought to walk as in his way. Maccovius in the disputation of Common Places, part 2, disputation 14, p. 257. Theologians call the first part a privative quality, the second a positive one.

Positive not Ethically nor Physically, for since an Ethically positive quality is virtue, a Physically [positive quality] is a natural quality existing from the creator or nature; it is not per se a quality of either, except from right reason and from God.

Therefore Logically: but Logically a positive quality is an affirmed quality inhering in a subject good or bad. Rollock, chapter 25, On Effectual Calling, where he made positive quality a part of original sin, thus explains himself: p. 153.

And these things so far concerning the threefold matter of original sin. These parts of the matter of original sin, since they are so many beings, and are from God the author, they have each an implanted quality of goodness: For apostasy or defection in itself and per se is good; likewise the lack of original justice; since it has the nature of a certain being, and is a certain thing made by that motion of defection; the lack, I say, is from God, and in itself is good; finally also that positive quality, which succeeds in the place of sanctity and the image of God, is from God as principal efficient, and is per se good. Therefore as it is a threefold entity, so it is a threefold goodness. Where he manifestly shows that he makes original sin positive materially accepted: in which way every actual sin can be called a positive being, real, indeed also good; namely by reason of the matter and underlying act. Which he further explains on p. 154. But just as the matter of original sin is threefold: so ἀνομία is threefold: For each part of the matter has its own ἀνομία and adventitious form, in which the nature of sin is posited: Apostasy has its own ἀνομία, lack its own, finally the positive quality its own. This threefold ἀνομία is not from God the efficient, but from evil instruments, first the Devil, then Adam, finally that man, whoever he is, who is born from Adam: For we also, who labor under this hereditary disease, are ourselves the cause of our disease. And most manifestly on p. 158, where for the defense of the opinion of Lombard against Bellarmine concerning positive evil quality he thus badly distinguishes: To the assumption we respond. In that evil positive quality, there are two things; first, the quality itself, which is a being; secondly, the malice or ἀνομία, which is a privation. Of the quality itself and being God is the author and principal efficient: But of the malice and ἀνομία not God, but the evil instrument, is the efficient. Compare the authors cited below in the penultimate thesis. X. Reason. If these things brought forward by me to reconcile the explanations of orthodox theologians do not suffice for someone, I ask from him that without contention or persecution he candidly communicate more ample and better things: And indeed let him first teach, whether and how both the privative of this sin properly and logically accepted, and the positive, namely the depravity or corruption or disease of nature, or the habitual disposition or inclination to evil, are really so distinguished among themselves; that the latter ought in no way to be conceived and called privation or privative being properly (according to the logicians and metaphysicians)

accepted. But let him remember that I am inquiring not about the depravity of nature or depraved disposition concretely, as it contains in itself the underlying subject (which is a real and positive quality), but abstractly, formally, precisely as such, and as such, as it is expressly distinguished from the subject quality by the whole genus. When I had thus explained these things with second thoughts, it seemed good to confer abundant caution against the slanders of the unskilled to bring forward our more recent Belgian theologians and to explore their consensus. And behold there offered themselves to me Altingius in the Problems recently published, where he accurately determines this question, by saying that sin abstractly taken is a positive quality not ethical or physical, but logical, that is, an affirmed quality, but evil, inhering in a subject, such as is leprosy, curvature: and he makes its positive cause the will of man freely averting itself from God. Romans 5:12, 1 Timothy 2:14. The reasons by which he proves the positive sufficiently show to me that he agrees most excellently with my conceptions as to the sum of the matter. But let the reader consult the author himself. Nicolas Vedelius in disputation 2, On Original Sin held at Franeker in the year 1641, Respondent John Roldan, question 5. Where to the objection of Corvinus against Du Moulin, chapter 8, p. 120, Bellarmine, book 5, On the Loss of Grace, chapter 15, thus defends the positive: They play, he says, with the ambiguity of the phrase of positive quality: which we do not take strictly or physically, or even properly logically, but improperly and broadly, inasmuch namely as it is active and operative; in the way that disease besides the privation, which is the quality of temperament having been taken away, also has something positive, namely the humors themselves inordinately disposed, as Thomas says, and they disturb and vex the body. From this distinction of the ambiguous word the rest of Bellarmine's arguments are also easily solved. Cloppenburg in the disputation On the State of Man under the Fall held at Franeker in the year 1646, disputation 5, which is the 2nd On the Sin of Origin, most plainly determines this question, expressly corrects the improper and rather harsh phrase of some concerning the positive: And he rightly urges them with this argument, thesis 8: For indeed those who, without that heresy of interpolated Manichaeism, so speak, in spite of ἀκριβεία and ἀπροσεξία as if they think Original Sin to be something positive, whether a habit, or another quality: they cannot defend their opinion otherwise, than that they state one or the other of these: either that Souls are from Traducianism and in their generation, sin is at the same time ingenerated by a positive act: or indeed that they are Created by God pure, but are infected by the Seed or impure Flesh. And thesis 14: On account of these and similar intervening questions, it is certainly safer to believe, that original sin is formally the Privation of original justice, than that it is something Positive: Since by this very thing, no less than from that hypothesis, it is believed to be sin of the true name, and the habitual aversion of nature from God. Maccovius in the posthumous minor works most recently published, in Anti-Socinus, p. 83: In inherent original sin it is said to be: A positive and negative Quality. They call this the lack of original justice, or not to be able to [do] good; they call that the depravity of nature or to be able only to [do] evil: But concerning this last it is asked: In what way is it called positive, when every positive being is, and every being is good? Multiple Philosophers say Positive. At present we will only adduce these significations, namely that it is said Positive physically, as the quality of a body, and thus Physically positive is good. Positive ethically, as virtues, thus also they are good. Positive logically, and this is affirmation, In this way this quality is called positive to the difference of the first part of sin, which is expressed negatively, when it is expressed affirmatively. See Zwingli concerning this matter. Fourteenth. Because Matthias Flacius Illyricus, did not conduct

himself providently enough here about the distinction of privative and positive, it happened that in the year 1561 in the collation of Weimar with Victorinus Strigelius, he made original sin a positive thing or essence, essential to human nature, indeed also substantial, or its substance. Which absurd and crass error of his see refuted by Wigand, Heshusius, Mörlin, Chemnitz and Schlüsselburg in the catalog of heretics; Pezel on the Examination of Melanchthon, and part 3 of objections and responses. But from the more recent Lutherans instead of all let Meisner be, Anthropology, decade 1, disputation 6, question 1, where briefly, and yet fully enough he expounds this whole controversy. There can be joined, from the Pontificals the excellent scholastic Gregory of Valentia on I-II, disputation 6, question 12, point 1. And Bellarmine, book 5, On the Loss of Grace and the State of Sin, chapters 1, 2, 3. But you have the history of this struggle in Schlüsselburg in the catalog of heresies.

2. We add philosophical-theological hypotheses concerning man the subject of original sin; which in the first edition of this disputation in the year 1636, afterward we explained and proved most of them ex professo as theses in the disputation On Creation in the year 1638 and its appendices in the year 1643. First hypothesis, after the first creation of man from the earth, God fixed this law of nature, that man should beget man, Genesis 1, against those who state that it can be generated from putrid matter, See Scaliger, exercise 103, section 1, and our disputation On Creation, Second: The essential parts of man are soul and body; against the new opinion or doubt, concerning which see the Apology of the Remonstrants, chapter 19, p. 129. Third, The soul of man is one; against the Heracleonites, who affirmed that man consists of a threefold essence, and the Manicheans with the Gnostics, who affirmed that the human soul is of a twofold essence and diverse nature, of which one would be from God the other not, as also against the more recent Philosopher Zabarella. Fourth, There is not a certain mind common to all men, but they are multiplied for the multiplication of supposita, against Averroes. Fifth, The soul is not part of the divine essence; against certain ancient Philosophers, and the Gnostic heretics, Manicheans, Priscillianists. Sixth, The soul is a spiritual essence, incorporeal, an immaterial form, against Tertullian and the Luciferians who [say it is] corporeal, and against the Nazarenes with the Manicheans who [say] it is of the same nature with the souls of beasts, and against the heretics called Arabians, (in Augustine, On Heresies, chapter 83), and more recent Atheists, who state that it is mortal. Seventh, The soul of man was not created by the Angels against the Seleucians, Hermians, Proclians. Eighth, The soul is not born from a soul against the Apollinarians. Ninth, Souls do not migrate from bodies into bodies against the μετεμψύχωσιν, which Herodotus in Euterpe attributes to the Egyptians, Diogenes Laertius to Pythagoras, Augustine, On Genesis according to the Letter, chapter 9, 11, Epiphanius, Panarion, book 1, p. 7, Lactantius, book On Divine Reward, to the ancient Jews, Matthew 14:2, with Josephus, book 2, On the Jewish War, chapter 7, to the following Rabbis, Elijah in Thisbi, the entry gilgul. (Compare the disputation on creation, and on Judaism) To the Tertullianist heretics, who dreamed that the souls of the wicked are converted into beasts and into Devils, Augustine, On Heresies, chapter 78. Tenth, souls are not from traducianism, concerning which question so many things [have been written] by more recent Philosophers and Theologians. There can be seen from the Pontificals the Scholastics on I, of Thomas, question 94, 18, article 2, and the Conimbricenses, Ruvius, Toletus etc. in Physics, from our authors Zanchi, Tilenus, Daneau, etc. and Rudolph Lavater, Pembellus in a peculiar treatise. And Baronius in Philosophy

the Handmaid of Theology, exercise 2. See also the opinions of various authors published in one book by Rudolph Goclenius, Although there are not lacking Philosophers and Theologians who hold the contrary opinion, or at least doubt, on account of that (as it seems to them) concerning the propagation of original sin. As all today's Lutheran theologians and philosophers as far as I know; and from our authors George Sohn, Combachius, Philip Marnix. Musculus in common places, thesis 101, advises ἐποχήν, Piscator in the disputation on sin, thesis 101, leaves to each his own judgment, with whom Herman Ravensperger agrees in the disputation whose title is Miserable Adam, Martyr denies that the opinion concerning traducianism can be defeated from the sacred writings. In antiquity this opinion had supporters. Tertullian, Apollinaris, and other Orientals by the testimony of Jerome, epistle 45, to Marcellinus and Anapsychia. Nor did Augustine much shrink from it, epistle 157, to Optatus and epistle 28, to Jerome, and book 1 of Retractions, chapter 1, and book 10, On Genesis according to the Letter, chapter 23. As neither Rufinus, if faith is to be had in Jerome reproaching him under this name, book 2, Apology, nearly at the beginning. Indeed from the more recent Lutherans, although contradicting themselves they seem to profess moderation or from it, they make the opinion concerning traducianism necessary. For thus in volume 2 of the Giessen disputations, disputation 12, thesis 65, p. 423: but it is a matter of religious scruple for us to depart from that opinion, which defends the propagation of sin, and with the vain and thorny questions of more subtle men having been dismissed, follows simplicity. And of this kind out of all the others that alone is, which defends traducianism. And thesis 49, p. 417: All also, who deny traducianism, and attribute the origin of sin in the soul to its natural conjunction with the body, what else do they consequently do, than constitute God the author and parent of original sin? And thus nearly Meisner, Anthropology, decade 1, disputation 5, question 3, §.4. And Eckhard in Fasciculus, chapter 10, appendix on traducianism, argument 2, p. 259. Eleventh, but that souls are created by God and by being created are united to bodies in one and the same instant; so that indeed moments of reason or nature ought to be distinctly observed here, but no instants of time through before or after can be conceived: so that God 1. creates the soul. 2. Unites it to the body. 3. The soul informs and actuates that body. 4. And thus thence the composite itself or the generation and production of the composite results and exists. Against the opinion of Plato, Origen, the Kabbalists who state that souls were produced before bodies or the composite and existed for some time, which ulcer we touched on in our dissertation On the Term of Life. Now we see a defense of the same opinion from Scripture peddled by a recent writer of the Jews, Menasseh ben Israel in Problems on Creation, Compare the disputation on creation, and the Scholastics on I, question 118, article 3. Twelfth, The absolute subject of sin in general, as also of original sin is not the soul or the inferior part of the soul only, or the body, but the whole man, the whole composite, but the subject by which, in a certain respect, or limited and indeed first and formally is the intellect and will; secondly and by participation it is the inferior faculties of the soul or sensuality, as an executive power. For the corruption of nature which we have contracted, through the sin of the first parent, according to the common opinion of our authors and the Pontificals (as Becanus admits in Scholastic Theology, part 2, volume 1, treatise 2, question 3), includes those four wounds of nature, which Thomas enumerates, I-II, question 85, article 3, namely ignorance in the intellect, malice or aversion in the will, infirmity in the irascible appetite, and concupiscence in the concupiscible appetite. Corollary: It seems to be said less accurately, or properly by

Thomas, I-II, question 83, article 2, that original sin is primarily in the essence of the soul, secondarily in the will.

3. With these things premised we approach the very unraveling of our question. But we forewarn, lest the fallacy ἀμφιβολίας be committed (which not rarely before this has produced confusion and obscurity here), that this question is two-membered, or there are two very distinct questions, of which the former is: In what way is that Original disease propagated to the posterity of Adam, and passes to all men or what and of what kind is its origin, what things concur to it. Which again is two-membered: 1. Whether it is through imitation, and contracted through repeated acts and custom (as the ancient and new Pelagians want): or truly propagated through generation? 2. Whether the mode of generation is through the traducianism of the soul, and by this reason, and not another the propagation of sin happens (as today's Lutherans want): or truly through the immediate creation and infusion of the soul. The latter is: Supposing, the mode of generation is through the creation and infusion of the soul, What then is the proper and proximate cause directly effecting (deficiently namely) of this sin, or the existence of this sin or what is the principle both which and by which, through which original sin first exists, and inheres in Titius or Maevius, so that it is his singular sin, his fault alone and he thence most justly contracts singular guilt for himself. In Physics the question concerning generation and what things concur to it, differs greatly from the question, what is the proper and proximate cause of the thing generated. For the proper cause of the thing generated is only one, but many things concur to generation, matter, form, privation, preparatory dispositions, the one generating, plastic force etc. To the former question whence original sin is in Titius, how it first entered there, how it was propagated and handed down from Adam all the way to Titius? We respond with all the orthodox Anti-Pelagians, ancient and modern, reformed and Lutheran in common places and in controversies, that it is propagated through generation, not contracted or acquired through imitation: that is, it arises in Titius from the first sin or on account of the fault of the first parent through generation and with the natural generation and origin of Titius, Genesis 5:3, Job 14:5, Psalm 51:7, John 3:6, Ephesians 2:3, Romans 5:12, 19. We add, with the Reformed denying traducianism, that it arises and exists in Titius through his defectibility, God the most just judge through His providence according to the counsel of His will, not bestowing His image on Titius, but most justly withdrawing it. Therefore to this propagation there concur but by far different reason 1. Adam. 2. each man. 3. the parents. 4. God. I. Adam concurs by his sin as head and root as of the human race, so also of sin and demerit, which is abundantly demonstrated from Romans 5, from verse 12 to 20. II. Each man concurs, both as subject, and as efficient cause; procatarctically indeed having merited this mortal blow in the loins of Adam; to these as efficient cause (properly deficient) direct, proper, proximate, emanative (so to speak) of this poisonous quality. Or so that I may better express myself, (although I fear, that these things can be expressed by me adequately and accurately enough), his defectible intellect and will destitute of the perfection of the divine image can be conceived as the synecdochical cause of this disease, defect, imperfection and inherent irregularity. For man can be thought, both as the receiving subject, and as the internal emanative cause of this ἀταξία or disorder, in which, from which, and by which it results and emanates together with the first and second powers or faculties, as they are ordained to operation, as their qualification and inseparable affection, and natural in this state of the fall. For those faculties disposed and modified to operation are

necessarily either well or badly; well if the light of the divine image is present, badly if it is absent. As the sight of man is badly disposed to reading if light is absent, (which is as much as if you should say, if shadows are present); well, if light is present. III. The parents concur through natural generation, and thus through plastic force, conjugal union, seed etc. Which are all a cause without which it would not happen, or antecedent, but not a cause per se; for they only substitute and apply the subject in which the sin of Adam produces its effect, that is, original sin. For this and nothing else is what Martyr wants, and other reformed Theologians, whom Eckhard from the Lutherans wants to contradict themselves and us, like it or not, to favor the traducianism of the soul, in the cited chapter, p. 262, when they say: The seed is the instrument, by which this sin is handed down by the parents into the children. And, No other way can be found, by which men can be partakers of Adam's sin, than the seed and generation. IV. God concurs by His just and efficacious providence, and that First, efficiently procuring the propagation of men as first cause, as to the production of the composite; and as sole cause as to the immediate production and infusion of the soul: without which propagation there would be no propagation of sin: Secondly, efficiently procuring and producing both as first cause, and as sole cause, the substrate of this sin in which it inheres and adheres, namely the natural human faculties and powers: For every evil is founded in good. Third, by permitting as every sin, so also original sin: Fourth, by not supplying (which He did in the first creation) the gift of His image, without which nevertheless original sin cannot be avoided. Others call this the subtraction and privation of the image; which nevertheless must be understood, as we will say in thesis 4. For neither does a real and positive action intervene here, but only non-action, or cessation from act. But this last act of God or rather cessation from act, is a work of justice punishing on account of the guilt of the first sin common to all. And with respect to this divine providence original sin is called a punishment by extrinsic denomination, although intrinsically, and by its nature it is sin; not otherwise than some actual sins are called punishments of other sins, and God is said to harden, to deliver to a reprobate mind, to pervert, to seduce, to send the working of error. For the privation of God depriving, the hardening hardening, the blinding blinding, etc. is distinguished, that is the providence of God on account of the sin of men, permitting sin, not supplying grace, withdrawing certain means and aids, loosening the reins on Satan and the wicked, to these positively ordaining, directing, and converting that sin to good, that is, from that evil as from an occasion and as it were matter drawing forth and producing some good either of justice or of mercy, from the blindness itself, the hardness of man or hardened hardening, etc. For that is a most beautiful providence and just punishment from God the author, but this is a most base stain and unjust fault of man alone, as subject and as cause. For God is in no way the author of it, but only of those antecedents, which we just now said, to which sin necessarily follows by a necessity of consequence. The narrowness of the Theses does not allow these things to be pursued at greater length. Meanwhile the Scholastics can be seen concerning sin, the punishment of sin, on I-II, question 27, article 3, and from them Becanus, part 2, scholastic theology, volume 1, treatise 2, chapter 8, question 4. From our authors Rivetus on Hosea, p. 149. Twisse against Arminius, Maccovius in the Collected Disputations, year 1625. Arminius himself proposed most of our things, in the Disputation on the Providence of God in evil. And Vorstius in the Apology against the Jesuits of Münster. Compare the Disputation on the Uses of Sin per accidens. If someone moreover desires to see the varying opinions concerning propagation, and their examination, let him go to the Sententiaries

on II, distinction 31, and Thomas on I-II, question 81, with the commentators. The same in the disputed questions on original sin, question 4, article 3. Viguerius in Institutions, chapter 18. Bellarmine, book 4, On the Loss of Grace, chapter 11, 12, with the Antagonists, especially Amesius in Bellarmine Disarmed, and Chamierus. Becanus, Scholastic Theology, part 2, volume 1, treatise 2. Meisner, Sober Philosophy. Du Moulin's disputation On Original Sin, and Anatomy of Arminius, chapter 10, and other authors everywhere cited in these Theses. Corollary 1. Hence it is clear that it is absurdly disputed concerning the propagation of sin through the body, or through the soul. Since it is propagated through neither: for neither did the soul or organically complete body of the man to be generated ever exist for even a moment apart before and outside the composite. Corollary 2. Nor is it distinguished happily enough the threefold times, or moments, in which the corruption of this sin infects man; namely of conception, of formation, of nativity. Since it does not infect nor inhere or inexist before that moment of nature and time, in which generation is accomplished, and man is said to be generated. Corollary 3. We reject that Talmudic trifle, concerning concupiscence creeping in in nativity and not in formation; because otherwise the infant would make a noise. Paul Ricius, a converted Jew, relates it in the epitome of Talmudic doctrine, chapter 264, from the Pistorius edition with those Kabbalistic writers, in folio.

4. And these things to the former question: to the latter we respond with these conclusions. I. Conclusion. God either through the creation and immediate infusion of the soul, or through concurrence with the generation of man, by which man generates man, is not the cause per se or properly so called of original sin as such, or principal, or meritorious, or instrumental: Or thus, God neither as creator through the first creation of man; nor as governor through providence either about the first sin of Adam, or about the generation of e.g. Titius, is in any way the cause per se or properly so called of original sin, as sin: although as governor and just judge He is the cause of that punishment or penal and just subtraction, by which He subtracts, that is does not confer and coproduce His image when He confers and produces the human soul (which otherwise He did in the generation of Christ the man), He is also the cause of all the other antecedents of original sin, namely of marriage, of the production of the human soul and of the whole composite, to which original sin in any man necessarily follows and exists. The subtraction, of which we speak, consists not in a positive act but formally in a defect or negative deficiency, and properly in the non-giving of the image or gift directing, perfecting and modifying the mind and will; which gift otherwise He could give absolutely and which from the law and ordinance of the first creation He would always have given: For Titius in his own suppositum before, or the soul of Titius did not have innocence and the image of God, which God would later take away through the body and union with the body; but taking away is only said with respect to that gift of the image which he had in Adam by reason of the common nature, as in the common natural and federal root in which he is understood to have existed and been reputed naturally and morally or federally and which he would have had in the example of Adam in himself or in his own suppositum in and with the first moment of his generation, equally as he has the nature and essentials of man, as soon as the human composite is generated (as Adam, Eve, Christ had it) unless the first sin of the first parents had intervened, and imposed guilt on Titius, on account of which he is justly deprived of this excellent gift able to be given and otherwise to be given. II. Conclusion. Marriage and conjugal union, or the generation of man, or

the generating parents, or the seed, or the body, are not the cause per se or properly so called either principal, or instrumental: but are the cause per accidens, that is properly antecedent, to which original sin necessarily follows by a necessity of consequence, or are the means or cause without which it would not be handed down to Titius, or exist in him. For because through those things the subject of sin is produced, namely Titius, (without whom the sin of Titius does not exist) commonly (but improperly) generation by which as soon as it exists, without that disease (with the fall of Adam having been posited now) it will not exist: hence ordinary generation from human seed is called the cause, means, instrument of the propagation and production of sin; which must be properly understood of the cause without which or per accidens. Moreover, as from all necessary antecedents necessary signs and criteria are taken which are a necessary argument, and reason of consequence and of knowing; nor yet are pure antecedents the cause of existence or of being per se: so also from the ordinary human generation, and origin of man through it we infallibly conclude, that that man is infected with original stain, according to that in John 3: What is begotten from flesh is flesh. Yet it must not be said that generation, or matter, or the instruments, or the causes of generation are causes directly and per se impressing sin. For otherwise it would follow that Manichaean delirium, that Marriage, and the conjugal act is evil, and consequently the generation of man. For what is per se and from itself the cause and means of sin, that itself is evil and illicit, and consequently to be avoided: But marriage and the conjugal act is such; therefore. And hence it would follow that God the author of nature and marriage, and the first cause of generation, inflowing into second causes of generation, and into the effect according to the common law of concurrence, is the author of evil: according to the common rule, what is the cause of the cause, is the cause of the thing caused. But all these things are absurd. And I now find that this caution in the explication of propagation (which I want to be always accurately adhered to) was seen by the far most learned Theologian Martyr in common places, p. 137, and Calvin with Daneau cited below, where they expressly deny that generation is a cause per se. Which I do not remember to have been so noted by most other theologians: although it is necessary for this to be noted, lest the incautious fall into semi-Manichaean conceptions. I. Corollary. Lombard speaks too crassly, book 2, distinction 31, and after him Gregory, Henry, Driedo; while they state that the body of Adam after the fall contracted a contagion, which was not only in his flesh, but also in his seed, and hence it happens, that all posterity contract the same quality in the flesh, from which a similar quality is derived into the soul, and that in the point of conception. Which opinion the more recent authors rightly refute on I-II, question 82, article 1. And among them Gregory of Valentia, cited place, and Becanus, Scholastic Theology, part 2, volume 1, treatise 2, chapter 9, question 4. II. Corollary. They are also deceived who ascribe the traduction and impression of sin in any way to the body or to bodily parts and qualities. Among whom are those, who think that the pure and innocent soul is infused and thrust into an impure body, derived from impure parents, and is infected by it, not otherwise than pure wine from an impure vessel. Augustine relates this mode, book 5, Against Julian, chapter 3, and it is approved by Lothair the Deacon, afterward Pope Innocent III, book 1, On Contempt of the World, chapter 3, Gerson in the compendium of theology, On the Vices of Nature, From our authors Whitaker, book 1, On Original Sin, chapter 8, Polanus, book 6, Syntagma, chapter 3, although afterward he explains concerning seed as the instrument of traduction. As Altingius just now to be cited below. Before them Beza in an epistle, with him Grynaeus theological disputations, part 2, p. 437, who there on p. 445 inserted

the epistle of Beza. And Martyr in common places, p. 136. But I respond 1. because it is absurd and inexplicable and repugnant to all sound philosophy, if it should be said that spirit (such as is the rational soul) is affected, infected, and corrupted by bodily things. This opinion seems to approach that fiction of the Pontificals concerning the passion of the soul through corporeal fire, and concerning the passion of demons through corporeal things. Which we touch on in the disputations On Demons, On Specters, On Exorcisms: where see. 2. because, it presupposes that the soul preexists pure for some time or at least some moment before it is infected with original stain. Which is absurd and akin to the Platonic and Kabbalistic delusion noted above. 3. because, it presupposes that the human soul preexists for some time, or at least a moment before union with the body, and before the composite. Which is absurd, and repugnant to philosophy. See the scholastics, and our disputation On Creation. The judicious theologian Zacharias Ursinus saw this, who when in the disputation On Sin (which is had in the volume of theological treatises), p. 204, he had responded to the objection from this opinion, that the body arisen from the parents guilty of sin and infected with it also corrupts the soul, soon subjoins another response distrusting the former, indeed sufficiently refuting it. We exhibit his words in the last thesis: where see. Let the reasons of those be compared, who confute the Platonic-Kabbalistic fiction of Origen, which sends souls into bodies as into places of punishment: such as from the ancients Cyril of Alexandria, book 1 on John, chapter 9, Epiphanius, epistle to John of Jerusalem, Augustine, epistle 28, from the more recent Bellarmine, book 4, On Grace and the State of Sin, chapter 11. 4. because, some of the more excellent theologians, these things having been more accurately reconsidered, expressly refute and reject this mode: among whom Daneau, p. 43, Isagoge, chapters 18 and 19, Ursinus just now cited, Andrew Rivetus in disputation 15, thesis 15, in the Synopsis of Theology of the reverend professors of Leiden. 5. because the authors of this opinion do not distinctly enough explain themselves and their opinion, Whether the seed is the inhering subject of the original sin of that individual, e.g., of Titius when it was in the body of the father and mother, or truly when it was cut off and indeed to conception, or truly when from there the embryo had begun to be formed. Again, Whether the body of Titius already formed an instant before animation is a subject of the same kind with the seed whence the body was formed by them; Whether and how that seed is or becomes the subject of that individual original sin, e.g., of Titius, and at the same time the instrument, or cause per se and directly producing? And if it is an instrument whether before cutting off or after cutting off to conception; whether after the begun formation of the embryo, or after it is completed; whether after the animation of the fetus the body is only then made the instrument of traduction into the soul. But if through all those moments, and all those (so to speak) stations, it is not only the subject of inhesion, but also the instrumental cause of traduction, and therefore contains sin in itself both formally and virtually; it would have to be explained whether containment of the same mode and kind from the first to the last is to be stated here, or not? It is necessary that they be consistent with themselves in terms: otherwise they do not evolve the difficulties. For I see them, as also the followers of the third opinion (which we will soon note in corollary 4) vary in the process of defense, and now call it absolutely the subject, now the subject as it were remote and the passing matter of sin, now rather call it the cause either material or efficient. III. corollary. Nor do they speak accurately enough, who ascribe the origin or increase of original sin to the temperament of the body and therefore to sensuality as to a cause drawing the mind downward and on account of the absence of original

justice necessarily doing this, or as to an allurement and solicitation. For this is to explain the obscure through what is much more obscure, and partly uncertain, partly false. This mode is had by Alexander of Hales, Bonaventure, and some of our authors. That the manners of the soul are falsely, or dangerously, or at least indistinctly said to follow the temperament of the body we noted in the disputation On Creation. I also want it to be explained by the supporters of that opinion, how the temperament of the body is disposed and disposes the soul, inclines, and draws it to spiritual and more subtly sins, e.g., lying, perjury, heresy, magic, pride, envy, atheism, etc. IV. corollary. That mode does not take away the difficulty, which Baronius, professor at Aberdeen in Scotland, defends as common, in Philosophy the Handmaid, exercise 2, article 6, and before him Keckermann had indicated as a certain peculiar and as it were newly devised or interpolated one, book 2, System of Theology, chapter 17. Altingius defends the same mode in theological Problems, he states that from the beginning of conception it inheres in the seed and embryo, but inchoatively, dispositively materially. Nor does Kellet dissent, book 1, Theological Miscellanies, (written in English) chapter 6. As if a spiritual infection was in the seed, which is not sin actually or formally, but virtually: in the way that infection in the seed of a leper is not leprosy or disease formally, but only virtually. With this the explication of Szegedin in common places, p. 236 nearly agrees, Thomas in the disputed questions on original [sin], question 4, article 4, and in I-II, question 83, article 1, and his commentators, Cajetan, Valentia, cited place. The words of Alagona in the compendium of Thomas, I-II, question 83, are these: original sin, as in the first cause is in Adam; as in the instrumental cause it is in the corporeal seed, not in the flesh; as in the subject, because the flesh is not capable of fault, except by reason of punishment, it is in the soul. Valentia adds, cited place, that the body, seed and thing sown are not infected subjectively with a depraved quality, but are only said to be defiled causally (dispositively says Stapleton), insofar as they are certain instruments by which the fault of Adam is derived to posterity generated in the ordinary way. The authors are not able to explain this mode, unless they either presuppose that the soul created exists pure and holy, (which is false, see Francis Junius on Genesis 2): or at least attribute a Physical action to the body in the soul, and that either by the hidden judgment of God, as Pareus against Bellarmine, book 4, On the Loss of Grace, chapter 12, or through the natural concomitance and communication which is between matter and form, as Estius on II, distinction 31, article 1, or through the ordination of God, which stated that that stain should flow and be derived from the head Adam into all, and that through the seed as vehicle. Zanchi, On the State of Sin and the Law, book 1, chapter 4, thesis 3, to argument 4, where with distinctions and cautions having been applied he strives to defend this opinion against exceptions and reasons. And he cites there for himself Calvin, book 2, Institutes, chapter 1, §. 7. The same On the Works of Creation, part 3, book 2, chapter 5. But this opinion is refuted 1. Because, our theologians at least cannot concede a physical action of the body in the soul, unless at the same time they cease to oppose the Pontifical opinions concerning the action of corporeal things, and of fire on demons and damned souls, and concerning the direct action of baptismal water on the soul of the baptized. 2. Because, it is presupposed that the seed is the subject of infection or sin virtually. But I want the virtual sin, distinct from the actual, to be either proved or explained; and the seed, or body to be the subject of sin, and not only man. Zanchi in the cited place strives to respond thus to the difficulties objected to his opinion. That this contagion and sin is first in the flesh as in the root, and by that by inchoation or inchoatively etc. but when the soul has acceded, in it it is perfected and more

kindled, as in accommodated matter or subject. Which he explains there by certain similes. I respond: The explication indeed is perspicuous and ingenious, but there is no proof. For the principle is always begged, and that hypothesis, concerning human seed, and concerning the embryo, the subject of sin: concerning corporeal contagion corporally propagated through the body: concerning the infection of the soul through the body as if namely sin was the substance of Flacius Illyricus (not otherwise than a fetid or poisonous vapor in corporeal things); or at least a real and positive quality able to be suffered, in the third species of quality. Which all things are too crude, than that they can be digested by a philosophical stomach. And this opinion could be attacked by nearly the same reasons, by which Whitaker, book 1, On Original Sin, chapter 8, attacks the opinion of Thomas, I-II, question 3, article 1. But we attack this mode more at length below in thesis 3. V. corollary. Nor do they explain the mode, or distinctly respond anything to the latter question proposed in thesis 3, who say that the mode of propagation is generation from corruptible seed terminated at a human suppositum. Here it is only responded to the former question proposed in thesis 3, and indeed only to its first member: so that the latter member remains unexplained and undecided, and not even is the mode of generation through the traduction of the soul from the parents excluded. So that if this explication is compared with those things which are left undecided, it is a mere explication τοῦ ὅτι, but no τοῦ διότι or causal one: as if to say, it is propagated through generation, when man generates man. VI. corollary. The opinion of Vedelius in new theological minor works remains subject to most of the difficulties already touched on, where in Controverted Questions on God and Creation, p. 226, he thus speaks: as to the latter part (namely the positive corruption of the whole nature) the parents by means of or cooperating with their soul, which has the power of generating produce the body of the infant and through it infect its soul. And thus it is infected by the soul of the parents, as by a principal cause, by the body as instrumental cause of the soul of the parents. VII. corollary. Nor does the distinction of Alagona suffice in the compendium of the Summa of Thomas, I-II, question 83, article 1: The infusion of the soul, as it expresses order to God, is not the cause of sin, just as neither is God; but in order to the flesh, when it is infused, thus. Likewise it is better that it be with a corrupt body, than not to be: especially since it can be cleansed through grace. I respond: this opinion by the same arguments, by which the preceding ones. because, it presupposes that the flesh per se, and separately, without the soul, is the subject of sinful corruption: Thence to be derived into the soul, and the essence of the soul to be infected by the corrupt flesh before the powers. We add that the distinction itself of the infusion of the soul in order to God, and in order to the flesh, labors under obscurity and ἀκυρολογία (lest I say something more serious). For if it can be rightly said, that God by His infusion in order to the flesh, into which He infuses the soul, is the cause of sin: in what way by equal reason could it not be said that God by the infusion and impression of first and second grace into a sinful or imperfect man, is the cause of sin, not indeed in order to God, but in order to man, e.g., Peter, grace is imprinted. But if our authors, in the controversy concerning the imperfection of our works and our sanctification in this life (concerning which see the excellent treatise of Beza, and after him of Davenant On Justification) had said, that the Impression of divine grace or of the Holy Spirit is the cause of sin and blameworthy defect, as it expresses order to corrupt or imperfect man, totally or in part carnal, into whom grace is infused or imprinted, it is not the cause of sin, as it expresses order to God: would they not clamor that God is stated to be the author of sin?

III. Conclusion. The soul of the father producing the soul of Titius, or by any other traduction, either from a certain spiritual and incorporeal seed, thus (Bright in Physics of Scribonius) is not the cause of this sin, as the Luciferians wanted, and most of the Doctors of the West, by the testimony of Jerome to Marcellinus and Anapsychia: whose opinion he attacks in the epistle to Pammachius against John of Jerusalem, and in Apology 2 against Rufinus, although Augustine wavers, as is clear from book 2 of Retractions, chapter 56, and book 10, On Genesis according to the Letter, and the book On the Origin of the Soul. This whole invention, which seems to be adopted by today's Lutherans rests on those false hypotheses. That generation is posited in the production of forms. Which see refuted by the Scholastics, and the more recent authors who philosophize from them, That the soul is the adequate subject of sin. Which although Whitaker, book 1, chapter 8, urges against the Pontificals, yet is rightly corrected by Pareus on Romans 5:12, p. 492. And that sin is a positive quality, or a certain corporeal contagion, which is first in the soul thence passes into the body, and is communicated to it. That the human soul is not produced, or cannot be produced through the immediate creation of God. Which all things since they are presupposed gratis, we deny with the same facility. Besides that the adversaries of the creation of souls can explain no certain traduction, although divided into five sects, they have devised five modes, all of which see refuted in Baronius, cited place. IV. Conclusion. It remains therefore that there is no other particular, proper and proximate efficient (deficient) cause of original sin, than each man, in whom original sin is, and that through his own sin in Adam as meritorious cause; and through his own defectibility, which because no obstacle is placed by God from justice on account of the first sin, necessarily and consequently degenerates and breaks forth into defect and depraved disposition, as soon as man is man. For destitute he destitutes himself and pours out from himself and in himself and flows (so to speak) together with his faculties and active principles this irregularity, just as with the sun not ministering its light, there are actually shadows. Therefore each one is of his own individual original sin both the proximate principle and subject at the same time and the author and possessor, just as man of his own natural faculties, and of his own acquired habits; And Adam himself of this original disease in his own person. If someone seeks a further cause, it ought no more to be given or able to be given, than the defect or fall of Adam, when his mutability was alleged. If someone therefore to those inquiring, what is the intrinsic, proximate, physical and direct efficient (or rather deficient) cause, through which the lability of Adam was promoted to actual fall, and through which the mutability of the same came from justice into injustice, and produced or was made to produce the first actual sinful motion or the first actual ἀνομία, could accurately and in terms respond, so that he satisfies himself and others: he will also by equal reason respond and satisfy those inquiring about the proximate, physical, direct cause, through which original inherent sin is first ingenerated and in any man actually results and exists. But if he will deny that he can ascend above that which we have now brought forward in explaining the origin of inherent sin, and consequently will prefer to confess a learned ignorance, than to implicate his own and the readers' wit with absurd δυσλόγοις and λογισμοῖς: certainly let him cease to further stun us with absurd questions, and to elicit things less certain and solid. For whoever inquires further here, they seem to absurdly feign and imagine. 1. That there is a real and positive cause per se, which produces this sin by a real action and causality. 2. And consequently that the causality, propagation, and communication here is positive and Physical; not privative and

moral. 3. That the transfused sin is as it were a liquid, or a quality able to be suffered, and therefore is handed down as heat from fire into wood, or odor from a flower or spice into the hand or clothes etc. is handed down. When rather it ought to be conceived nearly in that mode, in which about the participation of rights and lordships (which the offspring would receive in the first instant of conception or nativity by force of the paternal contract, which had been entered into many years before) from the opposite a certain privation of privileges is conceived, likewise poverty, ignominy of family imposed on account of the crime of the parent. Explain, I ask, how that is propagated, handed down, and you will have explained analogically the propagation of sin: concerning which whatever remains to us here, we conclude with Augustine, book 2, On Marriage and Concupiscence, chapter 22, when Julian the Pelagian asked, through what Hidden crack it had entered: What do you seek, he says, a hidden crack, when you have an open door? Through one man, says the Apostle, sin entered into the world. And book 5, On the Morals of the Church, chapter 21, where he confesses, that nothing is more known than that original sin is handed down, nothing more obscure than how it is handed down. And with Whitaker, book 1. Concerning original sin, chapter 8, and how it was propagated from Adam to his posterity, ought to be believed rather than inquired, and can be inquired more easily than understood, and is better understood than explained.

I have said what I could on a question so obscure and so vexed, so that the objection of adversaries can be satisfied perspicuously and solidly, which is this: If sin is propagated from parents to posterity, either it is propagated through the soul, or through the body. Not through the soul: because then it would be necessary for it to be propagated from the corrupt soul of the parents, or from corrupt seed through traducianism; or the soul infected with sin would be created by God, and united to the body: but both are absurd. Not through the body: because then the body or seed would be the subject of sin and the infected body would infect the soul, previously pure, as soon as it was united to it. All of which things are absurd and inexplicable. And this was formerly the principal argument of Pelagius and his followers, as also of Pighius, and of today's Pelagians. And in reality, says Zanchi, cited place, to the 9th argument, it is not about nothing. If someone brings forward to us more and better or more expeditious things for the illustration of this matter, certainly we will give thanks to him. Yet lest, as there is a great crop of cavillers today, we be burdened with the suspicion, as if we wanted to pursue new and vain curiosities indeed also heterodoxies, I looked around according to my custom after the first edition of this disputation, which theologians I could praise as supporters in this part, so that I might adorn the second edition with this cloud of witnesses. And behold there offered themselves, Ursinus in theological treatises, p. 204: But even if they could obtain the whole Minor, yet there is another sufficient response to the Major, so that it is not necessary to disputate anxiously neither concerning traducianism, nor concerning the mode of propagation of original sin. For even if we concede that the souls of individual men, when they begin to live, are created by God: yet it must not be imagined, that souls exist for some time, before they are inserted into bodies. For they are at the same time both created, and united to the body; as it is said, He breathed into his face the spirit of life. But just as even the substance of bodies, although it is taken from the substance of the parents, yet is rightly said to be created by God, that is, formed, and the substance of sinning men equally as of Devils are preserved by God, yet God does not for that reason exist as the author or preserver of their sin or malice: so also

God at the same time both creates the substance and natural faculties of souls, and deprives them of His gifts, which He had given to Adam on this condition, that He would give them also to his posterity, if he retained them, but would not give, if he cast them away by his ingratitude: but the soul destitute of the spirit and divine light, although it is inclined to appetites and operations, yet is blind, and not inclined to such appetites and actions, as the law of God requires: And by this reason the inclinations despoiled of their rectitude, exist evil of their own accord, and fight with the divine law. But those defects in the mind and will, and heart of the first parents, insofar as they are inflicted by God on them and their posterity are just punishments of the sin admitted by the parents and by the offspring in the parents: but the inclinations vitiated by these defects, and the defects themselves, because they cause that man neither is conformed to the divine law, nor can be, insofar as they are drawn by men, both for themselves and for their offspring, by sinning, and are received by them, and by the offspring, and exist in both, are sins. Therefore the sum is, that souls are created by God, and as part of the offspring of the parents are punished with privation of justice by sin: and at the same time while those things happen, they are corrupted by the fault of the first parents, and contaminated by sin, who had drawn this privation on themselves and their posterity by their sin, according to the saying: By the transgression of one many are dead. Likewise: By the disobedience of one man many were made sinners. Since this member of the division is omitted in the major, there is no consequence of the argument. Daneau, 3rd part of the Isagoge, chapters 18 and 19, concerning which I especially rejoice, because he expressly denies that generation is the cause, he also advises that two questions are to be accurately distinguished. Thus therefore he in chapter 19, p. 151: Finally others devise another thing, so that they may explain this mode. But this has already been partly explained by us: For the mode of that propagation must be altogether separated from its cause. For it is one question, what is the cause of that propagation: another what is its mode. The cause of fever is the abundance of yellow bile: The mode of procuring it was either too much drink, too much wakefulness. Concerning the cause, that it is the just ordination and law of God concerning the sin of the first man. Therefore the mode remains to be expounded, although already in part, what it is, we have said in the preceding chapter. But it is the propagation of man from man which happens from that law of nature, by which each one procreates like to itself. Thus from a horse a horse: from an ox an ox is disseminated: from a serpent a serpent: from a viper a viper is born, and that by natural law, from the noble noble things, from the ignoble ignoble things, Therefore from man, and indeed from him corrupt it is necessary that man also himself corrupt be procreated, as from a poisonous serpent a poisonous serpent, from an Elephantiac, or leprous father a leprous son. Which reason of propagation has nothing obscure, or difficult: Wherefore by the law of being born from sinful parents, the children become sinners. And this is the mode of propagating Original sin, but, as I have said, not the cause, since it is necessary, that man be, who is infected with this sin: therefore it is necessary that he be born from man. Wherefore the mode of propagating that sin is the procreation of man from man: But the cause, because he is born under the law, and punishment imposed by God on the sin of Adam. But it is asked, when the human soul is created by God, and therefore pure, but the soul of the son is not drawn from the soul of the father, how sin can inhere, and be in it, which is pure, and is not procreated from the traducianism of the soul already polluted. But I respond that this happens from the just ordination of God punishing the sin of Adam not in Adam alone: but also in all, and individual of

his posterity. Thus when someone on account of the crime of injured Majesty committed by him, from noble becomes ignoble, all his posterity bear the same ignobility as the punishment of the paternal crime, and become and are born also themselves ignoble. Therefore the soul of the sons is polluted, and sin is in it in the same moment of time, in which it is created by God, not afterward: Yet neither is that, insofar as it is a thing, and essence created anew by God, polluted: But insofar as it is in the human species an Individual, being born liable to this punishment by the just law and ordination of God. And chapter 18, page 150: But of this sin, as of other things, there are four principal causes, namely these, efficient. But it is on the part of man, that infidelity and free rebellion of the first man. Likewise the matter or subject. But it is the soul of man, or the faculties. For the soul properly is the seat of Original sin. The form of original sin is the depravity of the whole human nature, namely the darkness in the mind: and the ἀταξία and rebellion in the will of man. Whence guilt follows in us ourselves before God: and the perennial tinder, or fount of sinning: and actual sins themselves, which three are the most just effects of that sin, Ibid, a little after: Finally the efficient cause of original sin on the part of God is His just ordination, not the natural power of begetting itself, which is in us from God and is the effect of that benediction of God, Increase etc. Thus also Augustine. The mode of propagating it to posterity, is indeed generation and procreation, through which men are born from men by the law of nature, but the same generation is not the cause of that propagation. Calvin in the commentary on Genesis, chapter 3, verse 6, expressly denies that this sin is propagated naturally. Which must be accepted not concerning the natural mode but concerning the natural cause, in which way he explains himself in book 2, Institutes, chapter 1, section 7: Therefore there is nothing absurd, if with him despoiled, nature is destitute naked and poor: if with him defiled by sin, contagion creeps into nature. And a little after: For contagion does not have its cause in the substance of flesh or soul: but because it was so ordained by God, that what gifts He had conferred on the first man, he should have both for himself and for his own as soon as he lost them. And thus Altingius explains Calvin in the Exegesis of the Augsburg Confession, article 2, p. 18: Therefore first from the fallacy of division the adversaries construct a calumny: then also from the ambiguity of the word naturally. Which they take concerning the natural mode; but Calvin interprets concerning the cause in this sense: the sin of Adam is imputed to all his posterity, and the corruption of nature contracted from there is propagated in all by generation; this does not happen naturally, that is, its first and proper cause is not nature, or the substance of soul and body, but all that depends on the ordination of God: who just as He had adorned the whole nature of the human race in one man with the most excellent gifts; so in the same He stripped and deprived it of them. Rollock in the place cited above, thesis 1. Where see his words. And add p. 156, where he explains the mode of propagation through the contagion of the body as probable thus: God in the same moment, in which He creates and infuses the soul, by His just judgment deserts it, and permits it to be corrupted by the body: Therefore in the same moment and point of time the soul is created, infused, deserted by God, corrupted by the body. And soon with another mode having been proposed, which is through the fault of Adam through which as through a door he transmitted into all his posterity whatever was evil in him, he adds, You will ask, whence is that efficacy of that first sin, for propagating sin in all and individual posterity of Adam. I respond: The efficacy of that sin is from the word and a certain covenant of God, which in the first creation He made with Adam, with these words as it were conceived: That if man will stand in that innocence, in which he was created He will stand for

himself and his own: but if he will not stand, but will have fallen, he will fall for himself and his own: and whatever evil is in him, He will transmit all that into his posterity. And this last mode of propagation of original sin since it rests on the authority and words of the Apostle, is more pleasing to us, and ought to satisfy all moderate wits. Tilenus in Syntagma, part 1, chapter 56, theses 25, 27, 28, 29, 31: Since nature seems to reject this action of the body on the spirit, we rightly refer it to the most powerful justice and most just power of God avenging that evil of fault by the evil of punishment, by which our first parent voluntarily prostituted the Spirit to be subjected to the flesh, and in this way cast both himself, and all his posterity into the necessity of sinning. Therefore the soul is indeed pure, which is created by God: but yet now guilty of that debt contracted in the first parent, and to be paid by his heirs: But which hypostatically united to the flesh, and constitutes man; has not only guilt, but also fault: indeed bearing not the whole image of God, which it ought, but the corrupt image and likeness of Adam, Genesis 5:3. See our disputation on the origin of the soul. To seek another door, or crack, through which this evil broke into the human race, outside this fall of Adam; is of men purblind in the most clear light of Scripture, Romans 5:15. The fervor of lust in the use of marriage, although ἀμυδρῶς is wrongly stated by some for the channel, or conduit, through which this plague is derived from parents to children; since neither is this itching conjoined with τεκνογονίᾳ, nor will offspring begotten without lust be free from that plague of nature: indeed having fallen in Adam, and guilty. Therefore generation itself, and συνουσιασμὸς, is the mode by which this evil flows to men; who also depend on Adam by this one mode. Hermann Ravensperger in the disputation whose title is Miserable Adam, thesis 34, approves the opinion of Tilenus, with his words having been set forth. Rivetus in the disputation On Sin held at Leiden, 1621, May 25, Respondent James Fontaine, thesis 16: But the mode by which the sin of origin is propagated; is neither through imitation, as the Pelagians wanted, nor through the soul only, nor through the body only, nor through the seed, as others, but in the first moment of the Conjunction of the soul with the Body, so that man may become, the son of man may become; and therefore liable to sin and punishment, when on account of the sin of Adam he is justly deserted by God, and may be born without original justice, According to that, in the day that you eat you will die by death. Du Moulin in anatomy, chapter 10, after the propagation through seed and body, or through the soul begotten from a soul as light from light having been refuted, finally § 17, p. 52, concludes: With these things having been posited I say that God creates the souls of men good, but destitute of celestial gifts and supernatural light, and that deservedly, because the gifts which Adam had received for himself and his posterity, he lost for himself and his posterity. But not to give supernatural light to the mind, is not to put sin in the will, even if the blindness of the mind is followed afterward by the aversion of the will. For the will destitute of this light and cognition of supernatural goods cannot move itself to unknown things, but only to present and known things, such as are the pleasures of the body, riches etc. Which indeed since they are naturally good, nevertheless turn the will away from the study of supernatural things. Then the love of ourselves, which is naturally good and necessary, begins to be morally evil, because it invades the place, which was owed to the love of God. Hence that propensity to evil, which exists from the inordinate love of oneself, which supernatural light does not direct. Which light God not giving to the soul, for that reason puts sin in it. Amesius, book 1, Marrow, chapter 17, thesis 6, 7, 8. We do not write out the words, because the author is in the hands of all. Scharpius in theological course, volume 1, in the place On Sin, p. 245, plainly thinks with us. The words are

too many, than that they should be described here, and the book is common enough, Maccovius in the disputation On Common Places, part 2, disputation 14. And in the disputation held after the Common Places were published, On the Mode of Propagation of Original Sin, Respondent Nicholas Arnold, a Pole, in the year 1643. Where thus thesis 22: And hence it now becomes manifest how inherent original sin passes into the posterity of Adam propagated naturally from him, for after God imputes, because spiritual death was owed to this sin among other things, which is this sin, as we have said, God strikes those posterity with this death. Hence the Catechist responds not badly when he asks: Whether original sin passes into posterity through the body or through the soul? he says a third is given, namely through the fault of Adam. Especially in the posthumous writings, in Anti-Socinus, p. 77: 1. God effects by withdrawing grace from nature itself, but with grace having been withdrawn the thing passes into nothing, and this was done in the privation of the divine image. 2. He effects by withdrawing His conserving power, not from nature, but from the qualities of nature. For example, from those things which ought to be borne to good, He withdraws grace, not so that the qualities are not, but in this that they are not well. For not even the depravity of our nature, which seems to be something positive, is something positive, for it is a defect. Therefore thus in inherent original sin He did nothing except by withdrawing; but He withdrew justly, because He withdrew deservedly on account of the sin of Adam imputed. But the difficulty does not yet seem to be expedited. For those things still seem to be able to be objected. Alsted in theological Questions, chapter 18, question 25, p. 128: How is the sin of origin propagated? By the just imputation of God, and the ordinary law of generation. For as soon as the rational soul is infused into the body drawn from the parents, the person exists guilty in Adam, to whom God denies His grace and thus on account of the primeval apostasy corruption exists in man. Matthias Martinius in Method of Theology, in the notes to book 3, chapter 19, p. 412: But I know that the sin of origin is propagated from parents by the just judgment of God, who just as He deprived the souls of Adam and Eve, which had been created in purity, of wisdom and salutary justice after the fall: so also He deprives their natural posterity. This is the punishment, which we have merited, which is sin, insofar as we have merited that blindness and ἀδυναμίαν to good, and insofar as we still delight in it, and want to seem wise and just, as if the matter having been well done.

The rest of the more thorny things I relegate to the camp of curiosity, see the most erudite treatise of Johannes Spina On Curiosity, among those, which he wrote On Tranquility of Soul. Perkins in the series of causes of salvation etc., chapter 12, p. 27: Sin is propagated from parents to children, either because the soul is affected by the contagion of the body, as ointment by an impure vessel; or because God, in the same moment, in which it is created and infused, deserts the soul. For Adam, as he received the image of God for himself and others, so he lost it for himself and others. Parker, book 3, On the Descent into Hell, § 65, p. 121: Therefore those things of Urban (Metaphrase of Psalm 51) are not pleasing: The soul infused by God into the damaged body, is so defiled: just as wine infused in an impure vessel, although best is infected, and turns sour. And in that infusion, the soul itself receiving the just sentence of damnation in itself, contracts guilt and guilt, and is bound by perpetual punishment. But neither are those things of Faustus of Riez true. The flesh alone sinned in Adam, the soul is polluted on account of the consent of the body, into which it is infused. For the matter so holds itself. As a fount breaking forth in a muddy place, has a fault, not from the water alone nor the earth alone, but

from both: so man receives propagated sin not from the soul alone, nor from the body alone, but from both. Thus the Master of the Sentences. The cause of his carnal concupiscence, is neither in the soul alone, nor in the flesh alone, for it comes from both. For how can it be, that the body of Adam alone infects posterity, when not the body but the soul first infected Adam himself? For illustrating this he cites Augustine. The corruption of the body, which weighs down the soul, was not the first cause of sin, but punishment: nor did corruptible flesh make the soul a sinner, but the sinning soul, made the flesh corruptible. But if sin is propagated through the soul you will say, then it is not created pure from sin: thus it will follow, that God is the author of sin. The response to this is easy and expeditious. God must be considered by us not only as creator, but also as judge. He is the Creator of the soul as to substance, in respect of which, when it is created, it is pure. God is also Judge, while He creates the soul, as to this circumstance namely, that a soul is to be created by Him not simply, but the soul of one of the sons of Adam. In this respect it is just for Him, to desert the soul, as to His image lost in Adam: from which desertion follows the lack of original justice, from which lack original sin itself is propagated. Paul Ferrius in the Orthodox Scholastic, chapter 20, p. 195: I say therefore that there is not given some real cause which by real action produces original sin in little ones. The reason is, because in the formal concept that sin does not connote some real entity, but privation, as has been said. And afterward: Therefore also it is impossible for such privation to be introduced through natural and physical expulsion: and therefore to be the real cause of its traduction. Yet a moral one is given, which is either the general sin, by which we all sinned in Adam, or natural propagation And a little after: Whence also it is clear that actual sin itself, by which we all sinned in him, directly causes that original sin: but generation or propagation only applicatively, namely by substituting the subject, in which that common sin produces its effect: although truly it has now passed through many thousands of years, it does not impede that it produce an effect, for it is a moral cause, not a real one: but it is not necessary that a moral cause, while it produces its effect, exist. And p. 197: But neither do we deny that some vice inheres in the body: for we feel concupiscence itself in the flesh or inferior part, which is called sensuality: concerning which also so many things St. Paul [says], and especially in Romans 7, where he speaks of the evil inhabiting in the flesh, and fighting against the law of the mind. But we have said that that vice is not a positive quality, but is sensuality itself insofar as it is born, and prone to not obeying reason, but to coveting contrary to right reason: not from some implanted quality indicating ἧτταν, but from the lack of original justice, which perfectly subjected it to reason. Cloppenburg in the Gangrene of Anabaptist Theology, disputation 4, thesis 12: The Remonstrants explain the Emanation or propagation of evil, (so far indeed not badly) by that condition of nature which they draw from Adam sinners, which deprived of the good of grace and glory, cannot disseminate posterity otherwise than deprived of the same good, p. 57, the back. From the Pontificals, Lorinus nearly inculcates the same thing, except that he mixes in the error concerning original sin having been taken away, commentary on Ecclesiastes 12:7, p. 489: It suffices that the conjunction of the soul with the body be attained by the generating man, which he made and prepared, but in offspring of this sort original sin common to the whole nature immediately comes upon man with nature itself, with such generation having been propagated, with that old law of GOD having been posited, and covenant with the first parent as with the Actor, and Head of the whole of men to be generated thereafter, although the soul of the one generating lacks original sin, from which it is now justified. And thus nearly Bellarmine, book 4, On the Loss of

Grace, and before him Durandus on II, distinction 31, question 2, where they reject the mode of propagation through the flesh and the infection of the soul from the flesh; and finally as to the sum of the matter they conclude with us. I exhibit here the words of Durandus who perhaps is not at hand to all: Nor is it handed down otherwise, except because defective nature is handed down by him, who subjected himself and us to defects of this kind by his own fault. And afterward to distinction 32, question 2: Such guilt, which can be called sin comes in us from the first parent: but the punishment itself, which we incur, is to us from God. And a little after: Original sin, as it names guilt, is not contracted from this that the soul is united to the flesh absolutely etc. but it is contracted through this that the whole composite from soul and body is handed down in the way, which was said above, by him who sinned. Scotus states nearly the same thing on II, distinction 32. Scharpius wrote out part of his words, cited place.

5. We add a few problems related to this controversy. I. Problem. Whether if both questions are explained thus, as we have now explained and in general it is stated on both sides that there is depravity or corruption of nature, which is formally a privation; any real controversy remains between us and them. Affirmative, because they (at least most of them) constitute that privation in the defect of a gift per se supernatural (namely original justice), which being absent man nevertheless has free will to good and to evil. See Bellarmine, cited place, and Gregory of Valentia on I-II, disputation 6, question 15, point 1, and others cited by those two. And compare from our authors Whitaker in all of book 2. Moreover, they say that positive inclination or propensity to evil, is of the lower appetite or sensuality, etc., not of the will: which we Deny. See Whitaker, book 1, from chapter 1 to the end. Besides, they want the defect of original justice and the appetite deprived of sense considered according to themselves to have the nature of punishment only and not of fault; but that according to extrinsic denomination it in some way has the nature of fault, insofar as this defect is referred to the first sin of Adam, by which it is produced through a vitiated origin. Thus Thomas, I-II, question 82, article 4, Viguerius in Institutions, chapter 18, § 5, verse 1, folio 244. Which we do not concede. Finally, they say that it is something indifferent and an occasion of sin: but properly and formally it is not sin. II. Problem. What is to be thought of the opinion of Arminius in disputation 31, thesis 10? If he wanted nothing else, than what we said above, and admitted that distinction about the privative and positive, which our theologians cited above inculcate; certainly we do not contend with him. But if that serpent of the Pelagians and Pontificals lay hidden under that grass, and he attacks the positive here to extenuate the efficacy of sin and corruption, and to assert the powers of free will to good, as Corvinus against Du Moulin, chapter 8, p. 119-120, this assertion is suspect to us. III. Problem. Whether and how Christ was and was not in Adam, so that He was immune from original sin both imputed and inherent? We state that Christ was physically in Adam according to the origin of His flesh, Acts 17 compared with Luke 3:23, 38, against the Anabaptists, and Weigelians. For Adam was the common principle and root of the human race, from whose loins all men arose in a long series successively: and among them David, from whom through intermediates and ancestors Christ [arose], Matthew 1:1, Acts 2:30, whose generation was univocal, although the mode was supernatural. Yet we deny that He was in Adam morally and federally according to the federation initiated by God with Adam as principle, root, common representative head of that covenant. We consequently deny that He was an associate, participant and confederate of Adam thus considered, and of the covenant federally

initiated with the same and his participants (so to speak); Which is made known to us from the outcome itself and the fact ἀναμαρτήσιας [sinlessness], Hebrews 7:26, and from the antithetical comparison of the first and second Adam, and of the confederate members of each as well as of the covenant of works or old, and of grace or new, Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15. Finally we deny that the guilt of the sin of Adam ought to have been imputed to Christ, and consequently that the depravity of nature could have been penally handed down to Him; because He was not in Adam, nor did He have anything in common with the same, as a confederate member and participant of the Adamic covenant, nor was He considered or reputed in him as head and federal root. For what place is there for the second Adam and another head and opposite federal root, the mediator of the new covenant, in the old covenant or in the head of the old covenant? And I think this is the higher cause, to which one must ascend, when it is asked, why Christ was not liable to sin, equally as other men? Respond, Because from the justice of God He did not incur that punishment, which we all incur. If it is asked why He did not incur it? Because He neither sinned in Adam, nor was He reputed and considered in Adam as head and root of the first covenant, and consequently the judgment and guilt of the first sin did not pervade to Him. If it is asked why He was not in Adam thus considered? 1. Because it was the good pleasure of God (which is the sole foundation of our inclusion and repute in Adam as common principle and federal head), that He not be in him. 2. And Because there is no consideration or repute of the second Adam and mediator, no necessity of Him in the old covenant, and no part for Him there. 3. I add also, Because absolutely He could not be or be considered in that covenant, on this condition, that with the principle and root standing He would stand with it, falling He would fall. For it would imply a contradiction if it were said of the human nature assumed or to be assumed by God hypostatically, and therefore of the divine person, He can sin, He can not sin, consequently He can on account of the transgression of the Adamic covenant be penally subject to original sin, both imputed and inherent, and thus to actual sins arising from there. Concerning which we have acted elsewhere in the disputation On the Power of God. I know that not a few theologians assign this reason for immunity from original sin, because He was begotten from a virgin by the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit, and not according to the ordinary law of carnal generation. But this reason does not seem adequate, nor to rise to the first root of this immunity, the right itself namely: but only to explain the effect itself or outcome or at most, either some means or subordinate condition. For if someone with us would not expressly deny that Christ was in Adam, and was a participant of the first and common covenant, and of its transgression, how will he be able to defend His immunity from guilt and sin, and reconcile it with the justice and truth of God? Again, suppose God were to produce some other man outside the common and ordinary law of generation (which does not imply to be able to happen), by what reason will you keep him immune from the punishment of original sin, unless you can prove that he was not in Adam federally, and therefore immune from that covenant and its transgression? Compare Du Moulin in the Anatomy of Arminianism, chapter 10, § 16, axiom 1. From this our explication I think it is now clear what must be responded to the objection of Corvinus, by which he urges Du Moulin, who in the Anatomy of Arminianism, chapter 7, § 6, had conceded (and rightly) that Christ was in Adam, as one of his posterity. Briefly, those who were in Adam only originally, naturally, seminally, radically, (as Christ), and not also morally, and federally (as all other men were in him, except Christ) they do not participate in the guilt, and punishment of death and spiritual corruption. What others

respond to that objection through the distinction of a principle merely passive or material, and not effective or active; so that Adam was both with respect to all other men; the former only and not the latter with respect to Christ: that seems to me to remove the difficulty by another difficulty (perhaps more difficult); as sometime God willing we will show in problematic disputations. But if we cannot satisfy ourselves and others, we will have to acquiesce rather in the counsel of Melanchthon, which see part 2, Counsels, p. 127. IV. Problem. How can human souls which were not in Adam, nor were propagated from him by traducianism, be subject to original sin both imputed and inherent? Although [the soul] does not draw this substance of the soul from Adam but from the immediate creation of God, nor was his [Adam's] soul in him as to the origin of essence; yet the whole man or human composite consisting of soul and body was in Adam both morally or reputatively as in a principle, head and federal root, and naturally as in a root and principle of origin through generation; his soul was also in Adam as to the origin of subsistence: for that man begot the whole man, and he in turn another; and although he did not produce him according to the substance of the soul, yet he attained the union of the body with the soul produced by God according to the ordinary law of generation in which properly and formally generation consists. And in this opinion as to the sum of the matter I see Zanchi agreeing, cited book, p. 63, 4th edition, and Francis Junius in the disputation on original sin, theses 14-15, Pareus published on Romans, chapter 5, verse 12, Rivetus in the Synopsis of Theology of Leiden, place cited above, and Altingius in theological Problems, part 1, problem 27, and Parker in the book on the Descent into Hell, § 65, p. 120, whose most worthy words are to be exhibited here: Body and soul flow equally from Adam, yet in an unequal mode of propagating: the former indeed is from traducianism, but the latter from infusion, which in this respect is from the parent: because God does not create the soul as soul simply, but as the soul of one of the sons of Adam, whence also it is created by being infused, and infused by being created, and does not have any subsistence outside the body: but by union to the body, it is both created and infused. The Christian legate Athenagoras teaches. The soul does not beget the soul, but man man: that is: the soul is by no means from traducianism, yet from the parent, plainly by that reason which we have now said. This is explained more fully by Cyril of Alexandria thus. The mothers of earthly men, serving nature for generation, indeed have flesh gradually coagulated in the womb. But God sends the spirit to the fetus, in a way which He knows. But the nature of flesh is one thing, of the soul another. Yet nevertheless although they become mothers only of bodies which are from earth: nevertheless they are said to bear the whole man, who consists of soul and body, not a part of him. For no one would say that Elizabeth is σαρκοτόκον [bearer of flesh], and not ψυχοτόκον [bearer of soul]. Pacian of Barcelona applies these things to Christ Himself. In the last times, Christ certainly received soul with flesh, from Mary; He came to make this safe, He does not leave this among the dead, He joined this to His spirit, and made it His own. And as the soul is propagated from Adam himself: so also it propagates sin equally with the body, from Adam. For Adam is said to have begotten sons in his image, Genesis 5:3, but the image is in the soul, not in the body alone. What is begotten from flesh is flesh, John 3:6, flesh here also includes the soul itself of natural man. VI. Problem. Whether it is said accurately enough by Polanus, cited chapter, p. 337, that original sin which is properly and formally sin, exists first in the order of generation and time (as Thomas says in the disputed questions on original sin, question 4, article 3) in the seed. And whether it is rightly said by another theologian to exist first in the body already animated and then in the soul; and that on account of this reason, because

the body is conceived from unclean seed and the body before union is infected in itself with the principle and a certain disposition of sin; but the soul is created pure by God, and thus in punishment of the first transgression is then deprived of its purity and infected corrupted by the contagion of the body. No. Because they would have to assume various false hypotheses, which we reject above, and contradict themselves and our orthodox theologians, if indeed they want to defend this thesis of theirs to the end. I on the contrary think it must be stated. First, that the adequate and first subject also of sin is man, or the whole composite; but not the blood, or seed, or embryo; which are not even animals, or living things, much less that they be rational, and endowed with free will, consequently capable of moral goodness or malice, punishment and reward. Second, The organic body itself united to the soul is not properly the subject of sin: indeed not even, both essential parts taken together, not united in human nature and suppositum. For the human person is the subject of sin properly so called. For what Scripture sometimes attributes sin to the body and to the integral parts of the body, that must be understood incompletely, synecdochically, and improperly, mediately and through another: insofar namely as they are parts in the whole and constitute the whole, in which sin is immediately and per se. Third, That if it must be said that this sin is in one part before the other, this is rather to be attributed to the soul than to the body with nearly all theologians: and that from the law of contraries, for the image of God, and every theological or moral virtue whether considered in act or in habit or elicitive principle, is in the soul before, and not in the body: therefore the same must be said of its opposite, namely sin, whether original or actual. Fourth, no moral evil is given, or sin, which is such only inchoatively, and only the tinder of sin, but is not formally evil or sin. But whatever is besides moral good, or moral evil, is pure indifferent and neutral, which from its formal nature can express no moral impurity, turpitude, infection, depravation or depravity. And certainly I do not see, how they can explain and defend this their tinder to be moral corruption, depravity, and evil disposition (which nevertheless is not formally sin, nor can merit punishment), as a certain third thing distinct from sin and the opposite virtue, and yet solidly refute the tinder of the Pontificals, Socinians, Remonstrants (apology, p. 84, 86) to which they do not want to attribute the formal nature of sin and guilt. Fifth, as to the temperament, on which as direct principle, and per se or cause properly so called and per se they suspend the infection and inexistence of original sin first in the body now informed, and then in the soul, and therefore in the whole composite, and in which they place nearly the whole protection of this mode of handing down sin; I say that it in itself and per se is morally indifferent and neutral, not evil or vicious, no more than the humors, and all the parts, all the members of the body. Because, whatever it is in any man, it is directly and per se produced by God, as by the first cause and is the creature of God. And because, it is the underlying subject, or that good, by which moral depravity is: therefore it is not the depravity itself or sinful disposition. Because also it is the occasion, and tinder (if it may be so said), of the opposite good or virtue; but per accidens. For per accidens and through the intervention of the regenerating spirit temperaments e.g. melancholic, choleric, sanguine become instruments, which as also the members of the body, it can use and uses, either for profound humiliation concerning sins and gravity and constancy in the ways of the Lord, or for zeal, fervor, and courage in the work of the Lord, or for spiritual joy and ἀρετήν [virtue] in the grace of God etc. Just as the same temperaments are occasions and (per accidens namely of the corrupt or not sanctified soul) become instruments of heresies, quarrels, and ἀτυχία [misfortune] etc. For they are apt to be

made instruments of justice and injustice; although from the state of the fall they do not have receptive or passive potency to justice, except remote and obediential; because the world cannot receive the spirit, John 14. Besides because natural concupiscence and the whole sensuality is neither matter nor form of any sin, nor has anything vicious in itself (as Polanus rightly in book 6 of the Syntagma, chapter 3); therefore equally neither the temperament of the body, indeed much less. Finally because when they attribute so much here to that philosopheme concerning temperament, they must see lest anything be conceded to Remonstrant docility or good disposition in the first moment of conversion, which they refer to temperament and education, Apology, chapter 10, folios 118-119, etc. Compare above appendix 2 to the disputation On Creation, p. 849.

A METHOD OF RESPONDING to excerpts and slanders concerning God the author of sin, etc.

Response by PETRUS KALNAI, Hungarian, To the day April 24, 1647.

Although the cabbage of cavils and slanders not only twice, but a thousand times (so to speak) reheated, ought at last to produce nausea, to those to whom it is opposed: yet since on one side the Epicureans and Socinians against the providence of God, on the other side all today's Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians against the same, as well as against the grace of God, partly openly partly secretly do not cease to make a tumult and disturb the more uneducated, I will not seem to be about to do a thing without reason, especially now having been consulted by some, to whom I cannot deny this, if I set forth to our students and other lovers of truth in this brief writing, and subject to public disputation, the compendious, expeditious and certain method of meeting calumnious excerpts of this kind and consequences having been previously more often proposed in the course of lectures. That this may be done methodically, I will treat

1. concerning Excerpts and consequences.

2. I will show how they are to be met.

1. Concerning excerpts these things are to be known beforehand.

1. Whence they exhibit them.

2. Who exhibit them.

3. Of what kind.

4. In what form, and mode.

5. To what end. I. First, now and then, but more rarely, they exhibit them from the very confessions or catechisms, or declarations, apologies, collations, acts and common, public books, for example from the Belgic Confession, or the canons of the Synod of Dordt. To this can be referred the considerations of the Remonstrants on the Belgic confession and catechism, which see in their Anti-synodal writings. Especially they are accustomed to stun our authors with their cavils to questions 5, 60, 114. Which we have professedly and laboriously refuted in Thersites Heautontimorumenos. But for the most part or nearly always they exhibit their excerpts from the writings of Luther, Zwingli, Bucer, Calvin, Beza, Marlorat, Martyr, Zanchi, Szegedin, Ursinus, Pezel, Piscator, Perkins, Hubert Sturm, Pareus, Polanus, Gomarus, and others, whom see in the writings and acts of the Remonstrants to the Synod of Dordt, dogmatic writing to article 1, pp. 25, 47, and article 3, pp. 203, 218, and in the lists of excerpts, and other polemic books to be cited in this disputation. II. Secondly. 1. Such excerpts are everywhere exhibited calumniously in the common books of the Pontificals published in Latin or the vernacular, who for the most part are accustomed to write them out from Bellarmine, On the Loss of Grace and the State of Sin, book 2, chapters 2, 3, 4, and other writers of the greater nations of polemic writers, with the authors themselves not having been consulted, indeed often not having been seen. Compare Feuardent's Calvinist Theomachy, volume 1, book 2, chapter 12, Prateolus' Catalog of Heresies, book 2, under the entry Calvinists, William Reginald and Gifford, book 1, Calvino-Turkism, chapter 7. The Jesuits of Münster seem to have gained every point of malediction and calumny in the book, whose title is Credo of the Calvinists. But the professors of scholastic Theology, in their Academies could here teach them, that it does not seem to be seen by them what a bag is on the back. At least not without great imprudence and shameful ignorance of their own and our affairs, they persuade themselves to do this, our retorsions and excerpts from Pontifical writers; concerning which below. 2. The Neo-Lutherans joined themselves to the Pontificals, among whom excelled Conrad Schlüsselburg, book 1, Calvinist Theology, article 8, Philip Nicolai, Mentzer, and other Theologians of theirs of Marburg and Giessen in theological disputations. To whom are to be joined those of Wittenberg, Jena, Tübingen, and others who opposed themselves to the Irenic and syncretistic writings of the Academy of Heidelberg, of Lampadius, Pareus etc., such as Nicholas Hunnius, Johann Himmel, Johann Weber. But if anyone wants to make a compendium let him read Eckhard's bundle of controversies, chapter 10, questions 2 and 3, and chapter 15, questions 3, 4. But how prudently, and skillfully they roll this stone, they themselves will sometime as I hope see, when awaking from that lethargy of contentions they will have remembered the writing of Luther on the bondage of the will and of the ancient Lutherans, who thought with him here, and also of certain things said and written by their own, excerpts of which we exhibit in our problems, in the lists under the title on providence: finally the orthodox doctrine concerning the bondage of the will and the certainty of salvation, which they still defend against the Pontificals and synergists. 3. Coornhert, Anabaptists, and similar obscure and idiotic disputants, who now and then hiss something, are to us of no number. 4. The Socinians since they embrace both the ancient and more recent Pelagians, Anti-trinitarians, indeed also Epicureans, do not so much pursue excerpts and things said more harshly or unsuitably in certain reformed authors, as the very truths of faith and confessions of the reformed, indeed also of all Christendom; which they

openly and directly fight against, and as much as is in them, overturn from the foundations. 5. The Remonstrants, wanted to surpass the efforts of all adversaries and calumniators both ancient and more recent. Nor is it a wonder, since they see this one and extreme protection of their cause left to themselves after all things having been attempted in vain. Hence it is that we will properly accommodate our Method this time to them, certain that with their absurd slanders having been routed, nothing will remain for the rest of the adversaries, which they could put back with any appearance. III. Thirdly, It must now be seen what kind they exhibit. They are partly the very dogmas, and the principal five article theses, controverted between us and them, partly and for the most part certain hypotheses, which occur in the proofs of those theses, and the solutions of objections and exceptions in our authors. And here especially they seek occasion of hunting, and excerpting certain phrases or little words spoken more harshly, or more unsuitably (whether in their judgment, or in reality) in the fervor of disputation. The common places, about which they reciprocate this saw, are, especially concerning the decrees and providence of God, and concerning predestination, grace, and free will, faith and perseverance. IV. The form and mode of exhibiting these excerpts is various. 1. When bare excerpts from authors, are exhibited as it were in a list, without particular conclusions or consequences, or glosses having been added. Such a list among others in the vernacular language was published here at Utrecht in open folio by the Remonstrants in the year 1618. And as many manuscripts as you please are still daily obtruded on the more simple. Sometimes Remonstrant ministers wanted to defend the faith of the citations in such lists by a public oral collation, the more audacious the more unlearned. Of which rash and unhappy daring two examples now occur to me: in the town of Goedereede of a certain neophyte Adrian Romanus, least suitable for this business, as appeared in the Provincial Synod of Delft, 1618, whose acts concerning this unhappy champion and Pyrgopolinices can be seen. The same was attempted in the village of Bleiswijk near Rotterdam by a man of no study, no letters, also of no probity, Henricus Slatius then unworthy minister in Bleiswijk, and unworthily and ἀτάκτως promoted to the ecclesiastical ministry, afterward by an attempted parricide on the most high Prince Maurice, and other horrible conspiracies and betrayals against the fatherland and the supreme Magistracy having obtained the celebrity of a name, and an infamous punishment. 2. When those excerpts are nakedly and as it were in a list compared with Muhammadan, Manichaean, Stoic excerpts etc. and the reformed doctrine with the Turkish, Manichaean etc. An example of this in our Belgium was given by an anonymous list published, and adjudicated to the pyre by the supreme court of the duchy of Guelders at Arnhem in the year 1617. The Remonstrants replaced this list with a vernacular writing entitled Decent Examination etc., and tried to defend it, and condemn the deed of the court of Guelders: to whom some orthodox person under the name of Eusebius Philalethius abundantly responded in the same year 1617 with the title Answer to a certain slander entitled Decent Examination etc. 3. When laborious connections of consequences, or dissertations are joined to the excerpts, by which the falsity, absurdity indeed also blasphemy and ἀσέβεια of the opinions in themselves, and the agreement of the same with the Turkish, Jewish, Manichaean, Borboritic, Enthusiastic-Libertine, Stoic etc. could be persuaded to any reader. I will not now indicate the innumerable number of vernacular books published both before and after the Synod of Dordt. Among others one, which may be instead of all, not to be passed by, the Defense of the decree of the States of Holland of Johannes Wtenbogaert, to which the renowned Triglandius fully and learnedly responded, with the title Defense of the

doctrine and honor of the reformed churches etc. They did this with Latin writings especially the Remonstrants in the Anti-synodal acts and writings of Dordt, and in their notorious Apology, which were published under a common name. To which can be joined the notes of Daniel Tilenus on the canons of the Synod of Dordt, and the disputation of Bertius (afterward an apostate and Papist) On Occult and Revealed Theology, and the writing of the same against Piscator And the appendix of the Papizing Grotius On the Antichrist, added to the notes on the Evangelists pp. 64-65, where without citation of authors (namely by his own affirming authority) he reheats this cabbage. 4. When, by certain positions or theses they think they exhibit the sense of the excerpts, and through Remonstrant consequence, of all the reformed churches. This was done in the year 1617 in the duchy of Guelders where the notorious ten positions were made, and their revocation. Concerning which the history of Wilhelm Baudartius, written in the Belgian language, is to be seen; and the narration prefixed to the acts of the Synod of Dordt. 5. When, they harass and twist the opinion, or saying of a reformed author by bare questions. Which was recently done by an anonymous questioner in a vernacular book against a certain corollary subjected to a disputation of our Reverend colleague Dr. Carolus de Maets, entitled 12 stupid questions. To whom Mr. Cralingius, minister, when he was alive, of Woerden, neatly responded in the same language. Our colleague himself also in disputation 8, part 3, On Christ the Mediator, briefly reproached the crass ignorance of that man. Whom let the reader consult. V. The end of calumnious excerpts is partly particular and proximate, partly more universal and remote. The former is, that the God of the reformed be stated the author of sin; besides, unjust, a tyrant, a pretender; and thus all difference between honest and dishonest be said to be taken away, all pursuit of piety, all consolation to be fundamentally overthrown; finally in place of God a certain idol, indeed the evil God of the Manicheans, and the devil to be erected, and impiety, Epicureanism, atheism to be promoted among men. The latter is, that the doctrine of the reformed be rendered odious to the more uneducated especially and more imprudent by any sought color, and men be led away from the communion of our churches, and be retained in the conventicles of the Remonstrants, or certain ones be drawn there anew. To which could be added other particular ends both of the works and of the workers, that they may satisfy the desire of vengeance, that they may make sail for their ambition, lest they seem to have erred in vain and have disturbed the church etc. But these things pertain more to the history of deeds, than to elenchtic theology. And so we do not want to pursue them here.

2. With the disease now having been detected, the remedies and means are to be indicated, by which it must be met. Since all slanders are accustomed to be wiped away in a twofold way, especially also against religion and the church, by the living voice, or by writing or published books: I have always thought the former to be preferred, if indeed a collation could be had before auditors of both sides, or rather before Remonstrant assemblies, where the cited authors themselves could be inspected, read, and their sense explained, and be demonstrated to the eye of all cognitors and auditors; so that thus might be apprehended the ὑπόνοια of a bad cause, which seeks all protection in this one disease of cavils and slanders. This did not badly turn out in the year 1617 in the territory of Rotterdam, in the village of Bleiswijk; when at the provocation of Henr. Slaetsius afterward a parricide, there having been demanded by the orthodox the Reverend Dr. Joh. Cloppenburch formerly most closely joined with me as a colleague in the ecclesiastical ministry, now Professor of Theology in the Academy of Franeker,

appeared and overthrew the calumnious list of excerpts publicly fixed, and publicly confounded its unhappy author. But if this former navigation cannot be obtained, the second must be used, that is, by writing or also by the publication of a purgation or apology; so that the cause of God and of the reformed churches may be freed from those rancid Pelagian slanders among those, whose interest it is. This has been done so far by as many as possible, in the vernacular language (whom others I will not now indicate, except a few named in the preceding thesis) and in Latin; among whom now occur directly opposed to the Remonstrants the authors of the second Contra-Remonstrance by which it is demonstrated that the Remonstrants introduce a new doctrine, delivered to the States of Holland in the year 1617, p. 80, novelties 1, 2, 5, The Censure of the Professors of Leiden on the Remonstrant Confession, with the counter-apology of Isaac Junius, chapters 6, 8, 9. To which can be added, although they did not directly respond to the Remonstrants, but to the Pontificals or Neutrals or fanatical deriders, Calvin in response to the calumnies of a knave concerning the hidden providence of God; Rivet in the Orthodox Catholic against Bayle; Gomarus' Reconciliation of the orthodox doctrine of providence; George Abbot, the English theologian, in certain prelections published in Germany, among which one on God the author of sin; The man of Salisbury in the Baculum of Becanus; Conradus Vorstius in the apology opposed to the Credo Calvinistequarum of the Jesuits of Münster; Peter Du Moulin in the book on the Providence of God, Amesius in Bellarmine Disarmed, volume 4, disputations 5, 6, 7, who subtly and accurately blunts calumnious excerpts. And among those who responded to the Socinians, Johannes Junius in the refutation of the prelections of Socinus. Among those who opposed themselves to the Lutherans, the German Response of the Theologians of Heidelberg, entitled Ausführlicher Bericht etc.; Pareus' Irenicum; and the miscellaneous theological treatises of Johannes Polyander van Kerckhoven, where he acts against the Anti-synodal Theses of Balthasar Mentzer. Ludwig Lucius, Professor of Philosophy at Basel in the treatise against Andreas Libavius on predestination. Matthias Martini against Philip Nicolai; Henricus Altingius in the exegesis of the Augsburg Confession, article 19. There can be added the epistolary dissertations on the term of life, published by Joh. Beverwyck; Also from the Pontificals after Thomas and Cajetan, Diego Alvarez, Zumel, Bañez, Sylvius, and others cited everywhere by our authors Rivet, Ames, Twisse, Ferrius, and in the dissertations on the term of life; who will especially make for the pressed and accurate acceptance and application of distinctions and terms, and also for retorsion against the Pontificals. We, lest we plainly do a thing already done, yet lest we plainly not satisfy the desires of certain brothers, will delineate not so laboriously the matter itself or the method (so to speak) of using, as compendiously the mode of acting and the teaching method. But we state its members or kinds to be three: of which the first is, rejection; the second retorsion; the third, direct response. But we leave it to the judgment and prudence of each one, whether he wants to employ the three in order, or truly with the two former having been omitted, only the third for making a compendium of time, speech, and writing, especially, if he should seem with some appearance to his own, or to the middle and neutral to use tergiversation and some circumlocution. Truth does not seek hiding places, and always desires to meet the adversary, as Tertullian says. This also must be left to the judgment of each one, in what order the members of this Method are to be disposed, from which it must be begun, and in which it must be ended. But if this cause be agitated by writings, I (with better judgment reserved) would think it more advisable, that none of them be omitted, and from the third a beginning be made: by which having been read what especially

urges may be subjected to the eyes of readers as soon as possible, and the explication of which properly, directly, immediately, and proximately takes the scruple from their minds. With the third having been completed one may proceed to the second or to the first; as it will seem to each one to be especially conducive to this on account of the nature of the auditors or readers, or on account of the importunity of the adversaries.

3. Rejection therefore will be the denial of strife or apology over or for those excerpts. And it is twofold, either of all the excerpts which are exhibited from the private writings of the doctors; or of certain excerpts. The former is in every way just and legitimate, for those reasons. 1. Because no one of the reformed whether of the ministers in reception to the ministry, or of the members in profession of faith, or of the Remonstrants in a recantation, or in reconciliation with our churches is obligated, to acknowledge those excerpts in those authors, or if he acknowledges to embrace them, much less to furnish them, or to speak concerning those matters in the same or similar mode, as often as necessity will demand that. For neither are the phrases or sayings of Luther, Beza, Calvin, Zanchi etc. in this part of the Nicene synod, or also holy anointed etc. of the Ephesine synod. 2. Because it does not pertain to the common objective faith of our churches or to the truths of faith, the genuine explication and judgment of those excerpts; whether namely a false and absurd sense be contained in them, or not. But this disquisition pertains only to the deeds and to history, whether namely this or that author said this, and in what sense he said this. 3. Because it does not pertain to the internal faith of each one or by which he believes, to state for certain that that author must be so explained and not otherwise, and that he could or wanted to intend this and not another sense by those words; much less that it pertain to the faith of anyone, (who namely could not yet be persuaded, but that a false and absurd sense is contained in those excerpts) to assent to the same sense, and to approve it in conscience and to defend it against those contradicting: But it pertains only, to theological and much reading and various erudition; besides to fraternal charity and gratitude toward the labors of such great men, that we accept their words rather in a more favorable part, if indeed it can happen, than otherwise: and that we explain them dexterously according to our strength. For it must be thought what we want to happen to us, and what the apostle prescribes, 1 Corinthians 13. The saying of Jerome is commonly known: that it is wicked to want to seek a heresy in the words of someone, when his sense is known to be sound. 4. Because, not only true faith and the foundation of salvation (in which all citizens of one church ought to agree, and which is required for the esse of the church) depends on some particular Doctors, much less on a few sayings of theirs; but not even the declaration of external consensus and explicit communion, through expressed formulas of symbols, confessions, catechisms, which is required for the well being of the churches, depends on the said excerpts. Indeed on the contrary our churches reject from their consensus and communion all those things, whatever false or dangerous, or badly sounding, some perhaps judging less kindly concerning the sense of those authors, would think to be contained in their words, and to be educed through consequence from there. See I ask the conclusion of the Synod of Dordt subjected to the judgment on the five articles, Acts of Dordt, part 1, p. 275, folio edition. 5. Because, by ventilating and vexing those excerpts they seem not so much to seek the truth, as to flee it, and to dilapidate the compendia of time, study, and brief and perspicuous determinations, to be more intent on disturbing, distracting, burdening, overwhelming and confounding their own and

others' wits, judgments, memories, than on helping and expediting them. Concerning which enough has been said by our authors when occasion was given. 6. Because, the Remonstrants are accustomed to use this method, whenever it seemed good to them, to expedite themselves most compendiously, or most safely to decline odious causes and consequences. But what liberty they take to themselves, they ought not to deny to others. Thus they declined everywhere whatever of heterodoxies from Adolphus Venator, Peter Bertius, Conrad Vorstius was objected to them. Grevinchovius against Amesius p. 15: Did Vorstius commit himself to my patronage. In the Response of the Remonstrants to the list of Amstedam p. 29: That they are not bound to the apology of those things which were said by Vorstius, Venator, Arminius, Nicholas Grevinchovius, Bertius, Borrius. Johannes Wtenbogaert in the Belgian book whose title is Frank and Modest Account etc.: What is this, he says, to the Remonstrants? Is there anything concerning it contained in the remonstrance.

4. With the Method of retorsion having been employed it is met by the adversaries,

1. When bare excerpts primarily in this same matter, and secondarily and in the place of an epimetrum in other matters from their own authors (for example from the Pontificals from the Pontificals, from the Remonstrants from the Remonstrants, etc.) are opposed to their excerpts; the obscurity or harshness (so to speak) or ambiguity and lubricity of which they ought, and could vex with the same, if not, greater appearance through the same consequence, and burden them with the same absurdities. Which when they neither do, nor want to do; it is clear that they sin against charity, and by mere προσωπολησία, envy, desire of vengeance, zeal of contention, or some other disease of mind, not by judgment, not by zeal of truth, hurl those excerpts with odious consequences against our authors. Of such excerpts, we supply specimens from the Pontificals, Remonstrants, Socinians, Anabaptists, Lutherans in the First part of the syllabus of theological problems, where after the topic on providence there is a threefold list. And in the catechization of the Remonstrant catechism, in the vernacular language, where we increased those excerpts: Which we do not repeat here. Let him see there, whoever has leisure, the second and third list. 2. When to the calumnious consequences, by which they burden our authors, we oppose similar consequences fabricated through parody, and either urge their domestic authors, or their common doctrine, which they still hold with the orthodox, with the same things, and demand their response and apology. Whatever they will have responded here, we will apply that parodically analogically to the sayings of our authors, and will put it back in the place of a response to their badly patched together consequences and accusations. But if they want to act here by pure ἀποδίωξις, or rejection; certainly they will give us greater occasion of adhering to our first method. For they do not prove to us that our authors are more authentic, than theirs to them. But if they also desert their own doctrine, which they profess still to hold in common; certainly they cast the spear, and show that they are αὐτοκατάκριτοι, and more sceptical and vertiginous seekers, than teaching and responding theologians. This mode of retorsion was followed, against the Pontificals indeed by Amesius and Rivetus; to whom can be added Chamier, volume 3, Panstratia, books 2, 3, 7, 8. Against the Remonstrants the same Amesius in the writing against Grevinchovius, and in the refutation of the Anti-synodals; And we everywhere in a Belgian writing against Tilenus. Against the Lutherans, Pareus in the Irenicum, chapter 28, articles 1, 2. And Kimedoncius in the preface to

the book of Luther on the bondage of the will. 3. When questions are opposed to questions, and thus through counter-questions the absurdity and ineptness of the proposed questions is tacitly proved. For either the adversaries will confess this by their silence, when they do not respond to the counter-questions; or by their response of whatever kind they will show the way and mode of responding to their questions. This method of counter-questions was employed most excellently by Jacob Cralingius in two Belgian books against the stupid questioner. 4. When especially such excerpts from the common doctrine, or from their own authors are opposed to them in the first line, which not by some appearance through twisted consequences, but in reality and evidently, are either absurd, false, or at least badly sounding, dangerous, scandalous, as they falsely and undeservedly impose these things on the sayings of our authors. Of which kind are partly common or at least publicly current opinions, partly particular sayings from our lists only indicated in the mode cited. From the common opinions, or current disputations are these. 1. Of the Pontificals concerning the inclination of sensuality to evil before the fall. Bellarmine, book 6, On the State of Sin, chapters 5, 6, 7. Concerning the mortality of man, which is not the punishment of sin. Ibid., chapters 8, 9. Whence it could be inferred that God is the author of evil, Concerning fate more than fatuous and Stoic, to which they subject and implicate God, through the new fiction of conditioned knowledge with all freedom and supreme power having been taken away from Him. Concerning which see our disputation On the Knowledge of God, and dissertation On the Term of Life. That God could afflict men plainly innocent, even infants with eternal and infernal torments: concerning which we advised in the disputation On the Right and Justice of God. Concerning the eternal damnation of all infants born in the communion of the covenant from faithful parents and dying in infancy without baptism, Bellarmine, cited book, chapter 2. And the Louvainists and those of Douai now commonly hold this opinion; as can be seen in the book published at Louvain in the year 1641 entitled Complaint of Jacob Zegers Printer, pp. 64-65. By this doctrine forsooth they make God more merciful, than the reformed and forsooth have a milder opinion concerning the salvation of little ones, than the Reformed. Forsooth. That Christ could have assumed and personally united to Himself a sinful human nature, that is, that this proposition could have been true: God is a sinner; and consequently, God is damned. Likewise, that God could command a lie, hatred of Himself etc. This theology forsooth more than reformed, will vindicate the wisdom, sanctity, veracity of God. Compare our disputations On the Right and Justice of God and On the Power of God. 2. Of the Remonstrants: Concerning conditioned knowledge of God: whence a Stoic fate can be imputed to them equally as to the Jesuits. Concerning that inclination of the lower appetite to fighting against right reason, and concerning mortality, to be ascribed not to defection, but to the nature of man and consequently to God the author of nature: Whence the same thing, which to the Pontificals and ancient Pelagians, is imputed to them. The doubt whether Christ could have not done the will of the Father. Besides, that it is not certain that a sinner at the end of life repenting and desiring grace is to be received by God. Thus forsooth they exalt with the Socinians the mercy of God, and make it more universal and extended. That it is impossible, that anyone knowing that there is eternal life, and believing that Jesus was appointed by God etc. would not enter this way with all diligence. Thus they in their catechism, question 46. And this forsooth is to assert the freedom of the human will. That Christ by His sponsion, passion, and justice properly acquired for us or for any of men remission of sins and eternal salvation; but acquired for God, that He could enter into another covenant anew with

fallen man with justice unharmed: so that all could have been damned, with the intervening unbelief of all. This forsooth is to sing of more universal and extended grace of God and plenitude and sufficiency of the merit of Christ. Indeed rather it is to deny all force and sufficiency of the merit of Christ. See I ask the consequence twisted by Amesius in the writing against Grevinchovius, and in the refutation of the Anti-synodal writings. From particular sayings are these. 1. Of the Pontificals; That God presides over evil wills, and rules, governs, twists and bends them; so that although they are evil by their own vice, nevertheless they are ordained by divine providence to one evil rather than to another. Thus Bellarmine, book 2, On the Loss of Grace, chapter 13, section 8, p. 222, 8th edition, Ingolstadt. And that He positively inclines evil wills to one thing, and averts them from another. Thus Thomas in the commentary on Romans 9: That just as it is not evil for God to cooperate with the actions of sinners, as to the goodness of nature: so it is not evil to command them. Thus Cajetan in the Lentils of the New Testament, Lentil 6, question 2. Where to the words of the Lord said to Judas the traitor: What you do, do quickly, he notes in the business of the betrayal a threefold good to be found: first, according to the effect, which is the passion of Christ. Second, the good of nature of the very actions of Judas. Third, the order of the evil of fault, that is, of the sin of Judas himself. Concerning the second good he thus speaks in terms: For every action however much evil morally, since it is something, is good with the goodness of nature: and as such is from God. And as to this, these words of the Lord are preceptive, and signify the order of divine providence to accelerate the actions of Judas, so that at the time appointed by divine predestination the passion of Christ might be fulfilled. 2. Of the Remonstrants, That when the creature in evil is not altogether hardened, the act also because it is joined with sin it does not want to commit unless with certain arguments and occasions, which are as it were incitements etc. God proposes those irritants. Thus Arminius in the disputation On the Providence of God in Evil. Why do they not cry out here, that God is constituted the moral cause of sin? Besides, That God makes foolish, a hypocrite, a lover of vanity, mad. Thus an anonymous Remonstrant in the book, whose title is Accurate Examination etc., p. 59. 3. Of the Lutherans, That God damns the undeserving. Thus Luther on the bondage of the will, p. 262, 8th edition. And that He does evils through the evil, p. 218. And that He acts, in Satan and the impious totally, such as they are, and finds. Ibid. See also pp. 220-221. These excerpts are either openly false, and consequently to be rejected; or at least badly sounding, and dangerously said and consequently to be corrected; or confusedly, obscurely, and improperly said, and consequently to be enunciated more accurately, distinctly, and suitably; or in appearance harsh, although otherwise most true in themselves which could be accepted in a bad part by the unlearned and ἀγροίκοις, and consequently to be explained and defended.

5. Direct response is, which happens through the genuine explication of the excerpts the rejection and refutation of calumnious consequences, and the defense, excuse of the accused author. Of this method there are two parts: of which I. The former detects and reproves the crime of falsehood, if any is committed by the authors of the books, lists, and excerpts, when they ascribe to authors those things which 1. either are contained in them in no way. 2. or are not contained in them, as they are cited by them. Which latter is accustomed to happen especially in four ways. First, When certain words proximately antecedent or proximately consequent, or placed in the middle of the sentence are omitted. Second, when some word or

some words are changed into another or into others, and the words or word of the calumniator are substituted for the cited words or word of the author. Third, When things joined are divided and things divided are joined. Fourth, when words torn away from the whole body of the context or disputation, are twisted into a plainly contrary sense beyond and against the scope and thread of the speech and of the author: so that sometimes the objection is accepted for the response, or the opinion of another, which the author refers, for his own opinion, or an argument to the man, or a reasoning from hypothesis, or an absurd consequence, by which he presses the adversary, for his own peremptory and proper determination. I could refer here other special modes of falsehood: but I think that all can be reduced to these chief heads. Let him compare, who has leisure, the Jurists, On the Crime of Falsehood, and the Casuists On False Testimony, and On Calumny. And the commentators on Matthew 26:61. The Pontificals in this very matter have been frequently convicted of the crime of falsehood by our authors. Let them be seen among our authors cited above, Conrad Vorstius in the apology for the Orthodox churches etc. against the Credo-Calvinisequarum of Münster. And Joh. Brantius in the Examination of the Apostasy of Cudlemius, part 4, chapter 11. And from the Antagonists of Bellarmine, Pareus, And Henry of Salisbury in Becanus-baculum, pp. 32, 46. But I will not now delay by detecting or indicating their falsehoods. I proceed to the Remonstrants, who cannot be excused from the crime of falsehood in the discussion of this cause. The infamous in memory Henr. Slatius had given a specimen in his notorious list in citing the words of Pareus, and in the translation of the word reus by the Belgian verdoemt: as was then shown to him face to face in the collation. The paper does not allow, that I exhibit all the places from the trash of Belgian books, where by addition or truncation, or change, and substitution or unfaithful translation (for example necessity is translated by noordwanck, I permit by ick staet toe; which latter Dr. Triglandius noted in the preface of the book cited above), or transformation of the whole thesis, they placed their protection in calumny. I will exhibit only two specimens to the reader not blinded by zeal of party, both because they here touch us more nearly, and because they appear recently in a manuscript list of excerpts scattered in the territory of Delft, and transmitted to us through a friend eight days ago. Therefore let the first specimen be in the citation of the words of Calvin from the Response to the calumnies of a Knave, articles 13, 14. Which occurs in the list burned in the duchy of Guelders at Arnhem by sentence of the supreme court, concerning which above thesis 1; and in the list published at Utrecht in the year 1618; and in the Dutch manuscript list of the year 1647 just now mentioned. The words of Calvin are for the most part thus cited from part 2 of the theological treatises, class 6, Response to the calumnies of a knave concerning the hidden providence of God, p. 748, column b (Geneva edition by Joh. Vignon in the year 1617): You deny that it is permitted to God except on account of a crime to damn any of mortals. Innumerable are taken away from life still infants. Now put forth your virulence against God, who precipitates innocent fetuses torn away from the breasts of mothers into eternal death. Sometimes they also truncate the former words, and exhibit only the latter, beginning thence: Now put forth your etc., as was done in the manuscript list wandering about in Holland. From these words they want to persuade the people, that innocent men, even infants are damned by God, from the opinion of Calvin. But how the contrary is stated there by Calvin, and how he urges the heresy of his adversary denying original sin, and its guilt, by this absurd consequence, which he himself openly detests as blasphemy, let the reader know from the words of Calvin, which we exhibit here whole: What also you object, that no one except on account of a crime

and after a crime is justly damned, concerning the former you do not have strife with me: when I teach everywhere that no one perishes except by the just judgment of God. Although it is not permitted to dissemble that a hidden poison lies under your words: because if the similitude which you propose is admitted, God will be unjust, who involves the whole race of Abraham in the guilt of original sin. You deny that it is permitted to God except on account of a crime to damn any of mortals. Innumerable are taken away from life still infants. Now put forth your virulence against God, who precipitates innocent fetuses torn away from the breasts of mothers into eternal death. Whoever will not detest this blasphemy, where it is openly detected, let him curse me according to his own will. For it must not be demanded that I be immune and free from the reproaches of those, who do not spare God. The second specimen is in the citation of a corollary from a disputation of our Reverend colleague Dr. Carolus de Maets: which was done by an anonymous questioner; in a book in 8, whose title is Twelve stupid questions; and also by the author whoever he is of the Dutch manuscript list scattered this year in Holland in the territory of Delft. The crime of falsehood manifestly committed by the former was noted by Jac. Cralingius in the preface of the book, which he then opposed to that questioner. And afterward when occasion was given our Reverend colleague thus explained and defended each of his corollaries in disputation 8, On Christ the Savior, part 3, from thesis 25, so that I do not see how they can hiss against it with any color, unless they first deny with Epicurus the providence of God and with Socinus His foreknowledge. We also said something concerning each in the dissertation On the Term of Life. Therefore in this disputation we will defend that the crime of falsehood is again committed by the author of the manuscript list after the writing of Dr. Cralingius, and the apology of our colleague just now cited, when he thus proposes the words of our colleague: That God decreed and determined, that all things should happen at that time, in that mode, in that place, and order, in which they now happen in time: and that according to this decree and divine determination, man cannot do or omit more good or evil, than he does or omits. The first corollary may pass, because as to the thing he did not badly translate it. The second, which is immediately subjected to it, he plainly omitted, which thus sounds: This predetermination does not take away the contingency of things. The fourth thus sounds: With respect to this divine predetermination no one can do or omit more good or evil, than he does or omits. Although in the divided sense he can. Here indeed I desire faith and candor in him, when he immediately joined these words with the first corollary, as if it was one continuous speech, with no other words having been interjected; especially because he plainly omitted the second corollary, by which the first was limited, and the way was prepared for the explication of the fourth, and indeed with no indication having been made of its omission. Then I openly accuse him of the crime of falsehood, because he truncated those words: although in the divided sense he can. How great a moment they bring here, they are not ignorant, who have saluted even from the threshold these controversies agitated between the Thomists and Jesuits, and between our authors and the Remonstrants and other adversaries. I could add also a third specimen of falsehood detected here at Utrecht one and another year ago in the collation with a Remonstrant preacher by three then students of theology, now pastors of churches. But because the account of the repeated or second collation held before the most ample Delegates of the Consuls and certain chosen Senators and fortified by public authority, and perhaps the whole preceding private colloquy the Delegates themselves will sometime publish; I forbear this time, and betake myself to the other part of this method. II. The latter historically and candidly

first explains the cited authors; then shows that their words are twisted into a plainly alien sense. The explication of the words, can happen accurately, compendiously, distinctly, evidently, with the distinctions of the terms having been known beforehand and premised which are accustomed to be employed partly in the place of the predicate, or about the modification of the predicate, of necessity, possible, impossible, of the divine will, of predetermination, or predefinition, of liberty, contingency, inevitability: partly in the place of the subject, (sin, evil, hardening). Our Reverend colleague in the cited thesis set in light the distinctions of terms about the predicate. And we in the dissertation On the Term of Life, where by express testimonies of Scripture, and by various arguments, and by the consensus itself of any adversaries (with the Socinians alone excepted) we proved the necessity of all actions and events namely according to quid, that is of consequence or from hypothesis. And these things are obvious in Amesius, Maccovius, and among the Pontificals Bañez, Alvarez, Sylvius: and other Thomists; indeed also in the common Metaphysicians. Among those, who are employed in the place of the subject, the most frequent is the term of sin: the distinction of which we here briefly repeat. Therefore it can be taken either abstractly for sin as such, or ἀνομίᾳ, and the vice of a human act strictly and precisely so called, as it is contradistinguished against the underlying act or the action itself and motion, considered physically or metaphysically in the genus of being. Or concretely, for the whole complex, which consists of those three. 1. the underlying act, to which ἀνομία inheres; 2. ἀνομία itself or the moral vice, which inheres in that act. 3. the ordinability and ordination of that sinful act to some good: whether that be the good of vindicative justice, or of paternal chastisement and medicine, or of admonition and premonition of the faithful, or whatever other. Concerning which our disputation is to be seen, On the uses of sin per accidens. But if sin be accepted in the first signification, now we say that no positive decree or no will of effecting, but only of permitting; likewise no positive execution, determination, and causality of real providence, but only pure pure permission can be attributed to God about sin. But if indeed in the second signification; now we contend with our authors, that not bare permission alone must be attributed to God, but besides a real operation according to a positive and efficacious decree of the will, and its adjunct or affection necessity; not indeed absolutely but limitedly, as to the underlying act, and the ordinability and ordination to good: for no one, unless an Epicurean, denies that these are effected by God the highest good and first cause. The showing or demonstration, that the words of the authors are twisted into an alien sense is accomplished by this reason, If we say. 1. That Scripture partly by express words thus speaks, as our authors, concerning evil men and their depraved wills, and sins; partly implicitly and indirectly or through consequence thus speaks concerning the same sins, when it speaks concerning things and events in this world, which do not happen and exist without the intervention of the sin of demons and men, indeed cannot happen, nor exist: of which kind for example the crucifixion of the innocent Christ, persecutions of the church etc. But Scripture pronounces these four things concerning them: First, that God predefined, destined, willed them, and that they were not done nor existed without the counsel, decree, and will of God, Luke 22:22, Acts 2:23-24 and 4:27-28. Second, that God in time not only barely permitted them, Genesis 20:6 and 31:7, Acts 14:16, 2 Chronicles 32:31, but also executed them, according to His predestination and counsel, and produced, did, them, and by similar phrases, which are accustomed to denote the action, motion, physical providence of God, Isaiah 63:17, Amos 3:6, Psalm 105:25, Isaiah 10:5-6, 15, and 2 Samuel 12:11-12, 1 Kings 12:15, 2 Thessalonians 2:12. Add the texts concerning

hardening, Exodus 4:21, Romans 1:24, 9:18, John 10:40. Third, That God commanded them, or said, and by other similar phrases (which elsewhere are accustomed to denote properly efficiency, action and moral providence) 2 Samuel 16:10 and 17:14, Lamentations 3:37-38, 1 Kings 22:22-23, Isaiah 10:6. And Fourth, That consequently, with respect to the providence and decree of God necessity and impossibility is attributed to those events and actions of men, Matthew 18:7, Luke 17:1 and 24:26, John 12:37-40, Acts 1:16, 1 Corinthians 11:19, 2 Thessalonians 2:3. Fifth, That although God and man act at the same time and concur about the same object, to the same act, to the production of the same thing and event, nevertheless God does not participate in the fault of man, nor man in the virtue or purity of God; so that He be related to fault, he immune from it, Luke 22:22, Matthew 26:24, 18:7, Acts 2:23 with verse 28, Isaiah 10:1-2 with verse 4, John 12:29, 35-36 and chapter 9:15, Exodus 4:21 with verse 23, chapter 51. So that God therefore could not justly, sincerely, and without pretense prescribe due duty to man, and man would not be bound to furnish it, and God could not justly punish him, if indeed he should not furnish it. The reason of which is assigned, the widest difference, which is between God acting (who is first and last, absolutely independent, and owes nothing to anyone, Romans 11:35) and between the second cause, namely the rational creature: as also in the mode of acting, and end, Isaiah 10:6-7. With these things thus having been indicated the Remonstrants, Pontificals, Lutherans, are demanded, that they suitably explain those expositable enunciations of Scripture, which we can call such with the ancient logicians: but if they either do not want, or cannot, now they deliver the cause of the Christian religion to Atheists, Epicureans, infidels, libertines. But if they attempt and seriously do this, now it is necessary that they distinguish, between these three things: any act namely underlying sin, which God produces as first cause, Acts 17:28, Ephesians 1:11; and ἀνομίαν or the vice of the act; and the ordinability or ordination of that vicious act to good or for good. Arminius observes this distinction in the disputation On the Providence of God in Evil, and Suarez in the Relectio on the Freedom of the Divine Will, disputation 1, 2, n. 14, and other more recent authors, especially today's Thomists on I, question 18, article 4. Now we apply. When the effective will of God or positive decree, and His actual providence and motion both physical and moral is said to be about and concerned with a thing and event conjoined with sin, that must be accepted limitedly and with a distinction, with respect namely to those three things, both the underlying act; and the ordination; and the moral goodness, whatever occurs in that whole collective or complex of actions: which three things are without doubt good and from God: but not with respect to sin as such, or malice formally taken. Concerning the first that it is from God no one denies or can deny, unless an Epicurean or Socinian. See Suarez, cited place, and Melchior Cano, theological places, book 2, chapter 4, and the Scholastics on I, question 18, article 4. And Sylvius, Theologian of Douai in the treatise On the Motion of the First Mover. Concerning the second that common saying is known to all from Genesis 50:20. And that of Augustine: God is not the author of evil wills, but the ordainer. Concerning the third it was concluded against the Pelagians with Augustine, That every good of ours is either God Himself, or from God. When simple and bare permission, and the will of permitting, or permissive decree (which is sometimes called negative) is attributed to God about such events, that also must be accepted limitedly and with a distinction, with respect namely to ἀνομίας in itself, or of sin as sin, as such, or precisely, abstractly and formally taken; but not with respect to the underlying act and ordination to good, nor with respect to sin concretely, and taken for the whole complex. But

when God is said to foreknow, rule, ordain, be concerned with, that is, to care for, dispose, work something about evil men, depraved wills, sins of men, things and events conjoined with sin, or to which some sin is necessarily implicated, that must be accepted indistinctly. 2. That the Fathers, scholastics, and more recent Pontificals, indeed also Arminius, Luther and others are commonly thus explained by their own, and vindicated from calumnious consequences. That our authors can and ought to be explained in the same way: which I prove by these reasons. First, Because they have not spoken otherwise or more harshly, than Scripture itself (as will be able to be shown from induction and comparison of places); indeed they especially expressly inserted those sayings of Scripture, and wanted to speak by its words, not their own. Which can be proved by places commonly accustomed to be cited from Calvin, Martyr etc. See Calvin having excellently performed this apology in the treatise On Predestination cited above p. 716. Nor more harshly, than the Fathers themselves, as for example Augustine, epistle 48, and On Grace and Free Will, chapters 20, 23. Nor more harshly than the scholastics, and more recent Pontificals, Lutherans, and others indicated in our lists cited above, sayings of some of whom we repeat above.

Add Suarez in the place just now cited. But Scripture, the Fathers, the scholastics, other authors speaking thus are suitably explained: Therefore our authors also ought to be so explained. Compare our disputation On the Fathers, where we indicate in what way the Fathers even speaking less suitably are accustomed to be explained by our authors and the Pontificals. Secondly, Because they themselves in those same places, which are accustomed to be cited for calumny through the antecedent and consequent words, and the whole thread of the disputation and scope of the context, explain themselves enough, and purge themselves from those consequences. Or at least elsewhere evidently and accurately distinguish, and disclose their opinion. See especially Calvin against the Libertines, chapter 14, and commentary on James 1:15, Ursinus in the theological treatise, disputation On Sin, and On Providence, Pezel, part 2, objections and responses, with the judgment of Zanchi subjected there at the end having been compared, p. 409. Zanchi himself, book 1, On the State of Sin and the Law, chapter 2, c. But our authors cited above are to be compared, who one by one vindicate the places of Calvin, Zwingli, Martyr etc. from the calumnies of the Pontificals, Remonstrants, and Lutherans. In the question, or rather calumny, concerning the taking away of natural free will, we have the force of truth bursting forth from the breast and mouth of the most rigid adversary, Suarez in the minor works On the Concurrence of God, book 1, chapter 2, numbers 5 and 6. Where he thus says: But God since He is the author and Lord of the will can move, impel, or impede it in what way He will have. And Proverbs 21:1 having been adduced there, he thus proceeds: It has truth not only in the acts themselves, but also in the mode of operating. And afterward he added: Whence the sense of all the Saints is the same when they require this condition on the part of God for the free use of the will: namely, that He permits it to be moved in a mode proper to itself, supposing that God can, by His power and efficacy, impede that mode of operating if He wills, yet by the disposition of His mild providence, He does not do it: or if sometimes He does it, it is to be numbered among the miracles, which surpass the nature of common providence. And finally in number 7 he concludes: Whence the heretics of this time do not indeed deny, that they operate from a perfect judgment, and advertence of reason: for they experience that they are not compelled by the objects themselves, nor suffer necessity: yet they deny that we operate

freely: because God by His omnipotent will imposes necessity on us. In which they are not reproved by Catholics, because they assert something, which either in the thing itself involves contradiction or repugnance, or surpasses the omnipotence of God: but they are refuted because from the divine Scriptures, and other principles of faith it is established, that God ordinarily does not use that efficacy and omnipotence with us, nor is that consonant with His most wise and most mild providence. Ibid., number 11, he expressly disputes, that the created will can be necessitated by God. Therefore our theologians have not spoken so absurdly and blasphemously, when by phrases of Scripture they say that the sinner is impelled or moved by God. Which with what distinction it must be accepted they explain enough elsewhere both for Scripture and for themselves. Thirdly, Because it will not be able to be proved that any of our authors did not speak under the distinctions now brought forward by us, or at least did not want those distinctions to be employed. Let those briefly be named, who beyond bare permission, attributed to God an effective or positive decree, and actual efficiency whether physical or moral, about sin as sin or about ἀνομίαν formally, as such, precisely, and abstractly taken, and contradistinguished from the underlying act as also from the ordination to good. Or, so that I may speak more clearly, who thus treating concerning the efficacious permission, ordination, governance, and operation of God in evil and about evil, did not want to distinguish themselves or to be distinguished by others, between sin concretely taken for the whole complex and conflated from all those things posited above, and between sin abstractly, precisely, and formally taken, that is, ἀνομίαν as such. When they will have done this, I will say that the sayings of such authors are not to be excused or defended, but to be corrected indeed also openly to be rejected and condemned. Fourthly, Because it is in no way likely that those men versed enough in the Scriptures, and the Fathers, especially Augustine, and also Lombard and Thomas Aquinas and their followers, besides in the languages, arts and Philosophy, proposed or defended things so crass, stupid, absurd, implying contradiction, horrid, blasphemous, and scandalous, against all theology, and the universal consensus of Christendom, against every dictate of the light of nature, and of right reason, against their own opinions. Let it be thought what kind and how great were Luther, Zwingli, Bucer, Calvin, Beza, Martyr, Zanchi, Daneau, Perkins, Gomarus, etc. Certainly Calvin, who undeservedly is accustomed to be the anvil and target of all calumnies, so openly and so often explained himself here, that nothing can be desired. I will now cite one place of his, in part, from part 2 of the theological treatises, class 6, in the brief response to the calumny, p. 732: Nor indeed does He hide another counsel, by which He either loves, or wants to absolve with Himself the iniquity, which He condemns among men: but He wonderfully exercises His judgments, so that according to His inestimable wisdom and equity He directs and ordains to a good end even those things which are evil. For Calvin will not concede that God wills evil per se, that is, insofar as it is evil: but that the judgments of God shine forth in the crimes of men, just as through the incestuous intercourses of Absalom, He punished the adultery of David, Finally therefore (which in the third place must be done by us) let us conclude that our authors are by right and deservedly to be freed and absolved from the imputations and calumnious consequences: at least, whatever was said more unsuitably or even falsely in any of them, no prejudice can be brought from there to the common cause of religion and of the reformed church. But if the adversaries against the light of the deeds, against the evidence of the apology do not cease to cavil and to falsely accuse, we will think that something similar happened to Christ the Savior, and in this same matter to the apostle Paul

(see Romans 3 and 5 and 9) and to Augustine, to whom so that they might inflame envy the Pelagians imposed sixteen articles. The Louvainists, and other followers of Augustine and Thomas undergo the same lot today; whose cause the Jesuits endeavor to render odious among the nobles and people by scattered excerpts. Concerning which see the book entitled The Complaint of Zegers the Printer etc. at the end. I would also have wanted from abundance to respond to the questions and doubts, which are accustomed to be moved about any particular theses, or phrases, and modes of speaking; but because I was prolix beyond what is equal, and in the dissertation On the Term of Life I seem to myself to have expedited most of those things enough, I will forbear this time.

Some additions, which then when the press was running did not come into mind; or in various confused schedules were noted, were passed over; or from books afterward by chance inspected, or even at last published were observed.

Page 9, penultimate line. Here are to be added especially, what things the Jesuits preach so magnificently in the Image of the First Century, book 3, chapter 3, pages 340-341, concerning the syllogistic form and the didactic-scholastic method employed by their own in the schools and in disputations against heretics. Let him see the place, whoever has leisure.

Page 37, line 26. There are also to be compared the consensus of authors, who depress the Masoretic authority, such as Augustine Steuchus in the notes on Genesis 3:17, Genebrardus in the preface to the commentaries on the Psalms. And in the commentaries themselves on Psalm 2:6 and 4:4 and 26:6 and 24:4 and 27:8 especially on Psalm 78:47, Marin Mersenne in the commentary on Genesis, chapter 3, verse 15, Cornelius a Lapide on 2 Thessalonians 2, Marcus Marinus in Noah's Ark, on the entry to the place Deuteronomy 28:30, Philip Guadagnoli in the apology against Ahmed the Muhammadan, treatise 1, chapter 6. And these indeed are Pontificals, who not only diminish the authority of the Masoretes, but besides want the Hebrew text itself as it is now written, to have been corrupted by them. From our authors Scaliger, book 5, On the Emendation of the Times, p. 204. But he contends that blemishes have crept into the Hebrew text itself, as it now is, by the fault of the Jewish copyists, as can be seen in his Chronological Elenchus. Gomarus in the disputation On the Name Jehovah. The author of the Mystery of Punctuation (who is Louis Cappel), book 1, chapter 17, Louis de Dieu preface to the Hebrew, Chaldean, Syriac Grammar.

Page 38, line 7, add here. VI. Problem. Whether interpreters of Scripture prudently or safely translate דן. We the things having been presupposed which have now been said, Deny.

Page 40, line 8, who learnedly explained this matter: After Parker most recently the same thing was furnished by certain anonymous Londoners in the English treatise, whose title is Defense of the Divine Right etc. in 4, London 1647.

Page 50, line 22. The same Scaliger not only in chronological questions and numbers, flees to this asylum of sacred criticism in the places cited above in the disputation On the Authority of Scripture, but also in any others where it so came to him by practice.

Page 59, line 9. Add to the cited authors Rivetus and Chamierus in the places cited above (page 54), And Pareus' Orthodox Calvin.

Page 63, after line 22. After these seven specimens of insolubles excerpted from Pontifical Antagonists, three others were offered to me by our disciples, and at that time, and afterward in the college of questions to the sacred history of the Old and New Testament determined for the measure. Of which the first from 2 Chronicles 5:10 compared with Hebrews 9:4 seemed to be of some, the second and third of greatest moment. As to the first I say that a twofold reconciliation can be brought forward, one, from grammar, the other from history. The former, is again twofold. One, that it may be said that Hebrews 9 refers not to the proximately antecedent κιβωτὸν, but to the near, namely σκηνῇ, in which it is indubitable that all those things mentioned were from Exodus 16 and Numbers 17. Examples of a similar interpretation see in the notes and commentaries on Genesis 10:12, 2 Samuel 21:14, Psalm 99:7, Mark 2:3, 2 Thessalonians 2:9. Ribera in the treatise On the Temple, book 2, chapter 2, favors this interpretation, among all others brought forward by his own, and confirms it by reasons not to be despised. Which let him see, whoever has leisure. The other, that it may be said that the particle ἐν here signifies with, just as Ephesians 6:2, Romans 15:32, Luke 4:32, Matthew 6:26 and 16:27. The latter reconciliation namely from history, is such; that it may be said, when the tabernacle was standing, all those things were in the ark; but when the temple was being built they were placed back in the ark, but the urn and rod of Aaron were preserved in some other part of the temple. There are those who want that neither with the tabernacle standing nor in the time of Solomon were they in the ark, but at last were placed there in the time of the capture of the city by the Babylonians, and together with the ark were buried in the earth, and then with the same were dug up again after the return from captivity, and were preserved all the way to the last overthrow of the temple by Titus, at which time they were plundered. See Adrichem's Theater of the Holy Land in the description of Jerusalem p. 159 a, where column b, he adds that all those things are still preserved at Rome in the church of St. John Lateran. But this history or conjecture does not yet become likely to me. But we number its epiphonema among the Roman fables. As to the second we touched on it on page 59. But because that was afterward more often put back by our students, with all things having been weighed I thought it must be said: There is a twofold beginning of the reign of Ahaziah, first with his father, when he was 22 years old, and then with his father having died, when he was 42 years old, so that those 20 intermediate years are sometimes ascribed to the father, who was not fully disposed, sometimes to the son: as also below Jotham reigned with and for his father Uzziah to be sure leprous, 2 Kings 15:5, 2 Chronicles 27:21. With this having been posited, now the former doubt is solved, that Jehoram

reigned alone and immediately only 8 years, to whose life and reign if you add those 20 years, in which with him living with and for and in his name his son Ahaziah reigned, no difficulty remains, for then he will be sixty years old, and will be said to have reigned 20 years of his disease, to be sure not fully deposed; and not to have reigned, to be sure worn down by enemies, afflicted by a base and incurable disease and rendered impotent Hated by the Nobles and people and as it were thrust into a corner. The third is 2 Kings 3:1 compared with 1 Kings 16:29 and 2 Chronicles 6:13 and 1 Kings 22:41 and 52 and chapter 8. Here four doubts arise. The first doubt is, how Joram king of Israel is said to have begun to reign in the 18th year of Jehoshaphat, and in the 2nd year of his son Jehoram. I respond: It must be said that Jehoram reigned some years with his father Jehoshaphat still reigning as a colleague of the empire or vicar. The second doubt is, how Joram the son of Ahab is said to have taken up the kingdom in the 18th year of Jehoshaphat (2 Kings 3:1); when his father Ahab reigned at the same time with Jehoshaphat full 19 years, as is gathered from 1 Kings 16:29 compared with 2 Chronicles 16:13. I respond: Two beginnings of reigning are attributed to Joram king of the Israelites, the one in the 18th year of Jehoshaphat, when he reigned with his father Ahab and brother Ahaziah, the other when he reigned mutually for his brother Ahaziah in the second year of Jehoram king of Judah, which year fell on the 22nd year of Jehoshaphat. The third doubt is, In what way is Jehoram king of Judah said to have reigned in the fifth year of Jehoram king of Israel; when on the contrary Jehoram the Israelite is noted to have succeeded his brother Ahaziah having died, in the second year of Jehoram king of Judah, 2 Kings 1:17. I respond with Henry Philip the Jesuit Theologian in the accurate Examination of the chronology of the Old Testament in the notes and chronological questions on Joshua, Judges etc., p. 142: The second question can easily be responded to from the things said: For Jehoram is said to have reigned more often. 1. in the fifth year of Jehoshaphat, when born 32 years he was designated king. 2. he was confirmed or admitted into the administration of the kingdom about the 21st year of Jehoshaphat, but in the following year the other Jehoram succeeded his dead brother in Israel, with Jehoshaphat still surviving. Finally in the fifth year of Jehoram the Israelite, with Jehoshaphat having died Jehoram the Judean is said to have reigned a third time, that is to moderate the reins of the kingdom without the association of his parent. Torniellus cannot reject this doctrine, who in the year of the world 3427 gathers from Scripture that a threefold beginning of reigning must be attributed to this Jehoram. The fourth doubt is, In what way is Jehoram king of Judah said to have reigned in the 5th year of Jehoshaphat, when that year did not fall on the fifth year of Jehoram the Israelite. I respond with the same Henry Philip on the cited page: What I think concerning this is an easy conjecture. Namely Jehoram the Judean began to reign with his father in the 5th year of Jehoshaphat: afterward he administered the kingdom for his dead father in the 5th year of Jehoram the Israelite. Since therefore there were different beginnings of reigning, it is not a wonder, that the 5th year of Jehoshaphat, does not concur with the 5th year of Jehoram the Israelite. Therefore Jehoram the Judean was thirty-two years old when he had begun to reign in the 5th year of the reign of his parent and reigned with him about 20 years: but with his parent having died, he reigned eight years in Jerusalem: therefore he easily reached to the sixtieth year of life, since dying he left his son Ahaziah 42 years old heir of the kingdom. You will say that this could not happen: if indeed Jehoshaphat was 35 years old when he had begun to reign and reigned 25 years, 2 Kings 22:42 and 2 Chronicles 20:31. Therefore in the 5th year of his reign, he was spending the fortieth of his age: at which time he does not seem to have

been able to have a son 32 years old. I respond: Jehoshaphat was 35 years old, not when he succeeded his parent: but when Asa about the 31st year of his reign took that Jehoshaphat as a colleague of the kingdom: and thus Jehoshaphat reigned with his parent 10 years, with him having died 25; altogether 35, and before he had spent just as many without the insignia of the kingdom, by which it happens that the space of his whole life was extended to 70 years, and his son Jehoram began to reign, with Jehoshaphat now fifty years old. And these things I wanted to bring forward not from our interpreters or sacred chronologers, but from the Pontificals, and indeed from him, who after the opinions of all others having been weighed seems most recently to have reached the target and to have taken away all scruples, so that the Pontificals may see, that these are not truly insolubles, as indeed otherwise they want to profess; nor for that reason must one flee to the oracle of the Papal voice according to the quick, or to the magisterium of the Platonic-Ideal church in the Roman see.

Page 119, line 20. Add to Topsell and Kellet George Carleton afterward Bishop of Llandaff, who in the year 1618, 1619 was present at the celebrated national Synod of Dordt, in the English treatise On Tithes published in the year 1606; in whose title these words appear: By which the contentious and profane Atheists, and the hypocrites pretending of this time may learn to honor the ministers, and not to defraud them, to plunder the church.

Page 120, line 6. Add Illyricus in the disputation On Free Will and Original Sin, proposed and published in the Academy of Jena in the year 1562, with the acts of the colloquy of Weimar held between Illyricus and Strigelius in the year 1560, pp. 313-317 cited by us, attacks by as many reasons and indeed vehemently those principles innate concerning God, and the congenital or innate theology which the same thing he does in the colloquy itself with Strigelius pp. 72-73. But nevertheless on page 317 just now cited, he thus concludes that disputation and thus explains himself in the very course, that although sometimes his words in the fervor of contention seem to profess this, which the Pontificals impute to him, nevertheless his sense could be foreign enough to this opinion to just judges. For thus he speaks on the cited page: Yet certain good and learned men think, that there are still altogether some principles in man concerning God. They do not indeed say concerning one God, much less concerning the true God: but only that there is some divinity, and some power above man. From whom indeed my opinion does not much differ. For they have respect, as I think, to that which Paul affirms, that among the works of the flesh is idolatry: which although it could be referred to depraved reasonings and profane audacity, rashly feigning anything in religion, so that it only departs from the one and true God, to which fount also Paul reduces the idolatries of men, Romans 1, yet through me it is permitted to anyone to think, that there is still in man a certain perverse and distorted light (as in a certain book concerning this matter we have disputed more prolixly above) which indeed condemns the true God, and His religion as extreme foolishness, but shows false Gods and cults for true ones as it were the present image of Satan, and prescribes and orders that the devils themselves are to be worshipped. I would easily concede that there is now in man a certain fallacious, imposturous or deceptive light of such a kind, and above in the aforesaid book I showed abundantly. And in the Weimar disputation itself, p. 74: Paul in the Acts urges twice, that the Gentiles from the benefits of God gathered that there is a God, Acts 14 and 17. He does not say that they knew God before, and from the innate notion of God gathered concerning His works.

Whence manifestly, as also from the whole thread of the disputation I seem to myself to gather. 1. That Illyricus distinguished the questions, Whether and what God is, from the question who is the true God. Concerning that he denied absolutely; concerning this not so. 2. he distinguished about the question, What it is, and What it is between distinct, and confused knowledge; between due or necessarily required for salvation, and between of such a kind; between natural knowledge considered in itself and abstractly, and between the same as it is in individual corrupt men, or considered subjectively. 3. He distinguished between innate or congenital considered potentially, and as root, seed, and principle; and between actual perceiving, assenting, concluding, reasoning by the act itself. Concerning the latter he denies, and rightly conformably to those things which we determine on p. 141; concerning the former not likewise.

Page 115, line 31-32. Add the testimony of Arnobius, book 3, Against the Gentiles: however much you call us impious, irreligious or Atheists.

Page 116, line 2 from the end. And Jacobus Billius abbot of Prunay, book of the sacred anthology, epigram 106, pp. 255-258. And Besold in the political synopsis, in the prerequisites § 59.

Page 140, line 10. Vorstius in the apologetic Exegesis, p. 5, Timpler his colleague philosopher, book 4, Metaphysics, chapter 2, question 3. And the Physical Empsychology, book 3, chapter 3, problem 8. And Philosophical Exercises, section 1, question 20, and section 5, questions 50, 51, 54 seem to think nearly the same thing. Whether they said this by simple error and inadvertence; or truly followed Aristotle with and under that distinction which we employ on p. 141 they allow their mind to be explained; or finally they did this with a certain zeal and scope, here is not to be disquired. Concerning Julius Caesar Scaliger, Exercitation 207, section 18, we can suspect nothing else, than that he purely philosophically disquiring here adhered to the footsteps of his teacher Aristotle.

Page 144, line 30. And Martin Fotherby in Atheomastix, book 1, chapter 3. Ibid., line 35. Add to the cited commentators of common places the writers, Daneau, part 1, book 1, chapter 1, Musculus, place 1, p. 2, 8th edition.

Page 153, line 5. To this is similar the example of Cosimo the Italian a man of letters, but a Magician, who died in Armorica in the year 1615. Concerning whom the supplement of de Thou and the Compendium of Universal history, p. 716, of Johannes Laetus: Plainly, he says, he departed from this life an Atheist. When about to die he wanted to bear neither the Parish Priest, nor the Capuchins. advised to dread the last judgment, he laughed abundantly, he says foolishly enough there are no Devils, except our enemies, who vex us in this World, nor is there any other God, besides kings and Princes, who alone can help us and do good to us.

Page 168, line 6 from the end. Add the Mirror of the Popes of Szegedin. And the example of Paul III, concerning whom in the manuscript common places (title Epicureanism, folio 284) the very erudite and most pious Theologian Werner Helmichius of Utrecht, refers from the mouth of the once most celebrated Physician of Delft Forestus, who affirmed that this history was known

and believed by all in Italy (when he was occupied there); That namely when a Franciscan theologian was consoling this Pope near to death, and was exhorting that he think concerning the future life, into which he was soon to enter; he himself responded, Is there any? To whom when the Franciscan was modestly replying, Your Holiness knows well, You know well; and when he was proceeding to speak; the Pontiff with indignation and with aversion responded: Do not break my head: I will see it presently.

Page 170, line 5. add, Gregory of Nyssa, On Providence, chapter 1. Ibid., line 20. Add the Dialogues of Laurent Pollot against the plurality of religions, and Atheism.

Page 173, line 16. Add to the cited theologians especially Martin Fotherby in Atheomastix, book 1, chapter 4. And compare the authors noted below, p. 173.

Page 180, line 2. The theologian Melanchthon of the mildest disposition, part 1, Counsels, p. 300, thus judges: It is a moral and natural commandment to prohibit and punish idolatry and blasphemies, because they are prohibited in the first and second precept, which are moral, just as all nations punished perjuries. And without doubt the Magistrates ought to punish the profane or mad, who delight in Epicurean speeches concerning God and providence. Daniel 3, there is an illustrious example of the Ethnic King Nebuchadnezzar, who proposes an edict: lest anyone speak blasphemy against the God of Israel: Therefore the law concerning blasphemers to be killed, Leviticus 24, pertains to the second precept. The same, part 2, Counsels, p. 364: The Magistrate is the guardian of the law namely of each table of the Decalogue in external discipline: that is, the Magistrate ought to take care, that the people be rightly taught concerning God, and that Epicurean speeches, blasphemy, and perjuries be prohibited and punished, as it is written, Leviticus 24: He who will have spoken blasphemy against the name of the Lord, let him die by death. And p. 266: Let the degrees also in such offenses be considered. Let not the Magistrate be slow in atrocious blasphemies, but let him burn with just Zeal, as it is written: I have hated the unjust, but let legitimate judgments precede. But let it be less, if the offenses are less atrocious: but nevertheless let the contagions of errors be prohibited. I refer here only historically, what Melanchthon judged. Elsewhere I disclosed my opinion, about to act on this more fully when occasion was given, The English Theologians (among whom Robert Hull in the commentary on 2 Peter 3, pp. 314-315) all, if I am not deceived, expressed this opinion of Melanchthon now thencefrom the first reformation.

Page 184, line 13. But here the Jurists Criminalists, of the Lutheran and reformed religion are to be consulted. Also the political writers of the same profession; among whom Althusius, Politics, chapter 28, § 52, 55, 57, 71.

Page 187, line 5. after, they refute: add, This is proved especially by the examples of all theologians, who ever ex professo and by prescribed titles, or doing something else, fought against Atheisms and Atheists either in general or by name, by public books.

Page 190, last line. The Contention of the English Church, part 3, which contains the apologies of the Martyrs, pp. 294 and 386b, through the opinion concerning the Regal primacy in England

William Reynolds against Whitaker, chapter 4, endeavors to prove that the easiest way by far to atheism, Epicureanism, Turkism, Paganism lies open into any kingdom the vulgate edition of the Bibles having been repudiated to turn to the Hebrew and Greek edition, and the other various translations, which the Protestants published,

Page 192, line 3. See and compare our disputation below, On the Method of responding to calumnies concerning God the author etc. Ibid., line 5. What I say concerning Dorsche is an error: into which the bookseller led me, who was selling the treatise of the Theologian of Strasbourg Dorsche On the Name Jehovah in 4 joined together with this treatise, On the Moral Theology of the Jesuits etc., as of the same author and printer, when the name of neither is prenoted there, only the number of the year 1645. But the paper and characters of each booklet also by similarity seem to persuade that it was printed or reprinted in the same place. By whosesoever counsel, and with whatever printer whether there, or elsewhere in Germany it was reprinted; I gather now when I read it all, especially the appendix of Quires C and D, that it was written by the Pontificals, and indeed by the Parisian Sorbonnists the sworn and perpetual adversaries of the Jesuits. I do not want nevertheless here to conceal that the moral theology of the Jesuit Etienne Bauny of Mouzon, (which is frequently cited there and in the French treatise Sorbonne against the Jesuits in the year 1643) was prohibited at Rome in the year 1640, October 26, together with certain other books of others by the most holy congregation of the Index of prohibited books. Whose decree was afterward published or reprinted at Cologne in open folio.

Page 198, line 29. Most recently (namely in the month of September 1647) while I read certain things in the theological corollaries and questions of Francis Albertini, which are deduced from philosophical principles, I fell upon these words of his which volume 1, corollary 1, from the first principle of philosophy, question 24, p. 87: Therefore the first opinion is of Pomponazzi in 1, 2, which he published on the immortality of the soul against Suessionensis, although he does not say by express words that the immortality of the soul is against the light of nature; yet he endeavors by reasons to show, that the immortality of the soul is against the light of nature: yet having been interrogated he said the opposite, as is clear from the epistle, which is printed in the name of Pomponazzi himself against Javelli, in which he asks by prayers to be emended and corrected, if anything involuntarily slipped from his mouth, and he approves the Responses of Javelli himself to his arguments.

Page 208, line 14. Concerning Postel after he began to become famous by writings, it was variously judged. The Pontificals, in whose communion he lived, seemed to make something, indeed also much of him on account of the Oriental languages and peregrinations, as I think. Whether also on account of vertiginous theology, I doubt. Our authors reproach him as a fanatical and profane man; as Beza in the notes on John 21:22, where he says that he was still tolerated at Paris by the Sorbonnists after so many blasphemies. The author of Turco-Papismus (Matthew Sutcliffe), book 1, p. 187, calls him a most impure and plainly atheistic man. Joseph Scaliger in the epistles, epistle 362, p. 706, relates that he was thrown into prison somewhere, when he had begun to use his companionship, (at Paris, as I conjecture). And in the same place he adds, that he was a man, whom madness could vindicate from the suspicion of all malice.

And those who judge otherwise concerning him, are far deceived. Certainly the stolid titles of his books, a catalog of which someone recently gave with the minor work whose title is *Key of the Hidden Things from the Constitution of the World, etc. By Guillaume Postel the Transcriber from Divine Decrees, etc. Amsterdam 1646.*

Moreover, because he boasted that he was the soul of Adam; and that he called that impostor, who claimed to be John the Evangelist and was later burned at Toulouse, his brother; according to Beza commenting on John 21, in the cited passage. Page 216, line 29. Regarding the multitude of atheists in Europe & the Papal state, the testimony of Corn-à Lapide in Zachar.13.v.8 is well-known. Almost only Europe is Christian. Now in Europe, almost half are heretics, politicians, Atheists. To which can also be referred the words of Caramuel Lobkowits in his rational & real philosophy, preface to the reader: Note, he says, that Europe today labors under two plagues of Atheists, namely physical & moral. Physical atheism denies the cause of causes: Ethics the end of ends. Compare also the prologue of Martin Delrio to his Magical Disquisitions at the end, where he speaks of growing atheism.

Page 218, line 5. Besides Italian conversation (which has been noted elsewhere as a cause of this evil) & Italian emissaries, such as Vaninus, Cosmus, also Nannes, Grossius, Oresius Florentinus, according to the author of the abdication of Henry III, page 191. And besides the Roman curia which by a certain peculiar genius of its own is the common mother of impiety, there now occurs a third cause of this transmission from Italy into France, namely the writing of bad Italian books, & their translation into the French language. Which cause of impiety transmitted & inflicted on the French is most seriously explained by Gabr. Putherbejus in Theotimus, concerning bad books &c. book 1. And he imputes a great part of this to the Bishops & Clerics in France & finally on p.79 concludes: And it would be well advised for us, if Italy had kept its wares, perfumes, ointments, if it had kept its books to itself, & had them only for itself. Ibid. also p.77.78 he seriously complains of the Ethnicism of writers, especially poets with which Italy, & even Rome itself & thence France was filled.

line 23. Add the curious doctrine of Francis Garasse the Jesuit, by which the libertines & Atheists are rendered ridiculous. The same one's theological summa against the Atheists The same one's apology of the summa. To these the French treatises of Serres, & Joh. Arnoux The Jesuit on the Immortality of souls. The French dialogues of Pollet, & the French treatise of Alex. Capellus against the Atheists we have already cited.

Ibid.

Page 219, penultimate line from the end. Joseph Scaliger who was born & educated in France, had lived there for so many years, testifies about it thus, in a letter to Joh. Dousa, which is the first in the volume of letters, p.45. But regarding the Atheists, of whom that age was most fertile &c.

Regarding the same Atheists of France, Corn. à Lapide in his commentary on 2 Peter 2:18, p.284 says: Hence Epicureanism has so prevailed, and daily more prevails (N.B.), that Calvin

himself marvels that in France alone there are so many swarms of Doctors, who diligently labor to sow it, and an infinite multitude of disciples.

Page 221, line 13. But whatever the authors so far cited complain of regarding atheisms & atheists in France, let us not believe they are so foolish, as to want this to be understood, concerning direct atheists, & those openly denying and defending, that there is no God. By no means. For such are very few, & perhaps besides one or another e.g. Vaninus, Cosmus &c. none such are known. For if they existed, France would have long ago been freed from those monsters by being burned alive (as the example of Vaninus & Godfrey of the Valley has taught). Whence it is again clear that by the Theologian Antagonists of the Atheists is either only, or at least for the most part understood indirect atheism, or that which is participatory, or practical.

Ibid. line 23. Add Possevinus in The Atheisms of heretics chap. 11 where he affirms, that atheism flourishes most among almost all heretics, & reigns most powerfully in England.

Ibid. line 30. To the English treatises indicated on p.173, add here especially the commentary of Robert Hull on 2 Peter 3 published under this title in the year 1611: Saint Peters prophesie of these last daies, discouvering the iniquitie of the time, and Atheisme of the age &c. And instead of many there could be the writing & publishing of Atheomastix in the common tongue by Martin Fotherby Bishop of Salisbury in the year 1622, which however that most erudite man, prevented by sickness & death, could not complete. See the preface to the reader B.2, B.3, B.4 where among other things he warns on p. B.3 that the Atheism of this time is founded not so much on ignorance as on the opinion of knowledge.

Ibid. line 2. He concludes: The name of Christian cannot render a man immune from Atheism nor can the recitation of the articles of faith make one truly faithful. Compare the testimonies of Perkins, Topsell, Kellett, Carleton cited above p.118, 119.

Page 222, line 3 from the end. As for Machiavellian atheism, that German candor is now everywhere defiled by it, can easily be gathered from the histories of deeds done, & from political writings published from the beginning of the Bohemian & German war up to this day. To this I think pertains the apothegm commonly used by that most famous philologist J. Gruter, librarian of Heidelberg: Each one plucks Machiavelli, & each one expresses (practices) him by his praxis: as reported by Julius Wilhelm Zinkgref, in his German Apothegms part 1, p.262. As for practical Atheists; namely slaves of avarice or the belly, pigs from the herd of Epicurus, that there are many such in Germany & elsewhere, especially also in our Belgium, is not at all to be doubted: so that befits them that saying of Jerome: In my country the belly is God and more Holy is he, who is richer.

Page 223, line 5. The same Junius suggests rampant atheisms, by the title, preface, & refutation of arguments, against the history of creation; which he subjoined to his analysis of the 3rd chapter of Genesis.

Ibid. line 28. The Remonstrants in the booklet, titled The Right Remonstrant Theology, complain of the frequency of atheists in Belgium. The anonymous author of the accurate Examination against my first disputation held at Utrecht, says that men everywhere lapse into atheism. In what sense & scope they poured out those complaints there, we do not now inquire. The Belgian interpreter (whoever he is) of the Trismegistus Mercury published in the year 1643, in the postscripts to the reader p.145 says that he elaborated that translation, to convince those men (namely in Belgium) who dare to deny angels, devils, immortal souls, nay God himself.

Page 226, line 17, after those words: The writings of the Sorbonnists. Add, Steph. Paschasius in Recherches book 3, chap. 42, 43, 44. It is no wonder therefore that in the Papal kingdom atheism wanders so far and wide, when clerics & theologians, especially the Jesuits show themselves as predecessors. Concerning the Popes, Bishops, Cardinals, and other governing clerics it has been said above: & for proving this matter the mere inspection of the history of the times suffices. You have the sum in the Mystery of Iniquity of Plessis & in the history of Sleidan under Charles V, then in the history of Thuanus, with the supplement.

Concerning preachers & lecturers of theology and other minor clerics, Henry Stephens exhibits much in his preparatory treatise to the apology of Herodotus. Concerning preachers, who are accustomed to declaim so much against Machiavelli by living voice & writings, it has been truly said by Steph. Paschasius, in Recherches de France book 6, chap. 38: "But I am compelled to trumpet it in this calamity into which we are seen plunged. Because if you hear the Preachers of today in their pulpits they have no other declarations in their mouths than those which they make against Machiavelli: & nevertheless there is not one of them who is not truly Machiavellian, we call it Machiavelizing when a Preacher is in the pay of a great Lord to induce the people to follow him."

Briefly if anyone wishes to see Machiavelli's, or the more subtle than pseudo policy deduced into practice by the Papal Clergy, let him but read the History of the Council of Trent, published in Latin and other common languages. The reading of which will effect, that they can more easily do without the reading of Tacitus, & similar writers, if they cannot obtain it on account of other occupations.

Concerning Perron who was afterwards promoted to the Episcopate & Cardinalate, I have related in The Desperate Cause of the Papacy, how he offered himself in the court of Henry III to prove, That there is no God; & on that account was expelled from the court.

Concerning the atheistic apothegms of Julius II, Leo X, Bembo, and other Pontiffs, Cardinals & prelates, concerning the quasi-Ethnicism of Bishop Jovius &c. something has been indicated in part by others & by us elsewhere. The authors, who have written the lives of the Pontiffs, are to be consulted; whom we enumerate in our library.

Ibid. line 20. Let this Appendix to the disputation on atheism be written in the month of September 1647. To the voices of Atheists & atheisms, and their synonyms, you may hear some moved today by unjust or unskilled indignation, to the point that scarcely would it be permitted

by them to warn ruder or more imprudent men against such perilous & fanatical vertigos, to the glory of God & the salvation of souls. It has therefore seemed good to subjoin this appendix for abundant caution, as a more ample apology of our disputation (especially p. 133-136 & p.154 & p.168, p.181, p.183 & p.189-208 & p.216-226).

But of those, who do not bear that any of mortals, at least one confessing some deity, be urged by those fierce voices of atheisms there are distinct grades. For some here stumble through idiot ignorance & popular error. Others are half-learned, but in the writings both of natural & supernatural Theology altogether strangers, nay not even imbued with the slightest cognition of philosophical & theological terms & distinctions. Others indeed learned, but here contradict from prejudice or sickness of mind, because namely they so will, or it so falls out to them in some particular cause. Others perhaps, because they think themselves touched & their cause acted (for they know themselves best), bear most grievously all use of those voices. Others by no means evil, because they see that atheisms are often imputed too rashly to those, whose genuine faith & piety plainly persuades the contrary, or of whom at least from the rule of charity they could hope better, hence it happens that they disdain any usurpations of these voices whatsoever. We meet all those by the proposition of one thesis thus. The thesis is this: It is not illicit (much less that it be a crime to be punished politically & gravely) urgently to charge men not denying deity or deity, nay openly professing God, moreover exercising some form of public religion in Ethnicism, or Mohammedanism, or Judaism, or even in Christianism, namely in the Papacy, the dangers & consequences of atheism being shown, and so to impute to them atheisms (indirect & participatory) of their false doctrine; that they may be so much the better convicted of the falsity of their doctrine, or at least other ruder & more incautious ones may be forewarned.

I. Because, scripture does this which calls all Gentiles impious, Atheists &c Ephes. 2:12 coll. with 1 Thess 4:5. The same presses some in the midst of Christianism with the consequences of atheism. 1 Cor 15:32, 33, 34. Phil 3:19. 2 Pet 3:17 coll. with Ps 14:1, 94:7,8. Who however knew some God, & exercised even some Christian worship of deity.

II. Because, this proves the example & consensus of the fathers, who not only everywhere called the Gentiles atheists, Epicureans, impious, as has been said p.179 & namely their emperor Julian, Ibid.; But also heretics professing the Christian name, as the Gnostics, in Irenæus book 2, chap. 58. And the Marcionites, Valentinians, Basilidians, Saturnians and other heretics in Justin Martyr in his dialogue with Trypho p.45 of the Paris edition in the year 1551 & fol. 37b of the Latin edition Paris in the year 1565 in 8vo & p.77 vol. 2 of the folio Latin edition of Lange; where he says that those named by the name of Christians teach unholy & wicked & unjust things; and there he expressly on that account calls them & says they are believed by Christians to be ἀσεβεῖς, ἄνομες, ἀδίκες [atheists, lawless ones, unjust ones]. Behold here the common faith & profession of ancient Christianism, concerning Christian men, but heterodox or heretical, on account of absurd, strange, & blasphemous assertions or opinions… *"that they merely profess the name of Jesus, but in no way worship Him, although they call themselves Christians: just as the pagans ascribe the name of God to man-made statues, which they then profane with impious and unlawful rites...*"

III. Because, the example of the reformed theologians and other learned men leads the way here, who everywhere charge 1. the Papists, especially the Popes, the Roman curia, the consistory, the Bishops, the Jesuits &c. that their heresies, mode of disputing, barbarous persecution of truth & piety, impious deeds &c. either savor of atheism, Lucianism, Skepticism, Libertinism, blasphemy, or lead to them. See what we have everywhere noted throughout this whole disputation, especially p.192, 193, 133. To which add especially the author of Turco-Papismus book 2, where he everywhere throws back upon the Papists what they object to us. And Jos. Scaliger, who in his refutation of the fable of the Burdones [mules] sometimes strikes Gasp. Scioppius and his other detractors with the consequence of atheism.

II. The Socinians, and their adherents or kinsmen concerning whom p.194, 189. Add Beza in his epistles, epist. 16, p.111. Where he says, that no one in the church has thought, that Arianism is anything other than Atheism. To the Socinians I join Vorstius, concerning whom p.120. Whom especially the distinguished philosopher & Physician Eglisemmius accused of Atheism in his Critique of Vorstius' response p.4, 6, 15 and in his Hypocrisy p.15, 41.

III. The Libertines, Enthusiasts, Skeptics. Concerning whom above p.118, 222. Here add Beza's tract on punishing heretics, where he labels his adversaries with the title of new Academics. And Joh. Jacob Grynæus' theological disputations part 1, where he proves the certainty of doctrine against the Academics & Pyrrhonians. And Luca Osiander's tract against Franc. Puccius published in the year 1593 at Tübingen with the approbation of the theological faculty there & the ecclesiastical consistory of Stuttgart: in whose title it is said, that Puccius by his Satanic writing endeavored to introduce a confusion of all religions, & the consequent Epicureanism. And on p.196 he exhorts pious Magistrates, to seek out, suppress, abolish Puccius' blasphemous Booklet, that is, the compendium of the Turkish Alcoran, & the foundation of Epicureanism.

IV. Neutrals, & evil Syncretists, Concerning whom Wigand's book on the Neutrals. And there is a testimony of Melanchthon on them in his commentary on Romans ch. 14, p.411 of the edition Strasbourg in the year 1540 in 8vo: "But there arises a certain new kind of wise men, who, though they are divine, wish no controversies at all to be moved concerning religion, They praise peace, & execrate all, who in any way bear discords, these they think are to be removed as pests & plagues of the human race. This is one philosophy, of Pontiffs, Cardinals, Kings, Canons & very many, who wish to be esteemed political men, who of course do not wish their leisure to be disturbed."

V. Antinomians, and other fanatics emerging today in England some writings published in the idiom of the nation charge with impiety & atheism. From which Honorius Reggius of Kemnath excerpted his own, & published them in Latin. His words on p.50-51 I transcribe only these: "Paget in the dedicatory Epistle of his Heresiography [says]: 'Lo, the Hierarchy being removed, suddenly a huge number of heretics, like locusts, overwhelmed the Anglican Churches, Familists, Anabaptists, Donatists, Antinomians, Independents, Arminians, Sabbatarians, Anti-Sabbatarians, Traskites, Millenarians, Hetheringtonians, Socinians, Arians, Atheists.'

Concerning the Atheists he says thus: 'Their number is great. A certain one mocked the incarnation of J.C. before the Provincial judge. His father was burned at Toulouse in France, but with us the son escaped unpunished. They preach, strike, & exercise their heretical opinions openly.'" Before them Melanchthon had aspersed the same. part 2 of his Counsels p.357-358, where he ascribes to the Antinomians & indeed to public professors of theology, rages, sycophancy, scurrilous sophistry, impostures; & says their sermons are of Cynics rather than of Christians, finally on p.361 he thus concludes: "It is therefore manifest insanity, & the rage of Cyclops, & Cynics, to say, that the obedience, which the divine laws command, is not necessary. And those who defend such opinions contumelious against God & pernicious to morals, were to be coerced by the severity of magistrates. What is the difference between beasts & men with the knowledge of God, & the laws removed?"

VI. Pelagianizers whom in the disputation against predestination & the grace of God, Calvin calls impious & Skeptics in his theological tracts p.292, l.724.

VII. Philosophers, Physicians, philologists &c. Concerning whom see p.123, 131, 200. Add Sennert in his tract on the consensus & dissension of Chymists & Galenists. And Libavius in his refutation of the confession & report of the Rosicrucian Fraternity & in his singulars part 1 where he charges the Hermetic or Paracelsian philosophers & Physicians with impiety, foolishness, faction.

Nor is Meric Casaubon to be passed over, who in his Piety attributes ἀθεια [atheism] to Gasp. Scioppius and calls him an Atheist. There can also be compared the consequences, which some of the reformed use in the examination of the new method of proving the Existence of God; which Renatus des Cartes, a Papist so far as religious profession goes, & indeed a disciple and esteemer of the Jesuits, as he himself boasts, first, as he thinks, exhibited to the world.

Here is the English translation of the provided Latin text:

The authors cited in point 5 I will soon adduce.

IX. Pseudo-politicians, or bad Politicians; concerning whom see p.117. There could be added otherwise true Politicians & legitimate Princes and Magistrates, who do not cease to persecute the reformed religion & church with sword & flame professionally: if indeed we wish to argue at least to the man from that axiom which Didacus Celada has in his commentary on Judith ch. 7 v. 18 where §24 has this title: He who persecutes the pious & just, is nearly sacrilegious, & suspect of atheism. But let us not wish to employ these machines: when we consider the example of Paul persecuting the church.

X. Vicious men, although Christians by profession, such as are slaves of avarice, ambition, luxury. Concerning whom p.119, 124.

XI. Mahometans, Jews, Pagans, those alien to the faith. p.122. Thus the author of Turco-papism book 1 ch. 8 calls Mahumed plainly impious & wicked.

XII. Nay orthodox theologians sometimes burden each other, on account of dissensions about ecclesiastical polity & external rites. Which I here only report historically, nor put forth judgment: because it is not of this place. See p. 195. And add the title of a certain booklet of an English theologian, The Profane Puritan &c. which we refute in the disputation on Superstition. In turn the Anti-hierarchicals in England impute to the Episcopal hierarchy the occasion & origin of atheism. Concerning which see the writing recently published titled Honorius Reggius of Kemnath, in the penultimate page of the prolegomena. "The recollection of that which the venerable Beza not without the spirit of prophecy once wrote back to Knox, the reformer of the Scottish church, then came to the minds of many, 'As the Bishops begat the papacy: so it is now seen almost with the eyes themselves that Pseudo-bishops, the relics of the Papacy, will introduce Epicureanism into the lands.' Of which sure prophecy the Scottish Church was not far from almost experiencing the event, unless God &c." Ibid. last page. "And it seemed good to premise these things that it might be the more manifest that Britain could not bear Bishops any longer, unless it wished to lapse into Papism & Atheism. Let them go now, & boast of their antiquity & necessity!" The Jesuit Fitz Simon has collected more in his Ministro-machia Britannica.

Lutherans frequently enough impute atheisms to the reformed on account of some dogmas, in which they dissent from them. Which we need not laboriously prove: Andrew Jurgiewicius canon of Vilnius has collected those Flosculi from the books of the Lutherans in his War of the Fifth Gospel p.110. What? that Conrad Schlüsselburg book 1 of Calvinist Theology, articles 29, 30, on account of the eucharist not being accustomed to be brought to the sick or dying among the Reformed, & on account of the adoration of Christ in the supper not being practiced, calls the Calvinists atheists. From which at least it is evident, that no other Atheism, Skepticism, Libertinism &c. unless indirect, or participatory, or at least the dangers & occasions of one or the other were understood by them. And without doubt they would so interpret themselves. Nor do I remember the Lutherans ever accused or condemned by the reformed, where they hold power, of the political & most gravely vindicated crime, induced by the consequences & affirmation of their predecessors, that they should believe these things about the Calvinists, & publicly profess them.

IV. Because, the Papists themselves ordinarily rub their adversaries with this salt: whether by right or wrong, I will not here dispute. The historical relation suffices to admonish men of the Papal profession whether clerics or laity, lest they bear it so grievously, if indeed they are met by the reformed with a similar style, or if you prefer arguments & consequences reducing to the absurd; & that they themselves may see, what & with what subdistinctions must be answered to the accustomed complaints, concerning blasphemies & atheisms imputed to them by the reformed: which complaints they renewed & seriously wished to purge themselves of those horrid things in the recent colloquy of Thorn in the year 1645 sess. 11, 13 September. But the Papists use these weapons 1. Against the reformed & Lutherans. See p.190, 191, 122, 123. Add Barthol. Fay counselor in the Parisian senate, in his Energumenicus p.128. "To many," he

says, "wavering in faith &c." And Gifford and Reginald in their Calvino-Turcism book 1 & in the preface & ch. 1, 2 where namely he curses the Dutch, & the other federated Belgians, as if they approved that blasphemy concerning the three Impostors. Spondanus in his tract on Cemeteries p.7 does the same confidently enough. Renatus des Cartes although he is not a theologian, but a mathematician or philosopher, here perhaps would deserve a place among the Pontifical witnesses & disciples & esteemers of the Jesuits, because he not obscurely imputes atheism to me in a booklet published under the form of a letter to me: but because, the cause of Papist doctrine nay & his own philosophical doctrine being perfunctorily touched, he lapses to personal defamations, & on this account his infamous libels have been proscribed in this our city, I do not wish to stir up this hornet's nest here.

II. Against the Libertines, Socinians, Anabaptists, Neutralists, and others constituted outside the communion of the Roman church. But there is no need to prove this with more, since all the books written against those adversaries, are everywhere besprinkled with those titles. Possevinus in his sacred apparatus, under the entry Justus Lipsius, calls the Dialogist writer (Theod. Coornhert), who had written against some chapter of the Politics of Lipsius, an Atheist.

III. Against, subjects of their own church, who in some political cause do not do & speak all things at the nod of the priests: or who concede external or political tolerance of the reformed religion: or who do not persecute the reformed at the pleasure & nod of the Roman see: or who concede some reason of union between the subjects of the reformed, & Roman church; or who are in fact atheists, & declare themselves such by their life, whatever they may externally simulate. These they commonly assail with the name of politicians, atheism & libertinism, especially Princes & Magistrates. And the Jesuits here snatch the palm from all other Clerics & theologians in the Papacy. See what we note p.115, 116 & p.216 & in the paralipomena to that page. But if they so meet their own co-religionists & fellow church members, certainly those fathers or their disciples ought to be less indignant, if any reformed person opposes the dangers & consequences of atheism & skepticism to the noxious or dangerous commentaries of someone. Because (to say nothing of retaliation) there are just causes here both common on the part of the whole Papacy, which we note p.192, 193, and special on the part of the Jesuits, which we indicate p.116, 226, 192 & will someday deduce more fully. But if there accede special causes, of certain perilous theologoumena, or philosophoumena; which the Jesuits themselves & the whole papacy would commonly condemn, at least would not acknowledge as their own, in any case those consequences are not inopportunely urged, concerning the occasion of Skepticism, Libertinism, atheism being supplied, and concerning the leading to it (whatever the intention of the author may be) through labyrinthine, dangerous disputations, through new & absurd hypotheses, by which the authority of scripture is shaken, the firmaments customarily adduced for the truth of religion are weakened, doubtful, perplexing, vertiginous, absurd concepts about God (concerning whom it is dangerous even to speak true things) & divine matters are suggested to unskilled, incautious men, or those at the crossroads, and thus some are turned away from the simplicity of the received & common faith.

IV. Against philosophers, Jurists, political writers, Theologians. See p.117. If anyone reads the recent disputations of the Parisians against the Meditations of first philosophy of Renatus des

Cartes: especially the peculiar writing of Gassendi in 4to, he will perhaps wonder why they use those consequences, & why they wished tacitly to warn him, that in the future the door, nay even a crack is to be more accurately & otherwise shut to Skepticism. Julius Caesar Scaliger who as he was most hostile to Atheism & Atheists (witness his most worthy son of so great a father epist. 1 which is to Joh. Dousa) so he fairly sharply sometimes urges Cardanus. To whom Cardanus in turn on account of perilous & absurd arguments, (in his own judgment) imputes Impiety. p.1129 of his apology, which is added to the last edition of the work of Subtleties in 8vo at Basel.

V. Against Kings, Princes, Nobles. See p.116, 117. Add the author of the book on the just abdication of Henry III, where he reports that the King when the rigor of life was being discussed, said wondering & like one doubting: "But can it be, that there is one God." And Peter Matthew who in his history at the year 1602 inquires into the Atheism of Marshal Biron, & discloses it to sheets that will live publicly. The same Biron's atheistic apothegm, Camden reports (but a reformed historian) in his Annals of England under Elizabeth part 4 p.805. "Although," he says, "Biron & other profane men mocked this piety (of the earl of Essex in death) as more worthy of a ministrel than a warlike man, as if the dread of hell were not Christian fortitude." What other historians, Politicians, theologians, and other Pontifical writers, have written about the Emperor Frederick, About Henry VIII king of England, about queen Elizabeth, about the Kings of France, Spain, Sweden, Bohemia, about the Venetian Senate, about the Prince of Transylvania Gabriel Bethlem, about the Prince of Orange William, about the Illustrious federated Orders of Belgium, we have noted above in part & everywhere. And lest the Jesuits, or those who have come forth from their discipline, here seek themselves without, we suggest to the reader curious of these things, let him only thoroughly examine the Library of Philip Alegambe, & among other things let him inquire in it what politico-theological things, either in free treatises, or strictly to & against Machiavelli have been published by the Jesuits. Especially in the politico-pragmatic, or politico-special treatises, which they have published very many & for the most part with their own names suppressed, not rarely also with fictitious names of others. See the catalog & key of them in Alegambe p.447-453.

(In the following section when it says “Voetius” it is actually referring to Vedel)

VI. Because any other Antagonists of the reformed whatsoever, namely the Socinians, Anabaptists, Remonstrants, and others sometimes either in express words or by consequence impute atheism, impiety, blasphemy to our harmless doctrine. Concerning the Socinians, Anabaptists, and others I will not now prove. I only indicate the Remonstrants, whose calumnies we note p.195, impute not only to the reformed on account of the doctrine of providence, & divine predestination & perseverance, but also to universal Christianism on account of the anathematized Socinian heresies & perhaps worse than those and the public professions of them not tolerated, that they open a most open and most ample gate to crass atheism. And that hence it happens, that the number of atheists or hypocrites, or the most stupid is almost innumerable in all places where force rules, & the liberty of consciences (they mean of exercise & assemblies) lies oppressed. Thus they in their Vindications or Rapsodia of Voetius ch. 10 p.187 where see: & compare especially p.92, 93. See also our refutation of the booklet of Daniel

Tilenus, which we have written in the vernacular language. Therefore let the Socinians, Remonstrants and their favorers, likewise hybrids, hybrid-dogmatists, Skeptics, Lucianics, Neutrals in religion, with the initiates of Machiavelli & the Epicureans, who everywhere wish to be a nail in the ulcer, dwell with themselves, and not make such great tragedies, if perchance it happens that atheism or Skepticism, be named by the reformed, while they strive to reduce their most absurd adversaries to the absurd, that they may be converted to the truth, or at least others may not be turned away from it.

V. Because, the Academies, & schools, of the reformed church in Belgium wished to teach by their example that in certain cases with due mode & end, such hard wedges could be applied. For although they do not always use the express voices of atheism, Skepticism, Epicureanism &c., yet when they employ such reasons, & use such synonymous voices, from which readers could elicit the dangers or consequences of Atheism, Skepticism, Libertinism. I will only relate historically some things, which my memory now suggests to me: not that by that very thing I make each of the sayings & writings of each one up to the smallest points my own or am bound to approve & furnish them as my own: For some things occur, which as to the matter or particular consequence I expressly disapprove. Let the first example be in the cause of Puccius. See the treatise of Fr. Junius against Puccius. A second & famous example in the cause of Conrad Vorstius. See p.120 & his Antagonists Sibrandus Lubbertus, Matthaeus Sladus, the Leovardians Smoutius, Donteclokius & the distinguished philosopher Eglisemmius. A third example given in the cause of the Remonstrants, as it now is after the publication of the apology. Here to be seen especially are Voetius' secrets of Arminianism, the first part of which was approved by the theological faculty of Leiden. A fourth example given in the controversy between Barlaeus professor in the Gymnasium of Amsterdam & between Voetius Theologian of Deventer, formerly of Franeker. See Voetius' Desynagogue & the anonymous (Martin Schoock then professor of Utrecht, afterwards of Deventer, now of Groningen) Vorstius redivivus written for Voetius, but which Voetius approved and took care to have published. A fifth example recently given in the Examination of the new Method of proving God. Here to be seen is the disputation of Maccovius held at Franeker: Revius' Suarez repurgatus disp. 29, 30 whose opinion as to the impugnation of the argument from the idea Maresius Theologian of Groningen approves in disp. 7 on the Belgic Confession, thesis 1: Stuart's disputation, the primary philosopher in the Academy of Leiden, opposed to the same new method: D. Trigland's corollary subjoined to his disp. on the certainty of faith, which imputes blasphemy to that method: If moreover anyone runs through the books & disputations, of Fr. Junius, Gomarus, Rivetus, Polyander, Maccovius, Altingius, Voetius, & other Belgian professors, he will see that they do not entirely abstain from the terms of blasphemy, impiety, skepticism, atheism, Libertinism, Epicureanism &c., when they oppose the Papists, & other adversaries whether theologians or philosophers; nor yet to have been condemned by any reformed theologian, much less by ecclesiastical, or political, or Academic judgment of the infamous crime of injuries & calumny, and consequently to any of their adversaries whether of the Jesuit or another order or grade of Papist, or Remonstrant, whether theologian or philosopher, whether noble or ignoble the cause so far prejudged, namely provided that those defendants were convicted in the question of the denial of the fact. Nothing such especially has been done in the Academy & church of Groningen, when its professors wished to show zeal above other Belgians against some of their

adversaries both heterodox & orthodox or allies of the same confession by the precipices of impiety, atheism, skepticism, blasphemy being objected. That I may now say nothing of the writings of Ubbo Emmius rector of the school of Groningen, afterwards Professor of histories in the Academy against David Joris, & Kircherus Physician of Emden, by which even some of the primary men from the nobles & Politicals in Belgium are not lightly touched; Altingus alone in his problematics would suffice to prove this matter. For there probl. 2 p.17 about to eliminate all Metaphysics, & its use, he fights among other things with this argument (which is the third in order): It disputes all things in both parts, & scarcely has anything certain. Hence Skeptical theology is born, which at last ends in Atheism. By which dart not only the Papists, but also all theologians, philosophers, & Academic professors both Lutheran & reformed are struck, namely as many as are called students, cultivators, writers, doctors of Metaphysics; notwithstanding, that all those profess to oppose skepticism & atheism, also & even especially when they metaphysicize. The zeal of that most excellent theologian for the cause of truth (according to his knowledge) I here leave in its place: what however must be judged concerning that judgment, & the firmness of the consequence, I candidly & freely indicate in our problematic disputation on theology. Next let Freitag succeed the professor of medicine there, who in his Refutation of the new Sennerto-Paracelsic sect instituted in public disputations in the Academy of Groningen disp. 9 p.398 & in the apology of the disputations prefixed p.9, 10, 11, 14 imputes to the opinions of Sennert & Sperling professors of Wittenberg, which he contends are repugnant to scripture, blasphemy, impiety, damned heresies, & calls all Theologians against them. Martin Schoock professor of philosophy there did something similar not only in the little works previously published, but also in certain philosophical disputations held there, among which excel, the three disputations on Skepticism. Maresius professor of theology there, when given occasion opposes his adversaries with the consequences of atheism or Libertinism, or impiety: as is evident from the books published by him, against the Papists, Grotius Papizing, the Recent anonymous author of the booklet titled To the law & the testimony &c. Thus e.g. in his French booklet against the Liegians titled The Candle &c. in the preface he objects to the Papists the formal note or character of atheism. He so assailed the same Papists, in his Theological College held at Groningen, & published there in the year 1645 locus 1 thesis 14. "Therefore they wrongly distinguish between theological conclusions, & those of faith, of which they call the former deduced, the latter, expressed; to no other end than that they may elevate the perpetual quarrels of their own in the gravest chapters of captured theology, & introduce a certain Skepticism among Christians." If these things could be so said against learned men & public theologians without injury to be severely vindicated in the political court, certainly the theologians of Belgium indicated above, mathematical men & atheologians could say, that the new Method of proving God, was thus opposed by them with equal, if not greater right. The same along with Alting then constituting the theological faculty in the year 1644 on the 15th Kalends of September condemned six questions & their philosophical assertions offered to the disputations of Ant. Deusing then professor of philosophy at Harderwijk, now professor of Medicine at Groningen by the Theologian then of Harderwijk now of Franeker Joh. Cloppenburg to the faculty: not only as dangerous derived from the fables of the Jews & the deliriums of Plato, Origen & others, which corrupt sound philosophy, especially natural, but also false profane, (N.B.) directly running into the creation & providence of God &c. In Cloppenburg's Res judicata &c. p.11. The same in his philosophical disputations in the Gymnasium of Silva-ducis,

where he then acted as professor, disp. on the World Resp. H. Ruschius in the year 1639 thesis 11. "And Christians who in some way defend that opinion of Aristotle, stating that it is not repugnant, that the world was from eternity, seem secretly to militate for Atheism." Perhaps more could be excerpted from the writings of this theologian: But these will have sufficed: to show the custom of the Belgian theologians. Wherefore it must be more wondered at by that excellent mathematician, but less exercised in metaphysics & theology both scholastic & scriptural Ren. des Cartes, who came from France & the discipline of the Jesuits into our Belgium, & passed very many years there, that it seemed so unusual, that a Theologian of Leiden recently objected blasphemy to his new philosophemes about God: to the point that he dared to seek from the most ample Lords curators of the famous Academy of Leiden, that that illustrious theologian be compelled to a palinode or any other reason of satisfaction. But the juridical, no less than theological calculus deceives that man far, although an excellent mathematician. If he knew the histories, & prudently compared like with like, past with present without doubt he would grasp with his hands, that little was performed by the illustrious Trigland, in comparison with those things which by him, & his ally Mersenne & the theological faculty of Paris, & his Jesuit preceptors have been performed against the reformed theologians not only but also against those philosophizing & affecting a new reason & method of philosophizing of the Pontifical, Reformed, Lutheran religion. I will not gather many things, nor will I go far away. Mersenne Parisian theologian, from the order of the minims of St. Paul, in his commentaries on Genesis, in the problems of Fr. George of Venice, in his French Book against the Atheists or Deists, & in his French book titled Theological, physical Questions &c. not only to the reformed theologians & philosophers, but also to the Papists, Franc. Charron, in his book against the Deists, Gaffarel, Archangelus Burgus, William Postel, George of Venice, & all followers of the Kabbalah (of whom very many in the Papacy) in his commentary on Genesis against ch. 3 v. 21 objects atheism, Magic &c. both in express words and as to the sense & by consequence & against them as atheists, calls upon the secular arm. With the same brush he there blackens Robert Fludd the English philosopher. To whom Gaffarel in his hidden mysteries of the divine Kabbalah p.72 replies: "For the Republic ought deservedly to animadvert upon him, since he teaches openly in writings not the kabbalah, of which he is ignorant, but diabolical magic itself." Compare what he pursues there p.73, 74, 75, 76. And this Mersenne, although he had previously strenuously disapproved this new philosophy of Renatus des Cartes, nay had even indicated to me by letters that a refutation of it was seriously undertaken or to be undertaken by him, afterwards however aflame with I know not what sudden wind wished as it were to admire it, or at least so pretended. I add the Sorbonne or faculty praising & publishing the same Mersenne in his theological, physical Questions &c. q.28 to have condemned the Amphitheatre of Henry Kunrath German philosopher & Physician of the Lutheran religion by a solemn decree on 1 March 1625; because it was filled, as they say, with impieties, errors, & because by a perpetual & sacrilegious profanation of the texts of scripture it abuses many mysteries of the catholic religion, & leads readers to prohibited & abominable arts. But if it is permitted to the Jesuits the venerable preceptors of Renatus, to Mersenne theologian from the order of the minims, to the Theologians of the Sorbonne of Paris not only to condemn men of their own religion (George of Venice, Gaffarel &c.) & those dwelling in those kingdoms or places, where their authority is recognized, but also the theologians, philosophers, Physicians of our religion philosophizing freely (as they pretend) in Germany or England & hitherto without censure of

their own churches & theologians, by public books & solemn decrees: in any case the reformed theologian in Batavia ought not to be so indignant, if by the right of the theological chair he opposes the noxious doubts of the Papists, & among them that peculiar method of doubting of Renatus des Cartes & vindicates the certitude of scripture, of the Christian, & reformed faith, lest the more incautious be led away from the right path of religion, or be implicated in perilous & labyrinthine concepts, especially since the books of the same are everywhere thumbed by the hands of students, & of others consorting in the reformed religion, & the author himself with his followers dwells in Batavia and impends over that Academy. Before this by its right but not so similarly plainly in the case our Academy of Utrecht passed a decree, approved by the most ample Senate of this city, & not without its authority published, which puts forth judgment concerning the booklet & new philosophy of a certain Professor of Utrecht, for the necessary premonition of the Academic youth, & the public liberation of the Academy from the infamy of new paradoxes. But if any German or Belgian of the reformed religion, dwelling in France by an infamous libel (such as is the epistle of Renatus des Cartes to Dinet Provincial of the Jesuits) titled letter to a Reformed theologian in Germany & Belgium, so excepted the decrees of the Parisian Academy against the moral theology of the Jesuits, or against Gaffarel's unheard of curiosities, or against the opinions of the Hibernian monks, or against Henry Kunrath's Amphitheatre or against any professor or citizen whatsoever of the Parisian Academy, & namely overwhelmed the Rector of the Academy with lies & calumnies sought out; in what place would he think the affairs of that reformed German or Belgian in France would be? What if moreover Henry Kunrath or Robert Fludd, or anyone else dwelling in France contentiously sought from the King or supreme court & indeed by an epistle, that Mersenne & the Sorbonne be compelled to a palinode, or to compensation of injury be condemned by an infamous calumny, What does he think would happen? But let him think that corollary put forth against his more than papistical [philosophy] in the Batavian Academy to be scarcely a leaf cast upon his new metaphysics & natural theology: trees could fall upon it, & perhaps will fall afterwards, if indeed the whole theological faculty, nay all faculties in Belgium by the example of the Parisian, examine it ex professo, & emit their judgments & decrees against it, if perchance they should find there erroneous propositions, evil-sounding, scandalous, offensive to pious ears, (as the Parisians & other faculties in the Papacy are accustomed to speak) heretical, profane, or redolent of blasphemy, skepticism &c. But if such a judgment concerning his, or anyone else's perilous philosophy or theology were ever made, does he not believe that it could be obtained by the theologians & ecclesiastical colleges from the supreme powers of Belgium defenders of the true religion & piety that such books be proscribed & the authors, if they continue to make tumults against the constituted order, be duly coerced? But he will perhaps say that this power, this custom is not of the reformed Academies: And if it were, they ought not to abuse that power by judging badly: At least they ought not to stain their judgments with personal injuries & calumnies: even that it must be borne indeed that philosophy be refuted, exploded; provided that the authors themselves of it be not burdened with the odious consequences & crimes of blasphemy, Libertinism, Skepticism &c. We respond to 1. Concerning the power & custom of the reformed churches & Academies, namely in Belgium, it is not for him to decide, but for others to whom this pertains. To 2. Whether the Academies, or theological faculties, or ecclesiastical colleges abuse their just title & power, they will judge, to whom this pertains. To 3. the theologian will respond, whose corollary pricked the new philosophy, that nothing such was

done by him. The same the theological faculties would respond, if indeed such things were found in his writings, as he does not ignore are sometimes objected to him, they condemned. Whether by the same metamorphosis here he hopes that real philosophical or theological arguments forsooth taken from absurd consequences, of blasphemy, skepticism, Libertinism, atheism are to be changed at his pleasure immediately into pure personal calumnies, more than the decrees of the Sorbonne against Henry Kunrath, or Gaffarel; because perchance in his Parnassus he dreams that elsewhere among the good Belgians this once so succeeded for him. To 4. the theologians or theological faculties, will not suffer, to be prescribed to them by the sowers of new philosophemes, by what arguments especially reducing to the absurd they are to pierce them. Moreover why should they not expose the truth historically, if indeed they contain theological or philosophical things akin to Skepticism, Libertinism, Manichaeism, Epicureanism, Stoicism, Socinianism, Mahometism, or the deliriums of the Platonists or Marcionites, Valentinians, Gnostics, &c., or lead to those precipices. This could be proved by six hundred examples of the fathers, Papists, our own. I could also compare with Renatus' complaints about the Theologians of Leiden & about the decrees of Utrecht, the decrees of the congregation of Cardinals, & Inquisitors, by which at Rome they imposed silence on Galileo, Foscarinus and others philosophizing of that sect. But because as it is said that the decrees of the Sorbonne scarcely cross the Seine, so perchance the decisions of the Cardinals do not fly across the Alps, at least they do not enter our Belgium, which he now inhabits, I will forbear, & send him & my reader to the Anti-Aristarchus & Vesta of Froidmont theologian of Louvain. And these things indeed on the occasion of the corollary proposed in the neighboring Academy, & Descartes' complaint born thence concerning injury & calumny, it seemed good here to warn: Not that I wish by that very thing to confess that corollary as proposed by me (away with the so foolish consequences of the new Jurisconsults without a Code), or think that the neighboring Academy needs that defense; but because I cannot bear the calumnies of some against those theologians & philosophers, who watch for the truth & peace of schools, churches, Republics. See moreover & compare concerning fanatical & perilous philosophemes the disputation on Creation part 6 & 7. I conclude with the dictum of Sextus Empiricus against the Doctors Dubitantii & Skeptics, which he has in book 1 against the Mathematicians ch. 1. "In contradicting those who profess disciplines, the mind of the Epicureans & Pyrrhonians seems to be the same: but the affection is not the same."

To the disputation on the knowledge of God p.251 line 14. The formal words of Boethius book 5 of the consolation of philosophy are: "Great is to you, if you do not wish to dissimulate, the necessity of probity declared, when you do your deeds before the eyes of the Judge discerning all things." There can be added the dictum of Ignatius in his epistle to the Ephesians almost at the end: "For nothing is hidden from the Lord: but even our secrets are before him. Let us therefore do all things, as if he were dwelling in us, that we may be his temples, & he himself in us God." And of Basil in his Ascetics or in his questions explained compendiously, question 29. "In how many ways will one be able not to be angry? If he thinks God the inspector, & the Lord always present. For what subject would ever dare in the eyes of the prince to do something of those things which are displeasing to him?" Similar things in the case of the conjugal act Jerome has in his commentary on Titus 2, which I do not describe here purposely. Let him see, who has leisure. Not to be passed over is the golden sentence of Epictetus in Arrian book 1 ch. 14,

"When you have shut the doors & made the darkness within, remember never to say, that you are alone. For you are not alone: but God is within & your genius is within. And what need have they of light, to see what you do?"

To the disputation on the Right & Justice of God p.371 line 24. Nay Calvin himself sufficiently explains his mind, & confirms our opinion in his theological tracts, on the eternal Predestination of God p.728. "We must indeed recall to memory what I said before: that God does nothing except for the best reason: but because the most certain rule of justice is his will to us the chief, so to speak, reason of all reasons ought to be. For the humility of faith, since it is born from reverence for divine justice, is not to be imagined stupid. For who, unless he holds this persuasion fixed deep in his mind, that God is just, & his works right: will acquiesce in his pleasure alone? Therefore I detest that Sorbonic dogma, in which the Papal Theologasters applaud themselves, which feigns an absolute power to God. For it will be easier to pluck the light of the sun from its heat, nay its own heat from fire, than to separate the power of God from his justice. Therefore let that monstrous speculation be far removed from pious minds: that God can do something more than is fitting: or that he does anything without mode & reason. Nor indeed do I accept that fiction, that God, because he is free from law, lacks reproach for whatever he does: For he who makes God lawless, despoils him of the greatest part of his glory, because he buries his rectitude & justice. Not that God is subject to law, except insofar as he is a law to himself. For such is the Symmetry & consensus between his power & justice, that nothing proceeds from him, except what is moderate, legitimate, & regular."

To the disputation on the power of God p.410 line 8. Let there be added Origen book 3 against Celsus: "But according to us God can do all things, which being able he remains to be God, & to be good, & to be wise." And Chrysostom homily 10 on John: "If they say, that God can do all things, so that he could even have fallen into flesh. To them we say this in reply, that God can do all things as long as he remains God &c."

Page 427 line 5 from the end: Add ibid. apology 187, 118, especially also the Response of the Same to the excerpts &c. p.11. "There have not been lacking among the scholastics, nor are there lacking today those who have asserted, and assert without any danger that Christ could not only not obey but also could sin."

Ibid. p.428 line 11. Add Bellarmine book 5 on Justification ch. 11 who rightly defends, that for Christ even in his human nature it was intrinsic & natural, not to sin on account of his hypostatic union with deity, which ruled humanity: & therefore that Christ absolutely & simply could not sin. Formerly this opinion concerning the peccability of Christ was condemned in Arius as impious, foolish blasphemous, by the Nicene Council: witness his epistle to the church of Alexandria &c. in Socrates book 3 ch. 6. On account of the same the Alexandrian synod said anathema to the Arians, in Theodoret book 4 ch. 3. Compare moreover concerning this condemned opinion Socrates book 1 ch. 3 & 6, Theodoret book 1 ch. 4 & 8 & book 2 ch. 8, Sozomen book 1 ch. 14.

Ibid. p.431 line 12. the words of Jerome exist in his epistle to Eustochium on the custody of virginity. It is a wonder what Accursius wanted for himself in gloss 1 C. on the rape of a virgin.

When dissenting from the sentence of Jerome (which he attributes to Augustine by a lapse of memory) he states: that it can be restored by God not by man. Conrad Rittershausen indeed studies to excuse him book 4 of his sacred readings ch. 7 p.268. "He had regard I believe, to the guilt or effect of sin, which is the obligation to the penalty of the transgressor. For that this effect God can remove, & for his infinite goodness does remove in the fallen penitents &c." But this excuse is not suitable. For it is not to be believed, that Accursius was so absurd or unskilled that he thought Jerome, & the compilers of Canon Law, denied that the remission of sin committed by a virgin was possible for God; concerning which blasphemous assertion they did not even dream. And Rittershausen himself a little afterwards on the same p.268 sufficiently suggests that this excuse is not to be stood upon "Nevertheless this pardon and abolition of offenses does not have that force, that on account of it that enunciation should cease to be true: David took care that Uriah be killed that he &c."

The same page 431 line 25. We indicate some of those authors in the disputation on Creation part 10 near the end.

To the disputation on Christ God-man Page 350 line 1. Add: Casaubon observes on the characters of Theophrastus in the chapter on adulation, that the voices, master & himself were of slaves & disciples, which for the sake of honor they used in place of proper names, when they spoke concerning their masters or teachers. And he proves the same there from Greek & Latin writers & their scholiasts.

Page 459 line 14. Also add & reply to the Papists the dictum of Occam in his centiloquium, conclusion 62. "Christ," he says, "according to his divine existence is not the son of God." Let them dwell with themselves, & explain their Occam.

Page 460 line 31. Add the same Whitaker in his Defense against William Reynolds, to the preface §14, 15.

To the disputation on the necessity & utility of the dogma of the Trinity p.485 line 29. Add the prayer of Nathan Chytraeus to the Holy Spirit in his Provision for the journey of the last passage p.242. And the prayer to the Father, Son & Holy Spirit of Stephen Knyghts crowned with martyrdom in England in the year 1555, which Chytraeus exhibits ibid. p.426 from Foxe's commentary on things done in the church book 4 p.427 of the Basel edition.

To the disputation on the adoration of Christ the mediator p.552 line 9, 10. You will find this Supplement in volume 2 of our disputations.

Page 557 line 19. Scheibler the Lutheran theologian holds almost the same opinion book 2 of Metaphysics ch. 3 art. 3.

Page 569 line 2. Add the Conimbricenses on Physics book 8 ch. 2 question 6.

Page 587 line 10. Add from the more recent Claramontius book 16 on the Universe ch. 12

Page 601 last line. And Majolus colloquy 14.

Page 601, Lorinus in his commentary on the wisdom of Solomon ch. 16 p.555 concerning the salamander reconciles the opinions of authors, (whom he cites there very many) in almost the same mode. Laelius Bisciola does almost the same thing & lucidly in his leisure hours ch. 1. Either of whom can be seen.

Page 628 line 19. Add the tract of Fr. Paduan on Winds, & earthquakes, in folio.

Ibid. line 20. Joh. Manelphus also has some things in his Urban disputations to Aristotle's problems lecture 1. And more David Christian book 2 of Geography in the appendix.

Page 644 line 21. Joachim Vadian in his epistle to Rudolph Agricola the Raetian, which is subjoined to his commentaries on Mela.

Page 645 line 9. Among those Geographics Joachim Vadian in his epistle cited to the preceding problem,

Page 646 line 2 from the end. Salmuth to Panciroli's New discoveries title 1 throughout

Page 650 line 4 from the end. Magius also inquires into the increments of the Nile book 1 of his miscellanies ch. 10. And the Arab Geographer of Nubia p.98 of the Latin edition. And very many others. But with all exhausted & collected John Baptist Scorcia & Frederic Wendelin just now indicated have here surpassed all others.

Ibid. line 10. And, Julius Caesar Recerpitus' news on the eruption of Vesuvius. And Vossius book 2 ch. 68.

Ibid. line 21. Especially also Majolus colloquies 10, 11, 12, 13.

Page 651 line 19. Only add Henry Heers Physician of Eburo who recently wrote on the acid springs of Spa.

Ibid. line 27. To which add Peter Messia part 2 of his various readings ch. 24, 25.

Page 662 line 9 from the end. The knowledge of balsam will make for the easier explication of certain places of scripture. The same must be said about the vine & wine. There are extant treatises of Grataroli on wine & every drinkable; & of Canonhieri on the wondrous virtues of wine; & a Theology on the Vine bearing wine. From the ancients there can be compared Athenaeus book 1 & 2.

Page 665 line 22. Here pertains the contemplation of the Euripus, or the Euxine sea. But against those things which occur commonly in authors about its six flows & ebbs, it could

deservedly be doubted, whether they ought not to be referred to physical fables. Certainly Gyllius in his Thracian Bosphorus book 1 ch. 4 testifies that he diligently inquired into this narration, & learned from the millers, who are frequent on its shore, that it flows in only twice a day (namely a natural day of 24 hours) & ebbs twice: but sometimes it does not keep this certain course. Others add that its flow is impetuous. Thus Thomaso Porcacchi in his description of the celebrated Islands. Livy seems to remove this doubt: "Not seven times a day (as rumor reports) at certain times does it reciprocate, but rashly in the manner of the wind, the sea being turned now hither now thither like a torrent rolled down from a precipitous mountain it is seized." But Gyllius loc. cit. intercedes: "Indeed," he says, "when I had come to Chalcis, I could not approve Livy's opinion, when with no wind blowing at certain times I contemplated it being borne now from the rising of the sun, now from the setting, with so great impetus, that it carried with it contrary winds & full ships sailing against it, and I saw many mills turned by it for some hours from east to west, some from west to east." It seems from the irregularity of motion, which happens sometimes, And from the perpetual impetuosity to have arisen the vulgar opinion of its sevenfold flux. Certainly from the more recent Anton. Maginus in his Geography of Ptolemy, recognizes nothing beyond uncertain rumor: "Of swift and various flux is the sea there four times in a day, or seven times (as others say) the tides reciprocate." Boterus in his relations much more openly, that it flows in & ebbs four times, although it is commonly said seven times &c. And from the ancients Strabo shows nothing of certitude, when he says παλιῤῥοεῖ. Pausanias in his lucid description of Greece does not mention it, nor Thucydides in his history, where however frequent mention of Euboea occurs.

Ibid. line 29. David Christian; who book 2 System of Geography ch. 12, 13, 14 recounts fifteen opinions; & all the others rejected as false, because with them posited the tide is not always actually posited, nor with them removed is it removed; he admits the last as more common & probable: namely that the moon by the increment & decrement of its light, or by local motion above the horizon, or by natural sympathy alters the marine waters, & so excites the tide. He adduces reasons there, & suffrages of authors; moreover he solves objections, & responds to certain problems, which here make a hypothesis or consequence.

Page 670 line 3. Compare Jonston Thaumatography class 2 ch. 1 art. 5.

Page 671 line 4. Lazius also testifies concerning such lamps in sepulchers book 3 on the Roman Republic ch. 18. And Ulysse Aldrovandus in his Ornithology book 2.

Page 696 last line. See the same Benjamin p.214 of the Hebrew-Latin edition of l'Empereur in 8vo.

Page 703 line 19. From the Physicians Valerius Martinus Venetian Physician two books on color, light, lumen &c. Add Thomas Bartholinus on the light of Animals. The writers on Vision, &c. on the eye, such as Fortunius Plempius, Fabricius of Aquapendente, also touch upon these things in their own way.

Page 718 line 2. Add Pareus in his Exercises p.70.

Page 719 line 4 from the end. Add Moufet's theater of insects, London in the year 1634. But especially the physics of locusts must be known to the Theologian, for the explication of the places of scripture Matt. 3, Joel 1 & 2, Levit. 11:21, 22. Where after Bela on Matt. 3, above all others (whom I have seen) the commentaries of Cornelius à Lapide, on loc. cit. provide direction & indication of authors. And Vossius book 4 ch. 78.

Page 723 line 11 from the end. Concerning the pelican see also Vossius book 3 ch. 80, 83, 84.

Page 724 line 7. See also the fable of the phoenix refuted by Vossius book 3 ch. 99. & Franzius.

I would especially urge those two from the armory of theology among the reasons brought forth by them, & Nieremberg and Cordua just now cited & others. Of which one is, that by this reason the resurrection of the dead, or the return from total privation to habit is established as natural; & that consequently the proper faith and hope of Christians is by this fable not lightly opposed; so far is it from being established by it. The other reason is, that this succession of the Phoenix, by the transmission of ashes or putrefied flesh is repugnant to the blessing made peculiarly to the birds Gen. 1:22. Nor can it be excepted, that those ashes, or the putrefied flesh of the dead phoenix, are the putrid matter whence by the force of the sun or of the celestial influences a new phoenix is generated: because this could have place in insects according to the law of nature, but not in perfect animals, nay most perfect, such as the phoenix is said to be. And hence we gather the ignorance & manifold impiety of most of the fathers in matters not only purely scriptural & theological, but especially also philosophical & historical. But Pseudo-Clement book 5 of the Apostolic Constitutions ch. 7 surpassed all the stories & trifles of all, where he says, that it flies every five hundredth year to Egypt to the altar of the sun &c., standing toward the east, to pray to the sun, as they say, & to be burned of its own accord and reduced to ashes. Although however the epistle to the Corinthians lately published in England under the name of Clement, does not extend the fable so widely, it cannot however be excused from ignorance & an atheological absurdity, much less that it ought to be numbered among the canonical or quasi-canonical writings. For it seems to employ the Phoenix not obscurely for a most true argument of the resurrection: as this was formerly reprehended in it, in Photius in his Library, book or treatise 126. Vossius loc. cit. about to excuse Clement observes, that at that time this was the common opinion concerning the phoenix. Besides it is not necessary to believe, that Clement the author of an ecclesiastical writing knew all the secrets of nature: since it is not necessary to believe this even of the apostles. For that saying of John 16:13 is to be restricted to the truth of those things, which pertain to the business of salvation &c. But we now passing over the former consideration, respond to the latter: It pertains to the authority of scripture, that we believe that the writers taught infallibly by God by living voice or writings, never drew arguments for proving, or similitudes for illustrating from natural things, so that they stumbled in them against physics, or the truth of the matter. See & compare our disputation on the Authority of scripture.

Page 725 line 26. And perhaps now first that emanated from the Gentile ancestors: who established something sacred in storks, as Dalechamp notes on Pliny book 10 ch. 23.

Page 728 line 2 from the end. Concerning pegasus see Vossius book 3 ch. 99.

Ibid. line 23. And Vossius book 4 ch. 66.

Page 732 line 13. From our theologians Joh. Jacob Grynæus has inserted an epistle on the unicorn into his theological disputations. The commonly called monoceros also seems to be defended by Scaliger Exercitation 205. But histories & experience there appear almost none, besides the testimony of one Lud. Vartomannus, who says he saw two.

Page 733 line 8 from the end. Add Scaliger's Exercitation 186. But Cardanus more rightly denied it; whom Vossius defends book 4 ch. 59. Whom see.

Page 734 line 5. The same book 4 ch. 56.

Ibid. line 10. The same Vossius book 4 ch. 63.

Ibid. from the end. And concerning Elephants the notes of David Hoeschel to Origen against Celsus p.488.

Page 736 line 6 from the end. See also concerning silkworms Franc. Fernand. de Cordova in his didascalic multiplex ch. 7. Concerning the reviviscence of flies one of the two must similarly be stated. Likewise concerning the swallows lying hidden in winter at the bottom of a reed-bed. If concerning the hedgehog, what is reported, by Pliny book 11 ch. 36 be not fabulous, it could be said that the soul is divisible, & the dissected parts still animated are united. But I prefer to believe, that it is a fable.

Page 688 line 9. Add Belon's observations of memorable things in Greece, Asia &c.

Page 740 line 1. And Joseph de Acosta in his description of the new world book 7 ch. 3. And from him Johannes de Laet in his notes on Grotius' dissertation on the Origin of the American Peoples p.82 coll. with p.202 where he reports that even today in various parts of America are found men, who much surpass the men of our globe in height. And in the year 1586 in Mexico in the sepulcher of a giant a molar tooth was found, which surpassed a human fist. The same Acosta book 1 ch. 7 reports that in Peru there is much memory of giants of whose bones of deformed magnitude are still found near Manta & Porto Vieyo, who were three times taller, than today's Indians.

Page 742 line 5 from the end. Vossius book 3 ch. 99 conjectures that the fable of the nation of the Arimaspians in Scythia arose thence, that the Scythians being the best archers, in aiming used one eye, the other being closed.

Page 746 line 7. And Scaliger in his commentary on Aristotle on animals, where he treats of female marine creatures. And Vincent Cartari on the Images of the Gods, And Fortunio Liceti on monsters ch. 86 where also other authors are cited by him.

Page 746 line 9. Annals & history of the Belgians written by Johannes de Leydis, Reiner Snoy, Joh. Reigersberg, Jacob Meyer, Vincent Sifridi.

Page 747 line 18. Add P. Zacchias in his Medico-legal questions book 1 title 3.

Page 748 line 11. Among the Jurists especially Alphonsus de Carranza Spanish J.C. treats laboriously of abortions in his tract cited, With whom is to be joined Zacchias book 1 of his Medico-legal questions title 2 question 10.

Page 751 line 22. Augustine treats of the resurrection of abortions & monsters in his Enchiridion ch. 85, 86, 87. Whom see, with the commentary of Daneau.

Page 753 line 5. Concerning Strigæ & Harpies See Vossius book 3 ch. 99.

Page 754 line 28. Concerning the intermediate animals between men & brutes, what Albertus Magnus writes cited by Vadianus in his epistle to Agricola, published with his own commentary on Mela Ff. 3 we judge is to be referred to natural fables. The words of Albertus in Vadianus (for I do not have leisure to seek & inspect the book of Albertus himself) are these: "The Pygmies therefore, to return to our purpose, whom Augustine ch. 8, book 16 of the City of God, says obtained their name from the Greeks from the cubit, just as Eustathius [says], Spithamæi, that is of a palm, on account of their wonderful brevity, do not exceed three dodrants. The illustrious writers of the Greeks have very often made mention of them however with a certain diversity of situation. For when Pliny reckons them among the nations of India, Pomponius book 3 puts them in that part of Arabia, which beyond the Arabian gulf verges into Ethiopia. Strabo book seventeen thinks they were indeed believed to have been in the same places, but imagined: hence the occasion of fiction being drawn, because in interior Ethiopia, where the outermost parts of that land seemed to be inhabited, almost all animals were found to come forth small. But on the contrary Philostratus, who book 3 says, that the Pygmies dwelling under the earth, inhabit places situated above the Ganges, & that they live is not vain. With whom Aristotle agrees in this that he says they inhabit caves. Albertus book 21 on animals, that they indeed exist & live, but he denies that they have the exact use of human reason: And on that account ch. 3 book 1 he names them sylvan men, having something of our nature in a certain, as he says, deliberation, & ch. 4 §2 tract 1 book 1 he says the Pygmy Ape has the likeness of man, Pliny ch. 11 §4 & Solinus in his description of Thrace says that near the city Gerania next to Hæmus, & Strymon the Pygmies were believed to have been, called Catizi by the barbarians, expelled by a severe [people]. How elegantly our [poets] Juvenal & Gellius write about them."

Page 739 line 33. Especially Rainolds prelection 234 on the apocryphal books.

Page 742 line 26. Those whom the Arab Geographer, & Olaus Magnus loc. cit. say to be men in the lower recess of Gog & Magog or Cathay: them Athanasius Kircher in his Coptic Prodromus ch. 4 p.95 suspects to be cobali & munculi or virunculi (as they call them) of the mountains: concerning whom Agricola in the last book on Subterranean Animals. But perhaps another conjecture could be brought for the fable of the Pygmies. From the book of Paul Jovius on the legation of the Muscovites, when he says: "Beyond the Lapps in the region between the Northwest & North perpetually oppressed with gloom Pygmies are found, some witnesses of utmost faith have reported, who after they have grown to their full height, scarcely exceed the measure of one of our boys of ten years &c." If it be true, as is reported, that most of the Lapps or Lappians or Pilappians are of short stature, perhaps this brevity too much amplified gave occasion to the history of the Pygmies. I conclude with the words of Rainolds in the 254th prelection to the apocryphal books p.1507 when he had treated of the Pygmies & prodigious giants: "But fabulous portents of this kind have been devised by the wondrous artifice of Satan for sowing various errors. In which the Christian writers seem to have taken too little heed for themselves, who with too much credulity have commended to memory fabulous things of this kind for true, which however could be refuted from the circumstances of the history, and that by most manifest traces." & p.1510 "But Philostratus opened the way for trifles of this kind, and that for promoting the artifice of Satan of which I spoke, that those ancients might be thought gods and heroes, and worshiped by men for deities."

Page 755 line 24. Concerning various sylvan & uncultivated men approaching most nearly to beasts, although endowed with reason; and concerning men, who are said to be of another external form, Majolus in his Canicular days colloquy 2 seems to me to have collected almost all things; who is to be seen.

Page 760 line 25. But Paul Zacchias Roman Physician, who laboriously did this in his four books of Medico-legal questions, recently obtained by me, far surpasses Condroch skimming the chief questions: whom after, & above the often praised Condroch I commend to students of theology, both on account of the multitude of questions; and on account of respect to the texts of scripture & theological questions; and on account of the indication of very many authors of Physicians, philosophers, & Jurists. The apocryphal book of wisdom ch. 7 v. 2 attributes ten months to gestation; where see authors of every kind very many concerning the time of birth cited by Lorinus in his commentaries. And not only the Jurists, but also the theologians think the physico-Medical disquisition on the time of birth pertains to them, both on account of other cases, and especially on account of the gestation & nativity of Christ. Concerning which see the Scholastics on part 3 question 33, especially Suarez on part 3 vol. 2 disp. 20 last section. And compare our disputation on the Time of the nativity of Christ.

Page 802 line 7 from the end. Add especially Majoli Canicular days coll. 2, 3, 4 & last.

Page 803 line 22. Add, p.795 & the paralipomena to that page.

Ibid. last line. Add the treatise of Valerius Martini on the qualities of the whole substance to be cited soon. And what Vossius book 3 ch. 68 & book 4 ch. 61 gleans concerning remedies

against poisons. Where he also inquires, into the causes of the antipathy of the Psylli & Marsi. See if you will.

Page 804 line 26. Add Jos. Arommatari's tract on Rabies contagiosa Venice 1625 in 4to. Valerius Martini Venetian Physician also has not a few things concerning rabid venom in his tract on the properties of the whole substance book 2 ch. 3, 4, 5. Concerning the same Vossius notes some excellent things separately book 4 ch. 37 & book 3 ch. 72.

Page 806 line 14. And concerning Monsters, also indicated above.

Page 808 line 6. Add Majolus colloquy 23 or last where he treats at length of the wondrous works of men.

Ibid. line 24. Let there be added the tract of the same Cormann on the Miracles of the living: which I see is cited by Paul Zacchias the Physician; but the book itself I have not yet happened to see.

Page 978 line 8 from the end. Jerome vol. 2 on the epistle to Avitus imposes that opinion on him from the books of Origen concerning a twofold gospel: of which one is eternal after this life in the heavens to be preached for the salvation of demons. Mahomet also dreamed about the salvation of demons: whom Cantacuzenus assails on that account oration 3, from the more recent Philip Guadagnolo against Achmed the Persian treatise 2 ch. 8.

Page 1001 line 21. Add Binsfeld official of Trier in his tract on the confessions of Witches, prelude 12 doubt 1 & 2.

Page 1018 line 13. But Zacchias Roman Physician in his Medico-legal questions book 2 title 1 question 18 surpasses all, who after all the Physicians just now cited wrote on this matter, whom I would have wished to have seen before my Theses being reread & reprinted.

Page 1034, last line. He undertakes to defend ex professo the story of Nicole in the town of Vrevino among the Veromandui in Gaul, besieged by the little book of an anonymous author (an adherent of the Reformed religion), in the tract which Bartholomew Faye, a Royal Counselor in the Parisian Parliament, wrote on this occasion, entitled Energumenicus.