

THEOLOGICAL TREATISE

On REGENERATION, IN THREE DISPUTATIONS,

PRESIDED OVER BY,

The most Reverend and Excellent Man,

MR. ELIAS GREBENIZ,

Doctor and most celebrated Professor of Sacred Theology, my forever esteemed Patron
and Teacher,

COMPOSED,

by the Respondent

SAMUEL STRIMES,

of Königsberg, Prussia.

In the most Illustrious University of the Marches,

In the Year of the Messiah 1671.

PRINTED BY BECMAN.

TO THE MOST REVEREND AND MOST ILLUSTRIOUS,

LORD,

DN. OTTO

OF SCHWERIN,

L. B.

Ruler of Landsberg, Oldewigshagen, Wuditt, Drewitz, Zachan, Schönenbeck, Wittstock, etc. etc. Provost of the Episcopal Chapter of Brandenburg, Hereditary Chamberlain of the August and Most Potent Elector of Brandenburg, Supreme President of all Councils and Judicatories, Governor of the Captaincy of Oranienburg etc. etc.

His most Benign Lord,

As well as

To the most Generous, and also most Valiant and Strongest,

Lords,

DN. LUCIUS de RHADEN,

Intimate Counselor of the August and Most Potent Elector of Brandenburg, Magnificent Vice-Chancellor of the Judicial Chamber on the Spree, & most Splendid President of the Sacred Consistory,

AND

DN. FRIDERICUS de JENA,

Ruler in Wüsterhusen, most Secret Counselor of the August and Potent Elector of Brandenburg, & Magnificent Chancellor throughout the Principality of Halberstadt,

His Greatest Benefactors and Promoters.

This Theological Treatise is most humbly dedicated by the AUTHOR.

In the Name of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Disputation 1. On REGENERATION IN GENERAL.....	4
PREFACE.....	4
FIRST DISPUTATION ON REGENERATION IN GENERAL.....	5
Section I. NOMINAL KNOWLEDGE.....	5
Section II. REAL KNOWLEDGE.....	10
SUBSECTION I. ON THE EXISTENCE OF REGENERATION.....	10
Point I. On Absolute Existence.....	10
Point II. On the Related Existence of Regeneration.....	13
SUBSECTION II. ON THE ESSENCE OF REGENERATION.....	21
SUBSECTION III. ON THE COEXISTENCE OF REGENERATION.....	26
SECOND DISPUTATION ON CONVERSION.....	27
Section I. NOMINAL KNOWLEDGE.....	27
Section II. REAL KNOWLEDGE.....	30
SUBSECTION I. On Existence.....	30
SUBSECTION II. ON THE ESSENCE OF CONVERSION.....	53
SUBSECTION III. ON THE COEXISTENCE OF CONVERSION.....	59
THIRD DISPUTATION On PREPARATION.....	60
Section I. NOMINAL KNOWLEDGE.....	60
Section II. Real Knowledge.....	62
SUBSECTION I. ON THE EXISTENCE OF PREPARATION.....	62
SUBSECTION II. On THE ESSENCE OF PREPARATION.....	71

OF THE THEOLOGICAL TREATISE On REGENERATION

Disputation 1. On REGENERATION IN GENERAL.

PREFACE.

The supreme Moderator of Heaven and Earth, though most sufficient unto Himself, in need of no creatures (by which praise He Himself commends Himself, *Gen. 17:1: I am the strong and παναρκής, all-sufficient God*), and though He is all in all, *1 Cor. 15:28*; Nevertheless, it pleased Him to render this inexhaustible store of his sufficiency conspicuous, indeed most illustrious, with astounding Benignity toward His Creatures. For Good is communicative of Itself, and the Best is most prompt in Its communication. Hence God, living from Himself (*Deut. 32:40, Ps. 84:23*), is at once the fount of life for all creatures. He gives to all Life and Breath and All things. In Him we live and move and have our being. *Acts 17:25 & 28*.

This Life (so that He might communicate Himself) He first breathed into the Protoplasts, and made them fruitful by His Blessing for most happily propagating the Breath of life. *Acts 17:26*. Thus He willed the Image of His Life to exist in His Creatures, adorning Man with Intellect and Will, the most excellent form of Life, and He adumbrated the infinite Excellence of His own Intellect and Will. And lest, rejoicing in these alone, they might express the Divine Life more obscurely, they would express the Divine Life more obscurely to mortals, He instructed their Intellect with the most splendid Wisdom, and their Will with Justice, which by their brilliance might prefigure the inaccessible light, that which exceedingly dazzles the sharpest of eyes, and might exhibit it to those gazing as if in a Mirror.

When these were lost through the Fall, when thick darkness of ignorance and stupidity concerning Sacred things invaded the Intellect in place of Wisdom, and the Sanctity of the Will was converted to malice, and the whole Man was drawn away into depravity; Lest with the goodness of men extinguished, the Divine Benignity should also be obscured from the Creatures, He allowed another stream to be devolved to us from the inexhaustible fount of His Goodness, which could wash away the contracted stains, remove the diseases that threatened eternal ruin, indeed restore to life those already oppressed by death, and thus repair the Image of God in us. Thus God, living from Himself, is most desirous of the Life of men; He calls back to life those who are hastening on a swift course to death, willing that none should perish, but that all should come to repentance. *2 Pet. 3:9*. Living, He gives life, He gives life again.

We have adumbrated the most eminent Life of the most Perfect Living One in a Philosophical Style according to the poverty of our talent, and since we have decided with ourselves to stammer also in Theological matters—studies which in this nurturing Frankfurt we are taught, and taught to combine—we will decently subjoin Specimens of them: Therefore, that most excellent kind of Life, which, having proceeded from God, is

conferred upon Man, namely REGENERATION, we shall expound in public Disputations. May Life itself, and the Author of Life, be present.

FIRST DISPUTATION ON REGENERATION IN GENERAL.

Section I. NOMINAL KNOWLEDGE.

§. I,

Regeneration occurs in Theology, which never would have been heard of, had Theology not supplied it. By Theology is not understood just any kind, not Natural Theology, which is altogether ignorant of the Doctrine of Christ, of its Application, and hence of Regeneration; but Revealed Theology, which alone opens the way to struggle out of the miseries by which we are covered through sin, and promises life to the Dead. It is for this reason unknown in Philosophy, because the Reality, which is denoted by this Term, is Naturally impossible. This was not hidden from Nicodemus, one of the chief of the Jews, who, when Christ taught that a Man would not attain eternal Life unless he were born again, said: How can a man be born when he is old, who has already been born? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born? John 3:4. Hence physical Regeneration is an entity of reason, whether it be understood of Substance, or of Accidents. Since, therefore, this Term is domestic to Revealed Theology, it can deservedly be called Theological and Hyperphysical Regeneration; not for the distinction of a physical Regeneration, which is non-existent, but for an easier understanding of the Reality through its Attributes, virtually contained, formally expressed.

§. 2.

This Theological word is found used and applied in Holy Scripture:

(1) To things. Thus in Matthew 19:28, the Restoration or Renewal of all nature, which will be at the end of the World, is called *παλιγγενεσία* or Regeneration, which Peter describes more prolixly in his 2nd Epistle 3:13, compared with 10. But we await new heavens and a new earth. Most theologians understand these new Heavens and new Earth not as other Heavens and another Earth in Substance, but only a Renewal and Alteration of Heaven and Earth, and thus different in quality, or Accidents. Paul is cited on this matter in Rom. 8 from v. 19 to v. 23 inclusive.

(2) To persons. And thus it is used either of their Resurrection to eternal life at the time of the final Judgment, in which sense Beza takes the already cited passage in Matthew 19, who by *παλιγγενεσίαν* understands nothing other than the Restoration of bodies through Resurrection. Or it is used of their Reparation to Spiritual Life. Thus men are said to be renewed or regenerated by the Holy Spirit, Titus 3:5. And Christ testifies that only those Reborn of Spirit and Water will enter the Kingdom of Heaven. John 3:5. Amen, Amen, I say to you, etc. This is the meaning of this passage. Yet this varies again. For Regeneration is still understood:

(1) Substantially for a Substantial Reparation, by which reason our whole Substance would be regenerated by the Holy Spirit, even Physically. This is the Error of the Flacians and hence the Weigelians. For Flacius Illyricus disputed against Tapper of Louvain and Strigel that Angels and Men were Essentially changed and corrupted after the Fall. Likewise, that man after the Fall does not remain wholly Man, as he was before, even according to his Essence; But that the body itself and the Organic Powers are Essentially corrupted and lost. Whence in Regeneration he is again Essentially changed, and the most excellent part of the Soul or of Man, lost and taken away by sin, is created anew.

(2) Accidentally, for the Restoration of the accidents lost in Man through the fall: Such as were Original Justice, Eph. 4:24, & Perfect Knowledge of God, Col. 3:10. And so for the Rectification of the Intellect, the Will, and all the Affections. 1 Thess. 5:23. As the former Sense is erroneous, so it is rejected by us, as being adverse to sound Reason or Philosophy and Theology. The latter is both contained in the Holy Code, and not alien to our Institute.

§.3.

Yet not every Ambiguity is removed in this way, especially if we do not also consider the frequent significations among Theologians. It is sufficient for us at present to note that Regeneration is still taken:

(1) More broadly, for any Grace of God, by which He deigns to treat men dead in sins, either by calling them Externally to salvation through the preaching of the Gospel. And this either Immediately & Directly, as with the stubborn Jews in Matthew 23:37, Jerusalem, Jerusalem. Also Acts 13:46. It was necessary that the word of God should be spoken first to you, etc. With which Vocation, however, Internal Grace is always joined, unless you would make God offer His Word and Preaching less aptly than to a stone. Or Mediatly & Indirectly. As the descendants of Ham, Esau, etc. who were called in their Parents. In the same way, in the time of the Jews, the Ammonites, Jebusites, etc., were called. In the time of the Christians, the Jews themselves, Turks, and other non-Christians are, even today by the singular Benevolence of God, called in no other way, for to them the Church is a Light set upon a mountain, so that it cannot be hidden. Matt. 5:14. Or by calling Internally, and so opening their eyes, that they may understand that some Way of attaining eternal Life is given; Indeed, by bestowing on them the power by which they can aspire to salvation, if they are willing. Such is that of Paul's Epistle to Titus c. 2, v. 11. For the grace of God that brings salvation has appeared to all men. Which cannot appear otherwise than by somehow illuminating men: just as a lighted lamp illuminates those whom it finds present. To this Regeneration we assign Prevenient Grace, which is conferred on Men through the Vocation, and is established by us as Universal, as we acknowledge from Scripture a Universal Vocation. Rom. 10:18. But I say, etc. Also Matthew 28:19. Although it varies according to the different Kind of Vocation, and the secret, yet most just, good pleasure of God. Thus men receive the Power to believe God and His Word.

(2) More Strictly, for that Grace of God by which men are endowed with the power of believing in Christ. This befalls all those in the Covenant, even Infants. And although its Essence is not placed in an Act, it is by no means bare of all Act. It clothes Adults with an Augmentation of Prevenient Grace, which is indulged to those who comply with the Divine Vocation, and do not stubbornly resist the Power of assenting to the Divine Word, which they enjoy, like the hearers in Jeremiah 6:18, who impiously cry out: We will not obey your words, but we will do what pleases us. Also those whom Stephen rebukes. Acts 7:51. You stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart, etc. But they assent to the Divine Word and its Truth. To which pertains the Parable in Matthew 25. Where to the servant who had used his Talent rightly, another talent is added with this Epiphonema in v. 29. For to everyone who has, more will be given. By this Augmentation, Man not only retains the power of believing God, but is furthermore so far regenerated that he also acquires the strength to believe in Christ. Hence Faith comes from hearing Rom. 10:17 & v. 14. How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? To this pertains the Divine Grace, which is called Preparing: as, for instance, for Spiritual Life, and initiating it. Whether that Life implies only an Elicited and Spontaneous Act, such as occurs in Infants; Or an Imperate and Free Act, which is proper to Adults. For here we take Regeneration Abstractly, insofar as it is distinguished from the Regeneration of Infants, which rests only on an Elicited and Incomplete Act of Faith, and that of Adults, which descends to Imperate Acts.

(3) Most Strictly: For the Grace proper only to those who attain salvation in the work itself, and therefore for the Donation of Habitual Faith, by which we apprehend the Blood of Christ, our hearts are purified from dead works to serve the Living God. Heb. 9:14. i.e., by which our intellect, so evil from our youth, Gen. 8, is illuminated to know Christ, John 17:3. And this is eternal Life etc. Our will, so perverse, is so corrected that it rests in Christ alone. Ps. 73:25. Phil. 3 from v. 7 to v. 12 inclusive: What things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Also v. 12. Apprehended by Christ, that I may apprehend. In one Word: By which a man who before was plainly dead, is perfectly brought from Spiritual Death into Spiritual Life, Eph. 2:1. And you He made alive, who were dead in trespasses and sins. Also v. 5 & 6. To this Regeneration we attribute, with the Excellent Mr. President, Operating Grace. It is otherwise called Conversion. The first Acceptation of Regeneration is not of this place. Nor adequately the Third, but only the Middle one.

§. 4.

Hence its Synonym is not conversion; for that is Stricter than Regeneration, and is to be extended only to Adults. Nor Revival and Resurrection, Eph. 2:6, Rom. 6:5. Which likewise are more perfectly referred to an Imperate Act, and are assigned to Adults. For these are indeed like those oppressed by a deep sleep, nor do they awaken from the torpor of sin, unless they are revived; After their Spiritual sleep is shaken off by God through the internal motion of the Holy Spirit, they rise up, and they move themselves by this grace that has been supplied. But what signifies the same thing adequately is:

(1) New Creation, *καινή κτίσις*, 2 Cor. 5:17, from which the Reborn are called *κτισθέντες*, Eph. 2:10, and God is called *κτίσας*, Col. 3:10. Also *ποίησις* or *ποίημα*, Eph. 2:10. Creation is commonly distinguished into *κτίσις*, a Production from nothing; and *ποίησις*, a Production from rough Material. This can be most elegantly applied in this place. In Regeneration or new Creation, God both creates a new spirit in us, which was nothing before grace, and, having been aroused for a little while by Prevenient and Preparing Grace, He disposes and perfects it most powerfully, as if it were some rough Material. And just as Creation properly so called is the Work of God alone, by which He is distinguished from other Gods: so new Creation is also to be vindicated for God alone, to which Man contributes plainly nothing, nor is he more apt to regenerate his own heart than to create heaven, earth, and all that is in them.

(2) Vivification, understand Spiritual, Eph. 2:5. For otherwise, as Bucan observes, *Loc. Theol.* 39, p. 448, life is threefold: (a) the Life of Nature, called by the Apostle animal from the natural soul, 1 Cor. 2. (b) the Life of Grace, which only the Sons of God enjoy in this life. (c) the Life of Glory, in which the soul, united again to the body, will live an eternal life full of joy. Thus also its conjugate, Vivification, can be ambiguous. From the middle Life, that is, of Grace and Spirit, which is peculiar to Believers in this world, we derive Vivification as a Synonym of Regeneration. But we take the word not in the second Act, so that it is the same as the Operations of Spiritual Life: in which way Vivification coincides with Sanctification, by which the Reborn are diligent in the Works of Spiritual Life, and as the Psalmist has it, they go from strength to strength, Ps. 84:8. Nor in the State, in which they persevere to the end, nor ever fall away Totally from a perfect Life, and thus from confirmed Grace of God. But in the first Act, for the Entrance into this most happy Life, by which, having struggled out of Spiritual death, they begin to live in such a way that Christ is their Life, and Christ lives in them, and indeed they themselves live by that life of the Son of God. Gal. 2:20.

(3) Washing and Purging, 1 Cor. 6:11. Acts 15:9. by a certain metaphorical expression, by which the Unregenerate are cleansed from their sins through Regeneration, no differently than a cloth stained all over is cleansed from its filth, sprinkled with a certain saving water, they are sprinkled, they are washed. These three we call Adequate Synonyms of Regeneration, because they can be ascribed equally to Infants as to Adults. For the Infants of Christians, no less truly and savingly than believing Adults, are a new creature, endowed with Spiritual Life, indeed purged from the Filth of sin by the Blood of Jesus Christ. Whence they are also called Holy. 1 Cor. 7:14, and are externally irrigated with the water of Baptism to signify and confirm their Internal Purity. If anyone desires more Synonyms, let him consult the most Celebrated Mr. Gisbertus Voetius, *Disp. Theol.* Part 2, p. 435.

Section II. REAL KNOWLEDGE.

SUBSECTION I. ON THE EXISTENCE OF REGENERATION

Point I. On Absolute Existence.

§. 1.

When we approach proving the Existence of regeneration, it may seem strange, since to confirm more prolixly what is open is to lend light to the Sun. Meanwhile, since nothing is so friendly to Truth that it does not experience deceitful Enemies, it will not be without purpose to establish the Existence of Regeneration with one or two arguments. Indeed, Regeneration exists only by accident, nor was it ever Absolutely intended by God: for His Absolute Will would presuppose an Absolute Will for Sin, which to ascribe to God would be to deny Him. Nevertheless, it exists in very deed. Which we prove against Pelagius:

(1) Because express mention of it is made in the Holy Code. Where God is partly said Himself to regenerate man, Tit. 3:4. He saved us through the washing of Regeneration and Renewal of the Holy Spirit. Eph. 2:5,6. When we were dead in offenses, He made us alive together with Christ, by whose grace you have been saved; And raised us up together, and made us sit together in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus. I. Pet. 1:23. You have been born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, etc. In which Sayings not only the Thing itself, but also the Manner of the thing is inculcated, so that it can be denied so much the less; partly Man is seriously admonished to renew his mind. Rom. 12:2. And do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind. Col. 3:10. And have put on the new man who is renewed in knowledge.

(2) Because Man aspires to eternal life, nor can he be content with this life by Reason. 1. Cor. 15:19. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men the most pitiable. Also Rom. 8:23. We ourselves, who have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, eagerly waiting for the adoption, the redemption of our body. Now, Flesh and Blood, understood spiritually, cannot possess the Kingdom of God, 1 Cor. 15:50, nor shall anything enter the heavenly city that defiles, or commits an abomination, or speaks a lie, Apoc. 21:27. Whence also Christ says: Unless one is born again of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of Heaven, John 3. From which it is manifestly gathered, that Regeneration is by all means given. Pelagius objects: Regeneration is not necessary for eternal Life, because there is nothing that can be regenerated, since the Human Race has in no way contracted Original Stain. Resp. Besides this being refuted by the very mouth of truth, which has never spoken deceit, 1 Pet. 2, in the place just cited, John 3, the proof is also most deceitful, and opposes the whole of Holy Scripture, which almost everywhere brings into the light the corrupt Nature of the human race and Original Stain, and urges it the more, the more laboriously it toils in establishing the Sacrifice of Christ. Indeed, this very Figment of Pelagius, by which he strives to deny Original sin, is no obscure testimony of Original sin: For to

admit Holy Scripture, yet to call into doubt those things which are inculcated there even a thousand times, certainly argues a bad principle and a contaminated source.

§2.

However, so that the Existence of Regeneration may appear to us all the more evident, it must be explained here in a few words how it differs from all other Spiritual Benefits. The Gnostics warn that what is Distinct must be known and handed down distinctly: For the neglect of Distinction is the mother of Confusion. On the contrary, he who distinguishes well, teaches well, and expresses the matter to be taught perspicuously. Therefore, if we show that Regeneration is distinct from the other Spiritual Gifts of God, we shall easily prove its Existence, and we will discharge a labor in this whole Disputation that is both most useful and most necessary. It is confessed among all Orthodox theologians, and indeed the Heterodox do not entirely disagree, that God, in repairing the Human Race and preparing it for Eternal Life, employs various means, principally Vocation, Regeneration, Conversion, Sanctification, and Confirmation (I speak of those which pass into man, and in a certain way change him, not of those which accede to him Extrinsically, e.g., Justification. In a word: of the Inherent, not the Adherent.) Although it has not yet been agreed among all to which Men God bestows them, or at least wishes to bestow them; namely, whether to all and every Man, or only to the Elect? About which, more elsewhere. Indeed, some will also call into Controversy whether Regeneration differs from Conversion; which, however, we have already asserted above, and perhaps there will be an occasion to unfold it more fully below. Since, therefore, a friendly Consensus is found among Theologians on the rest, who conspire in this very work, while in their Systems they assign peculiar Chapters for treating all of them, the reason why these are distinguished must be sought more deeply. We believe, however, with the Celebrated Mr. President, that the Distinction and Difference cannot be more happily explained than by the Distinction of the Degrees of Grace, vigorously and according to the tenor of Holy Scripture invented by Augustine, and retained and highly esteemed throughout by Theologians, both Reformed, Lutheran, and finally Pontifical. Compare Wendelin, *Christ: Theol.* c.26. Expl. ad Thesin 2. 3. 4, p. 527. Also Polanus, *Syntag. Theolog.* lib. 6. c. 37. p. 3019. Hence we divide the Grace of God into Prevenient, Preparing, Operating, Cooperating, and Perfecting: in such a way, indeed, that a single Degree of Grace is attributed to a single Benefit of God, and in this way the Benefits themselves or Means, which God uses in saving Man, may be conceived and known as distinct from each other; And that Vocation by Prevenient Grace, Regeneration by Preparing Grace, Conversion by Operating Grace, Sanctification by Cooperating Grace, and finally Confirmation by Perfecting Grace, are constituted as by their Forms, and are divided from each other. Just as every Difference serves two functions, (a), to constitute, (b), to divide. Whence it is also called a Constitutive and Divisive Difference. I will not now be anxious about proving these Degrees of Grace, and laboriously handing down their Distinction from the Holy Scriptures. For besides that I suppose the Truth of these degrees is commonly and rightly conceded by theologians, I

also adduce for establishing them all those Sayings of Holy Scripture which theologians are accustomed to bring forward with great abundance to prove Vocation, Regeneration, Conversion, Sanctification, and Confirmation. This only I contend, that the means of salvation are to be distinguished by the degrees of Grace just mentioned. Which I prove: Because the recited Means of Salvation are either distinct or the same. If the latter: they have been treated in vain in distinct Chapters and under different titles, and are so treated to this day. If the former; the Distinction will have to be made by these Degrees. It is confirmed: Because they cannot be distinguished otherwise, or if otherwise, certainly not so conveniently, as is clear to one who pays attention. And although these Degrees are accommodated to Conversion alone, nothing prevents the same from being applied to discriminating these Means of Salvation: especially unless Conversion is then used complexly for all the Means of Salvation, you would admit that Conversion is confused with Vocation, etc. To this is added: these degrees, understood incomplexly of Conversion, can only be explained Tautologically.

§.3.

Nor does the opinion of Wendelinus, a theologian otherwise most renowned, please here, who in Theolog. Christ: c.26.Thes.1. Explicat.num.1.2. seems to make little of the Distinction of the Means of Salvation, and indeed suggests it is wise to disregard it for the sake of beginners. For by what reason the Confusion of things, which are κατ' ἐξοχήν (pre-eminently) Theological, should not then arise, and be very inconvenient even for beginners, is not permitted to see. If Distinction deserves a place anywhere in Theology, it should certainly be held here. For who would not think it a capital thing to be Converted, and another to be called, even Internally, to Conversion, and hence that Conversion is one thing, and Internal Vocation another. Certainly we cannot be called or intrinsically impelled to that which is Vocation itself. Hence the Celebrated Mr. President further observes in his Commentary on this passage, that the distinction between Internal Vocation and Regeneration is necessary to explain the Sayings of Holy Scripture on Apostasy. You may object: These Sayings only infer an External Vocation, not an Internal one, which does not differ from Regeneration. Resp. Whether this Explanation can be accommodated to those Sayings, I submit to be judged by those who read the Holy Scriptures with veneration and fear of God, and I place before them the Apostle in Heb. 6:4, 5, & 6 to be weighed again and again to be considered: For it is impossible, he says, for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted the heavenly gift, and have become partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the good word of God and the powers of the age to come, and have fallen away, to be renewed again to repentance. Does to be illuminated, to taste the heavenly gifts, to become a partaker of the Holy Spirit, to taste the good Word of God and the powers or Virtues of the age to come, signify only to be called Externally? Since External Vocation, in its literal sense, implies nothing other than the Annunciation of the divine word, and the Reception of that which is announced into the ears. Is it that whoever hears the Word of God is immediately illuminated? Where then are those who hearing they will hear and shall not understand,

and seeing they will see and not perceive? Matt. 13:14. Acts 28:26 & 27? Are those externally called thereby made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and likewise of Conversion? Whence then was Simon, who was not only called, and moreover professed the Truth, at least Externally? Whence, I say, was he in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity? Whence his perverse thought of the heart, Acts 8:22 & 23? Does one externally called, who only takes in the word of God with his ears, at the same time taste the good Word of God and the powers of the age to come? How then, (even κατ' ἄνθρωπον, humanly speaking), do those who are only externally called always resist the Divine Word? From these things it is clear, that to those of whom the Apostle speaks in Hebr. 6, there happens not only an External Vocation, but an Internal one: for all the Predicates that are asserted are internal. It is also clear that they are not thereby regenerated, or converted: for otherwise they would not totally fall from the grace of God, in such a way that it is impossible for them to be renewed to repentance. Whence it is further gathered that Internal Vocation can belong to someone to whom Conversion does not belong, and consequently these are distinct, and indeed must necessarily be distinguished. Note: This passage in Hebrews is understood by some to be about true Believers, and the condition annexed is held to be Impossible. To whom I Respond: An Impossible condition cannot subsist here, at least it is applied contortedly and inconveniently: since the Impiety of these who do not persevere is described there at length, and explained with many predicates, which would not be done if the Holy Author were speaking of something impossible. It remains therefore that the passage is more correctly understood of Hypocrites, as others of our party take it, and thus the Distinction just now advocated is necessary. The same Necessity of distinguishing the remaining spiritual gifts among themselves could be demonstrated to the eye; if we did not think that anyone imbued with theological knowledge would concede it.

Point II. On the Related Existence of Regeneration.

§.1.

In the Related Existence of Regeneration, there are to be considered (1) the Cause [2] the Subject (3) the Object. The principle of Regeneration (Which is better used in place of the Efficient Cause on account of the subtracted Matter) is either That Which, or That By Which. The principle That Which is either Indeterminate: the Whole Holy Trinity. This is hinted at by two very forceful and emphatic Sayings, one of the Old, the other of the New Testament. Isa. 66:9. Shall I bring to the point of breaking forth, and not cause to give birth? said the Lord. Shall I who cause to generate be shut up? said your God. Thus most elegantly Arias Montanus, in the same manner Junius & Tremellius, also Piscator. Luther is wrong: Should I let another break the mother's womb and not also give birth Myself? Says the Lord. And should I let another give birth, and be closed up Myself? Here express mention is made of Spiritual Generation, not to be effected by another with God's permission or Mediate Concurrence (which Luther's version presents), but to be begun and perfected by God Himself. From the New Testament, among many others, this is a notable Saying, which is found in James 1:18. That God,

because he willed, He brought us forth, ἀπεκύησε, by the word of truth, that we might be a kind of firstfruits of His creatures. Again the word Generate occurs, and, what is to be well noted, the Greek word signifies the Acts, both those Antecedent to Generation, such as Conception, and those Concomitant, and those Consequent, e.g., to kiss the offspring. The Determinate principle is then God the Father, 1 Pet. 1:3 & 4. Who, that is, God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, according to His great Mercy has begotten us again to a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Then God the Son, John 1:12. But as many as received Him, to them He gave the right to become children of God. To give someone the right by which he becomes a Son of God, and to regenerate someone, are grammatical Synonyms: For by Faith we are Sons of God. But Faith is the Formal element of Regeneration, as we shall explain below. Then God the Holy Spirit, John 3:5. unless one is born of Water and the Spirit, etc. Nor does the preposition ἐκ, a sign of the Material Cause, pose any obstacle. For besides the fact that these particles: by which, from which, through which, and on account of which, are spurious criteria of the Efficient, Material, Formal, and Final Cause, and are not rarely confused among themselves, it can also be observed specifically of ἐξ, that it is often used to denote the Efficient Cause. e.g. Rom. 11:ult it is said ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα (for from him, and through him, and to him are all things). Where ἐξ cannot denote a Material Cause, unless one were most absurdly to state that all things are particles of the Divine Essence.

§. 2.

The Principle By Which is the Regenerating Grace of God, called by another name Preparing Grace. We do not take the Grace of God Equivocally, for any benefit of God, by which reason we also refer our Natural Life, or that he created us, to Divine Grace. Pelagius used to play with such an Equivocation, distinguishing: Between the Grace of Nature and Creation, of the Law and Revelation, and finally of the Gospel and of Christ, which he sold as Species of Grace, when in respect of their Matter the first two members are pure Equivocals. But by the Grace of God we understand a Special Love in Christ, which, to distinguish it from the more Common grace of God, we call Mercy with the Scripture. Thus the Apostle in Titus 3:5. According to His Mercy He saved us through the washing of Regeneration. And this Mercy is at the same time the Sole internal Reason moving God to regenerate us. Whence, James says God begot us: Because he willed it, c 1.18. It is also the Ultimate reason, into which all others, whatever may be assigned, are resolved. It involves and presupposes the Good Pleasure of God, which the whole business of our salvation acknowledges as its foundation: Indeed, which not even Damnation and Reprobation spurn as their Ultimate Reason. For although to one asking: Why are some reprobated and damned, it is rightly answered: The cause of this thing is sin, yet if one should press further; Why does God reprobate and damn men on account of Sin and Unbelief; When yet His Omnipotence and Omniscience are not lacking here to satisfy His Justice, and to bring the Means of Salvation; Indeed, nothing prevents God from willing the very Merit of Christ to be applied even to final Unbelief? Here no other

Response is available or can be conceived, even from common hypotheses with the opposing side, than the Good Pleasure of God. Wherefore we touch upon this in passing, how futile are those who so immanely attack the Absolute Decree of Reprobation, which some Doctors of the Reformed Church favor, when if the whole Cause is inspected more deeply, one must finally arrive at the Good Pleasure of God. To this Impulsive or internal and Ultimate Moving reason we subordinate the External and Proximate Moving Reason, viz. the Merit of Christ or His Obedience, both Active and Passive. For He Alone has merited for us all saving Grace. Whence He is said to be made for us Wisdom, Justice, Sanctification (which presupposes Regeneration as an Act to a Habit), and Redemption, 1 Cor. 1:30. Without this Merit of Christ, or in a like manner, God would not have regenerated us, indeed He could not even have willed our Regeneration, because His Essential Justice persuades that sins are to be afflicted not with rewards but with punishments. But with the penalty paid by Christ, He embraces us again with His grace, indeed He instructs us ourselves with saving grace. This must be inculcated unto nausea upon the Socinians, who diminish to an excessive degree the Merit of Christ, on which all our Salvation rests, and impudently detract what is owed to Him alone. Therefore, Christ is both the Efficient and the Impelling cause of Regeneration. That these two can have a place in one subject is taught for the same reason by which theologians excellently reconcile: that Christ is both our Intercessor, and at the same time the one with whom the Intercession is performed; consult them on this matter, as they argue it sharply and most solidly against the Socinians. These causes, which we have thus far assigned to Regeneration, could have been confirmed by more Sayings of Scripture; meanwhile, we have made a selection of them on purpose, lest we accumulate those things which touch the matter less. And so much for the Principal Efficient causes.

§. 3.

Regeneration admits absolutely no Instrumental causes. Commonly indeed they assert the Word of God and Baptism. But then Regeneration is used either for Conversion, or not with the accuracy that was due. For us, because we treat of Regeneration precisely accepted as distinct from Conversion and the Regeneration of Infants, neither the Word nor Baptism are Adequate Instrumental Causes. Not the Word: Because of Infants, whose age is an obstacle to their being regenerated through the Word. For this operation of the Spirit of God, with the Word acceding and assisting, is to impel the one to be regenerated to the recognition of his own miserable State, and to the Desire for divine Grace, or a deliberate Act of believing in Christ, for which the perfect use of Reason is required, which everyone observes that Infants lack. Nor Baptism: Because of Adults living in the Church, who are converted to God only at a more advanced age, who are regenerated even without Baptism; For, if they were once legitimately irrigated with Baptism in Infancy, it can in no way be repeated. The Ministerial Cause is also commonly wont to be subjected to the Instrumental, namely the Minister of the Word, Whom the Lutherans exaggerate and extol beyond measure, attributing to him now a Physical, now a Moral, now an Organic power. König, Professor at Rostock, in *Theologia Positiva*, the

section on Regeneration §.464, p. 190, expressly teaches that the Ministers of the Divine Word co-influence with God in the Regeneration of men. Now, Influx is the Formal aspect of a Physical Cause. His words are: The Ministerial Causes of Regeneration are the Preachers of the divine Word and the Dispensers of the Holy Mysteries, called our Spiritual Fathers from their Co-influence in our regeneration. Thus he manifestly divides what is God's alone between God and a creature, and what was believed by the Orthodox to be a Work of God alone, he establishes as a Work to be co-produced by Man also. But it is not strange that Regeneration is ascribed to the Minister of the Word by the Lutherans, who clamor that their Ministers are Αντίθειοι καὶ Αντίχριστοι (in the place of God and Christ), being thus badly taught by Luther's erring Version of that passage in 2 Cor. 5:20. We are ambassadors in God's stead. Whence they are accustomed to absolve confessing sinners with these words: I in God's stead forgive you, etc. The more sound defend only an Organic Power, Danhauer in Hodosophia, p. 717. Which they explain thus: The ministry considered humanly indeed does not possess this power, but is elevated by the Principal Agent. But both opinions are absurd. Ministers influence our Regeneration with absolutely no power. The reason is: because Regeneration is an Internal Work of the Holy Spirit, imbuing our Soul with the Supernatural gift of Faith. How could Ministers effect Supernatural things? Then, the Lutherans themselves concede that Regeneration is a more difficult Work than Creation; now, however, no creature can bring any Power whatsoever to Creation. Therefore, much less to Regeneration. Indeed, no creature can be so elevated by God as to concur in Creation, because Creation is a Property of God. So also, a creature is not made fit to produce Regeneration even by divine Power. You object: You may object: [1] They are nevertheless σύνεργοι τοῦ Θεοῦ (co-workers of God), 1 Cor. 3:5. Resp. In the way, however, that they can be. Namely, by reason of External Actions, such as the Preaching of the Gospel, the Administration of the Sacraments, etc. Not Internal ones, which are to be vindicated for the Holy Spirit in their entirety. (2) But they persuade Morally. Resp. This Moral persuasion is not sufficient for Regeneration, unless Internal Grace from God is added, otherwise Pelagianism arises.

§. 4.

Material & Formal causes, properly so called, have no place in Accidents. The Final Cause is one thing with respect to God, His Glory, which is celebrated as much as possible by the demonstration both of his signal power, by which he vivifies the spiritually dead, and thus those affected by every kind of death: and of his ineffable Mercy, by which he snatches from the same death those who have merited eternal death, indeed those already clinging to the highest peril of death from the very heel to the highest vertex, and makes them partakers of eternal life. Whence Peter, contemplating these things, bursts into praises of God from the threshold of his Epistle, saying, Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his great Mercy has begotten us again to a living hope, 1 Pet. 1:3. Another with respect to us, which is again either Proximate, the Adoption of the regenerated as sons of God: For just as before Regeneration they were enslaved to sin, Sons of perdition, of darkness, of the Devil, etc.

So through Regeneration they are adopted as Sons of God, and acquire the Right of Spiritual Filiation. John 1:12. Or Remote, Eternal Life. This necessarily follows from the Right of Filiation or Adoption, and is most closely connected with it. Whence the Apostle intrepidly concludes. And if children, then heirs—heirs of God and co-heirs with Christ, Rom. 8:17.

§. 5.

The Subject of Regeneration is either Total & of Denomination, or Partial & of Inhesion. The Total is (1) Remote, Man. Not the Good Angels: For these, because they never fell, but remained in their State of Integrity, have no need of Regeneration. Whence they are Sons of God not by reason of Regeneration, Reconciliation, Redemption, but solely by the title of Creation and hence of Confirmation. Before the Fall of the other angels, they were indeed a possible Subject of Regeneration, because, enjoying a Liberty of Indifference to either of the Opposites, and being able to incline to the evil part as well as the good part which they embraced, and hence at least (speaking absolutely,) could become a possible Subject of Regeneration. Because in this way it no more involves a Contradiction for fallen Angels to be regenerated than for Men. But after the Fall of the Devils, and the confirmation of the good Angels, it is plainly impossible for them to be regenerated: Because it is impossible for them to fall, since they are so confirmed by Grace that they can now will only the good, with the Liberty of Contrariety and of Specification ceasing, and only the Liberty of Contradiction or of Exercise remaining along with Spontaneity. Matt. 18:10. Their angels in Heaven always see the face of my Father who is in Heaven. Thus they are preserved and sustained by the present favor of God, Col. 1:16-17. All things consist through Christ. Therefore, also the Angels. Hence it is that they are called Elect Angels, 1 Tim. 5:21. And just as the Good Angels cannot be even a possible Subject of Regeneration: so also the Evil Angels are by no means regenerated; because after the fall no Grace remains for them, but they are reserved under darkness in eternal chains for the judgment of that great God. Jude v. 6. Nor are Irrational Creatures a Subject of Regeneration, because they are absolutely incapable. But only Man, and he not considered in every state, and therefore not Man in his Integrity, which implies no less a contradiction than if Faith in Christ or its Power were attributed to him. But what constitutes (2) the closer Subject is, Fallen Man: No one can rise before he has fallen, so no one can be regenerated before he has been deformed by sin. Eph. 2:1. And you He made alive, when you were dead. (3) The proximate Subject into which Regeneration is introduced is Called Man or one endowed with the Covenant and Prevenient Grace, and therefore dead not Totally, but Partially. Yet not Every one: Because not all who are called or baptized are regenerated; But those who, according to the Variety and Capacity of the Subject, either do not spurn this Grace, or use it rightly, or, if they do not use it, are drawn by a Special Grace from God. And hence then Adults. Acts 2:37. Now when they heard this they were cut to the heart, etc. v. 41. Then those who gladly received his word, etc. (we speak of Regeneration as it pertains to Adults Ordinarily, not Extraordinarily). Then Infants. For the Holy Spirit operates not always

Mediately through the Word and the hearing of it, both in Adults and in Infants, but sometimes also Immediately. Ludovicus Crocius in Antisocinianus, Disp 13. Quæst. 12. against Moscorovius & Smalcius and Smalcius teaches the same concerning Infants, and confirms it with these reasons: (a) Because Regeneration presupposes not so much Nativity, or progress in years; as Carnal and Old Generation. [b] In Regeneration, Man functions not as an Agent, applying himself internally, but as a Patient. Whence with Voetius we reject the Assertion of the Remonstrants in their Response to the Excerpts of the Leiden Professors, p. 101, by which they exclude Infants from the Grace of Regeneration. Disp. Select. part 2, p. 437. You may object: Because Infants are not regenerated through the Word. Therefore they do not enjoy Prevenient Grace: Therefore the Proximate Subject is not well delivered. Resp. [1] The solution is clear from the various Modes and Species of Vocation. [2] Furthermore, although Prevenient Grace is the Formal element of Vocation, it is nevertheless Inadequate. (3) I distinguish between Vocation that is only Internal, and that which is both External and Internal. That Infants are instructed with the Power of Faith will be easily proven, if we show below that they are capable of the very Act of Faith. (4) From this prolix Disquisition, nothing else will finally follow, than that the Mode of Regeneration is one in Adults, another in Infants, which we do not unwillingly concede.

§.6.

The Partial or Inhesive Subject is either (a) Immediate, the Intellect, Rom. 12:2. be transformed by the renewing of your Mind. To this Intellect, a Spiritual Light is poured through Regeneration, so that it may rightly know God, and the things that are of God, which is the meaning of the words annexed to the text just cited: that you may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God. Hence Regeneration is also called Illumination, by which men's eyes are opened, and they are converted from darkness to Light. Acts 26:18. And the regenerated themselves are said to be Illuminated, Heb. 6:4, to be in the light, 1 John 2:9. Indeed, to be Light in the Lord, Eph. 5:8. (2) The Will, into which is then introduced the Law of the Mind which desires to do good. Rom. 7:19, coll. with v. 23. This must be held against the Remonstrants who prattle that the Will lost nothing through the Fall, and has no need for new Grace to be conferred upon it, but is of itself plainly Free. This is refuted by those Sayings of Scripture, in which the Will is expressly said to be corrupt and dead, Eph. 2, Rom. 8:6. The Will is certainly informed by a Habit, as it were, of malice, by which it happens that it always inclines to Evil, and cannot do otherwise. Jer. 13:24. Certainly if the Corruption of the Will is denied, the principal Part of the Corruption is denied, and Man is left for the most part whole, which is akin to the heresy of the Pelagians. For the Will is the Proximate and Formal Principle of Human Actions. Or Mediate (a) the Soul, which does not really differ from the Intellect and the Will. (b) the Body, which through Regeneration becomes a Temple of the Holy Spirit, 1 Cor. 6:19 & 2 Cor. 6:16. (3) The less Principal Faculties of the Soul, such as Memory, the Affections, Appetite, Thoughts, and Conscience, which is expressly said to be cleansed from dead works, Heb. 9:14. [4] All the Members of the Body, which then

become members of Christ, 1 Cor. 6:15, and whereas before Regeneration they had been weapons of Unrighteousness, and Servants of impurity, after it they become Weapons of Righteousness, and Servants of Holiness. Rom. 6:18, 19. See the Great Voetius and others. Although, speaking more accurately, the Body, the less principal Faculties of the Soul and the corporeal Members are the Subject of Sanctification rather than of Regeneration, since Faith properly inheres only in the Intellect and the Will.

§. 7.

The Object here concurs with the Subject: For what is called the Subject by reason of passive Regeneration, the same is called the Object by reason of active Regeneration. Meanwhile, it can be conveniently exhibited by the Terminus from Which and the Terminus to Which. For Regeneration is occupied both with abolishing certain things, and with introducing others. Thus the Terminus from Which is Spiritual Death or the Sin of Origin, both in the First Act, taken for the Impotence of knowing and willing God (such as is in unregenerated Infants), and in the Second Act, for the Actual Lack of this Knowledge and Volition, such as is in Adults. For the Ignorance and Hatred of God, which is a sin in an Infant, is not therefore a sin because the Infant does not by a Discursive Act know and love God, but because it cannot know even by any Natural Power, as is necessary for salvation. But in Adults, Ignorance and hatred of God is also a sin, inasmuch as they are not carried by a Deliberative Act into the Knowledge and Love of God, when nevertheless they ought to know and love in that way, as those who are not impeded by age from knowing and loving. See on this matter the erudite discourse of the Most Reverend Mr. Georg Calixtus, *Epitome Theol.* under the Title *de Peccato*, p. 73 & 74. However, this Original Sin is removed by Regeneration not as to its Essence, Presence, and Stain, but as to its Efficacy, Guilt, and Dominion, and thus not in every Way and simply, but in a certain Way and in a certain respect, namely, so that it can no longer impede the Conception of faith, and hence (to speak more clearly) it is not removed in the thing itself, but only diminished. In such a way that (1) on the part of the Intellect, that complete Blindness in Spiritual matters vanishes and is diminished, by which the natural man does not perceive the things that are of the Spirit of God and cannot know them, because they are spiritually discerned, i.e., by the Power of the Holy Spirit to be conferred through Regeneration, 1 Cor. 2:14. The darkness which belongs to the Unregenerate is dispersed, Eph. 5:8. (2) On the part of the Will, that natural Opposition to the Good is mitigated and corrected, by which Man refuses to be subject to the Law of God, nor is he actually subject, indeed he cannot be subject. Rom. 8:7. Likewise, that the Desires of the Flesh and its works, which are listed in order in Eph. 5 from v. 19 to 22, may be repressed and abolished. Whether Actual Sin understood as to its Dominion is also a Terminus from Which, in the destruction of which Regeneration is occupied, can be inquired into and doubted here not inopportunately. The reason for doubting is: Because we do not have it sufficiently explored whether Infants, as soon as they have left the mother's womb, sin Actually. If, which is doubtful, it is affirmed, then the matter is on solid ground, and Actual Sin is also understood to be clearly referred to

the Terminus from Which of Regeneration. From which Opinion Cel. Voetius is also not far, although he speaks of the Actual Sins of the Unregenerate Adults. loc. cit. p. 437. But if the Doubt is denied, the Question will also have to be denied; Because (as we have several times warned) we consider Regeneration insofar as it is distinguished from Adults and Infants.

§. 8.

The Terminus to Which is Spiritual Life, not as to all its Acts and Effects, nor as to its Perfection and Complement. For the former would confuse Regeneration with Sanctification; the latter would then induce the Error of the Perfectionists and Novatians, as well as the error of the Lutherans, who attribute the same Act of Faith in its Essence and Parts to Regenerated Infants as to Adults. But as to its sole Essence and Presence, either Complete or Incomplete according to the Capacity of the Subject, and thus again not in every way, Simply and Totally, but in a certain way, in a certain respect and Partially, insofar as is required for believing in Christ and beginning a Spiritual Life. In such a way that (1) on the part of the Intellect a certain Supernatural Light is kindled, by which Christ and his merit can be known. (2) On the part of the Will the Love of Christ and Acquiescence in his Satisfaction, and the desire for Salvation may be elicited. Briefly, to retain the words of the never-to-be-praised-enough Voetius, which elucidate the whole matter most of all, loc. supra cit. The Formal and Proximate Terminus ad Quem, he says, are the Supernatural Qualities or Dispositions, which God produces in us, which Scripture calls a new creature, Gal. 6:15; a New Man, Eph. 4:24; the image of God, Col. 3:10; the Divine nature, 2 Pet. 1:4; the Spirit, Gal. 5:17; the Inner Man, Rom. 7:22; the Law of the Mind, v. 23; the Mind, v. 25.

SUBSECTION II. ON THE ESSENCE OF REGENERATION.

In this Subsection, as in a Compendium, all things concerning Regeneration are to be handed down, which constitute the Citadel of the whole Cause. Hence, to touch the thing itself, we must strive according to our ability. We shall therefore assert (1) the Contractible Concept, [2] the Contracting, and (3) the Consecutive. The Contractible or Common Concept is a gratuitous action of God. We call Regeneration an Action, because here we consider it Actively, insofar as it is introduced into man, not Passively, insofar as it is admitted or received by Man, in view of which it would become a Passion of his Genus. For, what we will then urge more pressingly, Man behaves Purely Passively in Regeneration, nor does he perform anything that deserves the name of Action in producing it. Whence we also say that it is an Action of God, Exclusively of all other things, which bear the name of God either not at all, or equivocally, but not Exclusively of the θεάνθρωπος (God-man), since he is the Highest and True God. *Rom. 9.* But God acts here not by a Causality different from himself, which is the way of Creatures, but in the manner in which the other Actions of God are understood to proceed from him. But it is especially to be observed: that Regeneration is a Voluntary Action of God, undertaken by God not for any merit of ours, but proceeding from a sole spontaneous Love toward the human Race, and that in Christ, *Eph. 2:4, 5.* *But God, who is rich in mercy, because of His great love with which He loved us, even when we were dead in trespasses, made us alive together with Christ.* This saying, above all others, deserves to be noted in this Chapter of theology. Hence, All Merit of Congruity, and whatever Preparatory Dispositions are said by the Pelagianizing Pontiffs to concur with some Causality to Regeneration, are to be kept far away, and indeed by this and other twin Sayings of Holy Scripture they vanish of their own accord into thin air. To the Socinians who prattle that our Regeneration is not a benefit, because Christ, according to our hypothesis, merited it with an infinite ransom and a most full satisfaction, we retort, you who speak blasphemies and lay most dangerous snares for our highest Consolation in Life and death, we block you with this one thing: That something can be and be called both Gratuitous and Merited, though in different respects. Thus our Regeneration is both gratuitous, in that we obtain it from God by no merit of ours, and moreover also merited by Christ, who, by his Blood shed for the sins of the whole world, *1 John 2:2,* brought it about that eternal Salvation should be offered to us who are unworthy, and thereby the way to our Regeneration should be opened. And certainly if the Enemies of truth would consider this one thing with themselves, namely that the very Satisfaction of Christ is gratuitous, and is derived from the ineffable Mercy of the heavenly Father, they would have reason to repent, to be converted, and to hold our Regeneration as a most unmerited and beneficial Action of God.

§. 2.

The Contracting Concept or the Formal element of Regeneration itself we place in the Spiritual Life as its beginning, or (to speak more clearly) in the Power of believing in Christ, not separated from every Act. The Holy Scripture intends this very thing when it

contends that through Regeneration we are made alive from the dead. Eph. 2:4,5,6. Likewise Col. 2:13. And you, being dead, says the Apostle, in your trespasses, He has made alive together with him. And to the Romans 6, from v. 4 to 8. That just as Christ was raised from the dead, so we also should walk in newness of life. It aims at the same thing when it shows everywhere that in the Regenerate a light is kindled and we are illuminated, Eph. 1:18. The eyes of your understanding being enlightened, etc. 2 Cor. 4:6. has shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge. Likewise, when Regeneration itself is intimated through Illumination. Eph. 5:14. Therefore He says: "Awake, you who sleep, Arise from the dead, And Christ will give you light." With very many other Sayings passed over in silence. We constitute the Power, not precisely the Act, of believing in Christ to be the Formal element of Regeneration, on account of Infants, both because their Regeneration consists more in the Power of believing than in the Act, and because if we were to place the Essence of the Regeneration of Infants in the Act of believing, it would be most difficult to explain how all Infants, that is, those of the covenant, are regenerated, and if they are regenerated (which must be absolutely maintained on account of Universal Grace, as we shall explain more fully below), how they do not fall from Regeneration, when yet daily Experience is our Teacher that not all Infants of Christians, when they grow up, walk in Faith and Piety, but are very often enticed by a diabolical and voluptuous Life and are led astray to perish eternally. Or it would have to be maintained that one can fall from the Grace of God by an act of true believing: Which contravenes the Orthodox Faith and Holy Scripture, which teaches that Christ sent up prayers to the Heavenly Father for the Perseverance of all Believers, John 17:20. And that Christ is never not heard by the Father, He expressly testifies in John 11:42. And yet we do not think that Regeneration is situated in the sole power of believing, by which reason we would confuse the broadly defined Regeneration, to which we above made Prevenient Grace proper, with this Regeneration taken a little more strictly. Hence we say that the Formal element of Regeneration is the Power of believing in Christ, not alien to every Act. Alien indeed from the Complete Act of Faith, and considered as to all its parts: which the Perseverance of Believers proves. Yet not alien from every Act of Faith, even an Incomplete and Partial one, such an Act and of such a quantity as befalls Infants, as we shall prove in its proper place, and it derogates absolutely nothing from Perseverance, a most excellent Dogma in the Holy Scriptures. Which indeed salutes Faith, even if Imperfect as to its Degree, as True Faith, and in this sense the Imperfectly Believing as Truly believing, and such indeed as will never fall from the Grace of God, according to that of Isaiah: A bruised reed He will not break, And smoking flax He will not quench, etc. Isa. 42:2. Meanwhile, they nowhere promise the gift of perseverance to a Faith that is Imperfect as to its Parts, which is deprived of either an Actual Knowledge of Christ, or of Repentance, or finally of a reflexive and probative Confidence. Perseverance indeed follows upon *ὀλιγοπιστίαν* (little faith), but not immediately upon *μεροπιστίαν* (partial faith). Regeneration is therefore nothing other than an Awakening from spiritual death joined with a certain power to believe in Christ and joined with a confused act of believing in him.

§.3.

We proceed to the Consecutive Concepts or the Properties of Regeneration, which, being hidden in its Formal aspect, expose it to the most splendid light and bring it into the open. The first is Supernaturalness, by which Regeneration is a Supernatural Gift, both in respect of its Principle: because it is derived from that which is above nature, Rom. 8:7. Ezech. 36:26. 1 Tim. 2:25. And in respect of its Form: because it is plainly unknown and impossible to Nature, as such. For although Man by his Natural Powers, without the Special Grace of the Holy Spirit and the gift of Regeneration, can know Natural things, to which all those things pertain which are either necessary or profitable for transacting Life, and even Moral things, namely the virtuous Actions commanded in the Decalogue; Meanwhile, Spiritual and Supernatural things, such as the Mystery of the Trinity, the Doctrine of eternal Life, and what is connected with this Doctrine, the Incarnation of Christ, his Satisfaction, can neither be investigated nor understood from the light of nature, so much the less can the Power of believing in Christ or Regeneration be obtained. Whence results (1) the Necessity of Regeneration for attaining eternal Salvation. Because from Nature we obtain no knowledge of Christ, not even the slightest, and outside of Christ and the Apprehension of him no Hope of Salvation shines, we are certainly in need of Regeneration. Hence Christ's Statement: Unless one is born again, etc. John 3:5. And the Apostle, In Christ, he says, nothing avails except a new creation, Gal. 6:15. (2) Pure passivity with respect to Man. For because Regeneration is Supernatural, and we are in no way able to attain to Supernatural things by the powers of Nature, we do nothing here, but only admit the Action of the Holy Spirit, whether we enjoy Special or even Universal Grace, and hence we are not a Co-cause in Regeneration, but only its Subject.

§. 4.

You object (1) Through Universal Prevenient and Preparing Grace Man receives the Free Will to believe in Christ and not to believe, and by this Benefit he determines himself to Regeneration, and thus becomes a co-cause of his own Regeneration. Resp. I deny that by Universally and Orthodoxly understood Grace man obtains the Free Will to believe and not to believe, and by this benefit can determine himself to Regeneration, so as to become a co-cause of his Regeneration. For the power to believe is one thing, and the Free Will to believe is another. The former is content with a certain faculty for performing a Spiritual Act; the latter, however, implies (a) an Equilibrium towards either of the Opposites, and (b) the Power of effecting Faith, which in the not-yet-converted involves Synergism and a Contradiction. This only follows from Universal Grace: that a Man endowed with Universal Grace, first has suffered Prevenient Grace, which Passion, if he does not resist it, is followed by another Passion, by which he is regenerated. Then, even if we concede this Non-Repugnance in Adults to be an Action, it does not therefore follow that Man is a Co-cause of Regeneration, or actively concurs in it, but only this is gathered, that Man, elevated by the Prevenient Grace of God, performs this Condition, which having been performed, he suffers Regeneration impressed upon him by God. You

insist: But in this way Man moves or impels God to his Regeneration, and thus, if not an Efficient Cause, he is yet to be held as its impulsive cause: But this, if not Pelagianism, at least smacks of Romanism. Resp. I deny the Consequence. Not every condition is at once a Moving or impelling Reason. Man is indeed regenerated when he does not resist, but not because he does not resist. Thus a Believing man is saved, not because he believes. (For Faith is neither a Formal nor a Virtual Impulsive cause nor a Reason for God to grant us eternal life) but when he believes. You object (2) But that Action, by which an Adult Man endowed with Prevenient Grace acquires Regeneration, seems to be more excellent than the Regeneration of Infants, because it is a Deliberate Act, while that of Infants is only Elicited and Imperfect. Whence results an Absurdity: that an Adult Man regenerates himself, and in a more excellent manner than infants are regenerated by God. Resp. We have immediately warned that we do not place the Regeneration of Infants in an Act, although we maintain that it is not devoid of all Act. That is, we understand the act of believing to be Really and Essentially distinct from the power, but not separably. But that power of believing, which constitutes the Regeneration of Infants, is not a Transient Act, but the Existence of faith, and therefore Faith, and Actual Faith, but nonetheless Incomplete, and thus not anything else, outside the Disposition of Faith, just as a Habit of Faith, or Faith complete in all its parts and rooted, whether of a greater or lesser degree, belongs to the Converted who have attained the full use of reason.

§ 5.

The second Property is Instantaneousness, by which it occurs in an Instant, when it occurs, but not so that it always occurs when it is offered: For God does not always snatch away from a man the grace of believing granted to him as soon as the man rejects it, but not rarely insists with his long-suffering, especially if the man is born and educated in the Church itself. He has stretched out his hands all the day to a rebellious people, as he once did to the Jews, Isa. 65:2, and very often strives with the desire of gathering them. Matt. 23:37. Jerusalem, Jerusalem etc. how often I wanted to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, but you were not willing. And though by a just judgment on account of man's pertinacity and refractory malice, He frequently hardens and blinds man by the annunciation of His word, e.g., Pharaoh and the Jews. Much less do we speak of the whole Act of Conversion, which is entirely successive, with both Orthodox and Lutheran Doctors agreeing on this.

§6.

The third is Resistibility, which, if not admitted, the Regeneration of all is inferred. However, this must be restricted to Adults: For it cannot be understood how Infants, destitute of the use of Reason, should resist Divine Grace; But that Adults resist Regenerating Grace is plain from many Sayings of Scripture. One stands out above all for us, taken from the Sermon of Stephen, Acts 7:51. You stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears! You always resist that Holy Spirit; as your fathers did, so do you. You will say: the stiff-necked etc. are introduced as Resisting; but not those who have been

endowed with Preparing Grace. Resp. It is clear from the preceding Chapters that these, whom Stephen calls stiff-necked, had already previously received the Gospel of Christ from the Apostles, and therefore had enjoyed the Power of embracing the Christian religion; consequently, they were Resisting and unbelieving not merely Negatively, but Privatively. For we believe that an Immediate External Vocation is never denuded of an Internal one; But as long as Men are called, so long do we maintain that the Power to obey is supplied to them, through itself and in a manner revealed to us. Otherwise, an immense amount is taken away from the Holy Ministry and its Practice, so that it is little short of being exposed to ridicule. For to call to salvation Men deprived of all power of coming, and not at the same time to remove from them the Impotence of obeying, is to thresh empty straws, and to lose oil and labor.

The fourth is Imperfectibility, which becomes most conspicuous especially in Infants. For these, because they lack the perfect use of the intellect, enjoy a less rooted Power of believing in Christ, and are destitute of only a small Act, not however of all, just as they are not destitute of all Intellect, unless one would wish to deny that they are Men and to apply here the Distinction of the most Celebrated Physician Mr. Deusingius between a Man and a Human Animal.

SUBSECTION III. ON THE COEXISTENCE OF REGENERATION.

We have referred the Effects of Regeneration to Coexistence; Not because the Effects always exist at the same time as the Subject, but because they are conceived as being properties of it, or following from it. But one unique Effect occurs that is especially worthy of consideration: The Inheritance of eternal life, which in respect to Adults is Contingent, but in respect to Infants is Necessary. That it is Contingent in respect to Adults is clear, because in respect to them Regeneration is Resistible. If therefore they resist it, and are not sustained by a particular Grace, they do not attain the salvation, the power of obtaining which they had been given. This is clear from *Matt. 23:38. See! Your house is left to you desolate.* Also *Acts 13:46. But since you reject it and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, behold, we turn to the Gentiles.* Experience also speaks the same, which has taught that this power of believing in Christ and thus the inheritance of salvation has often been taken away from a whole region on account of ingratitude, formerly in the Asiatic Churches, and indeed in the preceding century in other places, so that there is cause for us daily to recall to each other's memory the Admonition of Christ in *Luke 13:3. but unless you repent you will all likewise perish.* By this, however, we wish nothing to be derogated from the Special Grace of God, by which it most often happens, indeed, as far as is known to us, in all who are to be saved, that although they resist the Divine Grace, with Nature always striving and prone to corruptibility, they are nevertheless drawn by God to Salvation. *John 6:44.* And thus they are compelled to come to the Heavenly Wedding, *Luke 14:23.* Where the word ἀναγκάζειν (to compel) is found, which is not exhausted by Moral Suasion. But in respect to Infants, as such, the Effect of Regeneration is necessary, because they cannot resist it on account of their age. This is a great Solace to Christian Parents, who, when their newborn infants, even those not yet baptized, exchange life for death, can most effectively console themselves, because they know that they do not exchange spiritual life, which they live, for spiritual death, since of them is the kingdom of God, *Matt. 19:14.* And the Heavenly Father does not wish that any of these little ones should perish. *Matt. 18:14.*

§2,

Very many things opposed to this Doctrine could be brought forward, but we reject them for the Second Disputation, where we shall pursue them more fully. At the end, it could be asked: Is there not some Practice of this doctrine? This we deny from the definition of Practice, which requires a Producibile Object, from the Truth and Hypothesis of the major Philosophers. Practice is so alien to the Regeneration of both Adults and Infants, that whoever wishes to urge it here, implicates himself in the most shameful error of Pelagius. Meanwhile, if Practice is used abusively for Use, we do not deny that there are very many Uses of this Doctrine. However, we do not now present those that are obvious to every Christian, but we place the colophon on the First Disputation. **TO GOD ALONE BE THE GLORY.**

SECOND DISPUTATION ON CONVERSION

Section I. NOMINAL KNOWLEDGE.

§. 1.

From the more general, with God's help, we descend to the more special, and we who have contemplated regeneration abstractly will now consider it as restricted to a subject. At the outset, however, we advise that we will not establish different species for every diversity of subjects capable of regeneration; but only that which also varies the very form of regeneration itself. Thus, for us, the regeneration of an adult will be one and the same, whether he was born in the Church, or was constituted outside the precincts of the Church and comes to it, being called: because here regeneration is found to be formally the same. In a like manner, the species of infantile regeneration will not be different, whether it happens to an infant born of covenanted parents, or whether it can at least happen also to an infant born of non-Christian parents but in the Church itself, and sprinkled with the water of Baptism with the parents either knowing, or not knowing, but in the meantime not unwilling. Since again, for the same reason of form, regeneration would be the same. The regeneration of Adults and of Infants are a different matter, which vary the forms themselves along with the subjects. For this reason, we shall treat of them as different species of regeneration.

§. 2.

The Regeneration of Adults is called by another and, as it were, its own name, by which it is Adequately distinguished from the Regeneration of Infants: Conversion, a name which is never used to designate the Regeneration of Infants. But it is used either of an Adult once Regenerated and Converted, whether Standing or Stumbling, such as was the Conversion of David, after he had perpetrated adultery and homicide, 2 Sam. 12:13. Nor do we doubt that David retained the Holy Spirit and the Root of Faith, even when he was overwhelmed by these sins, as he himself removes all scruple in Ps. 51:11,13, where he prays to God not to take his Holy Spirit from him, a prayer he could not have used if he had been utterly deserted by the Holy Spirit. Such also was the Conversion of the Apostle Peter, after he had denied his Lord Christ, Matt. 26:75. For we do not think his Faith was in any way abolished by this denial, if we wish to have faith in the words of Christ, whose authority ought to be greatest among all, who said, I have prayed for you, that your faith should not fail. A Conversion of this kind is not so much a Conversion, since no total Aversion precedes it, but repentance for a deed. Or it is said of an Adult completely alienated from God, dead in sins, and possessing not even a shadow of Faith, such as was Saul in Acts 9:5. The former can be called Continued Conversion; the latter, Inchoate Conversion. We are not concerned with the former here, since it cannot be an inferior of Regeneration, but is either a Mode of Conversion or Sanctification itself. The latter is the subject of this place.

§.3.

This Conversion is taken either Broadly, for the whole State of the converted, inasmuch as it includes their Justification, Adoption, Communion with God, Sanctification, etc. Thus we commonly say: This Man is among the Converted, that is, among the Pious, among those whose is eternal life. In which signification it is used in Acts 26:20. I declared to the Gentiles that they should turn to God, doing works befitting Repentance. Or Strictly, inasmuch as it denotes one Moment of that State, and is contradistinguished from the rest. The former we do not treat again, being content with the latter alone.

§. 4.

Thus it is used either Intransitively for those Acts by which a Sinner acknowledges his faults, grieves over them, flees to Christ, and receives himself to amendment, called by one name, Repentance; or Transitionally for the Action of God, by which He works in man the things just now recounted. The Lutherans delight in these Terms everywhere, and among them especially the celebrated in his own circles, D. Joh. Musaeus, Professor of Ordinary Theology in the Academy of Jena, in his Treatise on Conversion, and elsewhere. To us, those Terms (although one ought otherwise to be easy in Terms) are not pleasing in every part, since we must diligently strive to remove from ourselves, as far as can be done, even the suspicion of Pelagianism, which vanishes all the more quickly, the more we use here Terms that are more opposed to the Pelagian Dogma. Whence we think it is better in their place to substitute with our own Theologians others, by which they are accustomed to say that Conversion is taken either Passively for Repentance and the Action of Man, or Actively for Conversion and the Action of God. See Voetius Part 2. Disp. Select. p. 436 & Henricus à Diest. Mellefic. Catech. p.406. Voetius warns that this Distinction is to be accurately observed so that all predicates may be dextrously applied to each. For there occur some things (these are the words of the Great Voetius) which are proper to this, and some which in turn are proper to that, and some which are proper to both Regenerations. In the same sense, he says the word Conversion is taken in a threefold way on the preceding page, 435. (1) as it notes the Act of God alone [2] the Complete Act of God and Man (3) the Formal Act of Man.

§. 5.

Amesius, Modul. Theol. Lib. 1. c. 26. num. 20. on the Reception of Christ, which for him is one and the same with Conversion, cf. n. 19, distinguishes it very forcefully in his manner according to the saying of the Apostle in Philip. 3:12, I was apprehended that I may apprehend: into Active and Passive. For him, Active is the Elicited Act of Faith, by which the one called now rests wholly in Christ, etc. Passive is that by which the Spiritual Principle of Grace is engendered in the will of man. Although we consider that Active and Passive Reception, and likewise Conversion taken Actively and Passively, constitute one and the same Action, and are called now an Action, now a Passion only due to the different consideration of the principle or terminus a quo, namely God, and of the

subject or terminus ad quem, namely Man; nevertheless, we here take Conversion more Actively, inasmuch as it designates the Action of God, than Passively, inasmuch as it designates the Action of Man; especially since, as Bucanus notes in Instit. Theol. loc. 18. quaest. 16. p. 183, Conversion used for the Action of Man in the holy scriptures, signifies not the Interior Conversion, which alone is the subject here, but the Exterior, by which Man converts himself to good works.

§. 6.

König, Theol. Posit. §. 482, makes the synonyms of Conversion to be Vivification, Regeneration, the Creation of a new Heart, and Repentance. But all confusedly: For the first three are broader than Conversion and can be said not only of Adults, but also of Infants. The last becomes a Synonym not of Conversion taken Actively, but Passively, as our theologians rightly observe, Bucanus Instit. Theol. Loc. 30. quaest. 1. Diest. loc. cit. Who call both Repentance and Contrition, and the Greek words, μετάνοιαν, and μεταμέλειαν, Synonyms of Conversion taken Passively. Consult also Joh. Musaeus who in the cited Tractate deals with these words ex professo p. 29, 53. More correctly held as Synonyms are the Greek ἐπιστρέφειν used Genuinely and Actively in Luke 1:16 & 17. And many of the children of Israel he will turn (ἐπιστρέψει). And again: For he himself will go before, to convert (ἐπιστρέψαι). Also the Substantive ἐπιστροφή, which occurs in Acts 15:3. Also the Latin Resurrectio & Resurrectio prima, Apoc. 20:5.

Section II. REAL KNOWLEDGE.

SUBSECTION I. On Existence.

§. 1.

In order to prove the Existence of Conversion, we begin from its Causes. From the causes, I say, into which, as into a sea, all the Controversies which are usually agitated in this Chapter, flow together with a great confluence. First, we will expound what is True; then, what is false, in General.

§. 2.

The Principal Efficient Cause is God himself (1) ἐσιωδῶς (essentially). Jer. 31:18. Turn me, that I may be turned, for you are the Lord. Lam. 5:21. Restore us to Yourself, O Lord, that we may return. Acts 11:18. Then God has also granted to the Gentiles repentance. 2 Tim. 2:25. if God perhaps will grant them repentance. &c. (2) ὑποστατικῶς (hypostatically). God the Father, John 6:44. No one can come to Me unless the Father has drawn him. God the Son, Tit. 3:5. coll. with v. 4. He saved us, that is, God our Savior, through the washing of Regeneration. Matt. 23:37. Jerusalem, Jerusalem &c. God the Holy Spirit, John 16:8. ff. To the Principal Cause belongs the Impulsive, which is either προηγουμένη (antecedent) or προκαταρκτική (preliminary). The former is the mere and gratuitous Mercy and Benevolence of God toward us, Eph. 2:4, 5. Because of His great love with which He loved us, He made us alive together. The same Peter testifies in 1 Epist. 1:3. The latter is Christ with his Merit and Satisfaction, who is at the same time the Meritorious cause. Whence Eph. 1:6. God is said to have made us beloved to Himself through that Beloved One.

§. 3.

The less-Principal and Instrumental Cause (if we speak of that which happens mostly and Ordinarily) is the Word of God; producing Conversion not by a Quidditative Virtue, either from itself or Participatively (as König wills, Theol. Pos. §. 491); for no thing that is not God himself can participate in this Virtue and Efficacy, namely, of converting man: but by an Adjunctive Virtue, Adjunctive, i.e., by the Virtue of the Holy Spirit which is joined with the Word of GOD. This is clear from the fact that if the Word of God possessed an intrinsic and inherent power of converting, anyone who heard it would be converted. But since many hear and are not Converted, indeed they never even reach the point with King Agrippa that they are almost converted, or almost persuaded, Acts 26:28. Therefore, it is rightly concluded that the Word of God by itself cannot effect Conversion. You object: That many are not converted upon perceiving the word does not argue a defect of the virtue inherent in the Word, but the obstinate malice of man. Resp. Therefore, the Word of God will produce this Effect either Necessarily, or Contingently. Not the former: Otherwise all would certainly be converted; Nor the latter: Because every Creature is plainly incapable of either receiving or exercising an Idiom or action of God in any way. Indeed, it follows from this that our Conversion should be credited to a

Creature, which is absurd. Hence, the most illustrious Mr. Rutherford shows that the Word without the efficacious Action of God, and therefore Moral suasion without a Hyperphysical motion, can effect nothing whatsoever. Exercit. Apologet. pro divina gratia, Exercit. 3. cap. 1. & 2. Also the Noble Mr. Maccovius, Disp. 4. Collegii Theol. We add, however, on purpose that this is to be understood of what happens Ordinarily; For we do not doubt that God can convert a man Extraordinarily even without the Word. An example is available in Cornelius the Centurion, Acts 10:2, 3.

§. 4.

The Ministerial Cause are the Pastors of the Church, Acts 2:40 & 37; 2 Cor. 5:19. Inasmuch as they announce the Word of God, with which God joins His Virtue: For they cannot illuminate the heart, or excite a pious desire in it. Whence Ravanellus most elegantly in his Bibliotheca Sacra under the word Conversion: It is not, he says, in the power of the Minister to convert Men to God. For the minister, however Excellent, converts only those in whose hearts God acts Efficaciously. Thus John the Baptist did not convert all the Sons of Israel, but many, namely only those whom God Efficaciously called, Luke 1:16. And yet not only the Ordinary Minister of the Word, but also any other, whom God uses to reveal His Will to the Unconverted and to show him the way of Salvation. Examples of this are not lacking in the Sacred writings, Acts c. 9, v. 10 & 6:18, v. 26.

§.5.

Thus we have handed down what is true; what conflicts with falsity and error now remains to be expounded. But just as All Truth is almost always so constituted, that it is not only itself the Lydian stone, to which false things are brought to be examined, but also the cornerstone, against which the examined things are broken and demolished, but moreover it is a Stone of small Magnitude placed in the middle, from which it is very easy to err for one who is accustomed to incline either to the left or to the right: so also this most splendid Truth, showing the one and only genuine Way and Cause of salvation, namely the Grace and Mercy of God, indeed pronouncing God himself, is found situated between two most dangerous syrtes, as between Scylla and Charybdis. About which Strigelius very judiciously and circumspectly admonishes his Auditors in his Loci Theologici, published by Christoph Pezelius, part 1, loc. on the Free Will of man, p. 328 & 329. Let the Studious understand, he says, that we are not without peril in the Explanation of this and other Loci of doctrine. For it is a difficult navigation between the two Cyanean rocks, between which the Argonauts navigated, as Apollonius narrates: since there is a danger that, while avoiding one rock, the ship may strike the other and be broken. Therefore, to hold that course in Navigation, so that the ship declines both fatal rocks, is not only a matter of great art, but also of a certain rare felicity. And a little after he applies this: The same happens to us, he says, when we are engaged in the Disputation on Free Will unto salvation. For as Pelagius defends this hyperbole, by which he immoderately praises human Powers etc. So the Manichees and the like sin on the other side, transforming man into a Stone, a Brute, and whatever is of the same kind.

The great Man indicates two Extremes to be fled worse than a dog or a snake, on one side Manichaeism, on the other side Pelagianism. The same is observed by the great Light of the March in his time, Job Bergius, in the Treatise *Der wille GOTTES von aller Menschen Seeligkeit* p. 55. He makes two erring parties in this Doctrine. Of which one part goes a little too far to the Right, the other to the Left in the matter, and therefore one part is accused by the other of Pelagianism or Semi-Pelagianism, but the other of Semi-Manichaeism or Stoicism or Enthusiasm. The most Celebrated Fridericus Spanhemius applauds this in *Syntag. Theol. Dip de Lib. Arbit: Thef ult.* p. 239. As does the Excellent Dreier, *Tract: Gründliche Erörterung etlicher schwerer Theologischer Fragen. Chap. Von der Bekehrung der Menschen zu Gott*, p. 474.

§. 6.

Therefore, so that we too may the more happily be withdrawn from the imminent danger, we think we shall be doing a worthwhile service if we deduce each error from its Origin, though briefly. We shall place Manichaeism before Pelagianism, as it is a more obsolete error, and less received in this our age. The very first authors of Manichaeism are said to be Valentinus, Cerdon, and Marcion, around the year of our Lord 140, who laid the first foundations for the error by positing that Sin did not enter the world through the free Will of Man, but that there are two Principles, one Good, the other Evil, each of which created a Substance; the Good, a Good one; the Evil, an Evil one, which Substances were like Trees of Good and Evil Actions as their fruits. And just as a good tree could in no way bear bad fruit, and conversely a bad tree good fruit: so all Actions, whether they be good or evil, are so from the Good and Evil Substance, that the Good ones are necessarily done by the Good, but the Evil ones are necessarily from the Evil Substance. These were followed by Manes from Persia in the Third Century, who, among other Delusions, about which see *Instruct. Historico-Theologicas* of Joh. Forbes, lib. 4, c. 8, Sect. 2, and *Locos Theologicos* of Victorinus Strigelius, part 1, p. 359, imagined there to be Two Substances in man: one Good; the other Evil. The Good one effects this in man, that whatever good Actions he performs, they necessarily proceed from him; but whatever evil ones he perpetrates, they are owed to the Evil Substance, as if necessitating man to perform them. And so he uniquely labored to destroy Free Will entirely. Conf. Dreier, l. c. p-475. From this, the Manichees have their name, whom all of sane-minded Antiquity most sharply opposed. So much so, that some even fell into the other Extreme, namely Pelagianism. See the same Author, p-477.

§.7.

After the Manichees, at the end of the same Century, arose the Enthusiasts, a little better than the Manicheans, who, rejecting those two Contrary Principles, and also being ignorant of the two Substances, posited that man, far from the Holy Spirit, cannot effect Spiritual Motions; So far, so good; but they added, and this badly: that the Holy Spirit is not Ordinarily efficacious through the Word, but invades the human Soul in a dream and amidst Speculations, and regenerates it without any struggle. They also

fostered other errors, which it is not relevant to commemorate here. Augustine deals with these more prolixly in *De Haeresibus*, c. 57.

§. 8.

There are those who think that the Predestinarians, as they are called, drew upon and propagated the essence of the Manicheans, although Forbesius seems more correctly to deny that any ever existed designated by this appellation in *Instruct. Historico Theol. lib. 8. c. 19*. Although he does not deny that some of the Semi-Pelagians, among them Faustus, and especially Gennadius of Marseilles, out of Hatred for the Augustinian doctrine and Love for their own Dogma about some natural liberty of the Will in good things, saluted the followers of Augustine with the name of Predestinarians. To whom some even today number Godescalc, a Monk of Rheims, teaching in Gaul in the 9th century. But by the same right by which the former were named Predestinarians. The already mentioned Forbesius thinks that Ussher proves this solidly in his *History of Godescalc*.

§. 9.

We, for whom it was not our purpose to explain all these Authors, because we are excluded by the narrowness of time, nor does the present Cause urge it, now leave it in the middle, whether Heretics called Predestinarians ever existed in reality. Meanwhile, we believe it is placed beyond all shadow of a doubt that in the last century there were some, and there exist today, who derogate too much from Free Will, so that they seem to introduce a certain Fatal Necessity. To the former class we refer Luther, Brenz, and others of the Lutherans, about whom Chemnitz says, p. 488, Even among our own, he says, there are those who often do not seem to speak in the same way, while one proposes to oppose Pelagianism, another Enthusiasm. And from this, contradictions are fabricated and unnecessary Conflicts are stirred up. Also some of the Scholastics, among whom are especially the Thomists and Dominicans. To the latter class, we refer those whom they call Supralapsarians in Belgium itself, about whom Wendelinus says in *Systh. Theol. Majori*, There are some, he says, among the Doctors who are otherwise Orthodox, etc. p-333. Whose opinion was also struck by an Anathema from the Synod of Dort, See the Synod of Dort itself, Conclusion. *Errorum circa doctrinam de Perseverantia Sanct. p. 376*. We have brought forth their Doctrine as the first reef to be avoided concerning this Article on the Conversion of Man and his Free Will. To what extent, however, the Free Will of Man is to be denied and Divine Grace is to be asserted with them, we will pursue more fully after we have produced the other error, which sins by Defect.

§. 10

Pelagianism owes its Origin to a too fervent Refutation of Manichaeism, and to an ignorance of urging and teaching Practice and Good Works. For when the Fathers

applied themselves a little too earnestly in refuting the Manichaeian Error, and in consequence spoke more mildly and less than was proper about Original Sin, the seeds of the Pelagian Heresy began to be sparsely sown. Hutter on Original Sin c. 3. p. 87: The Pelagians themselves always sharply opposed the Manichaeians, and the more deeply they progressed in refuting them, the more they were confirmed in their own error. Thus Augustine in Book 2 to Boniface against the two Epistles of the Pelagians, chap. 1. These Pelagians, he says, do well to pronounce Anathema on the Manichaeians, and to contradict their errors: But they do two Evils, for which they themselves are to be anathematized: One, that they accuse Catholics of the error of the Manichaeians, the other that they themselves introduce the Heresy of a new error. For it is not because they do not labor under the disease of the Manichaeians that they are therefore sound in Faith. There is not one kind of pestilence, just as in bodies, so also in minds. Therefore, just as a physician of the body would not have immediately pronounced free from the danger of death one whom you denied was dropsical, if you had perceived him to be sick with another lethal disease. So truth does not congratulate these because they are not Manichees, if they are insane with another kind of Perversity. Wherefore, it is one thing that we anathematize with them, another what we anathematize in them.

§. 11.

The heresiarch, whose name they bear, was Pelagius, a monk from Britain, initially of great Authority among all, both on account of his signal erudition, and because he was one of all men most devoted to discipline and an upright life, whence Augustine at first, concealing his name, censured his Errors; Chemnitz, Loc. Theol. Loc. 6. c. 8. p. 203. But afterwards, when he began to deny Original Sin more clearly, and to extol Free Will beyond measure, teaching that it was sufficient by its own and Natural Powers to perform all Spiritual works, and thus could attain eternal Salvation: he was called to Judgment before the Council of Diospolis in Palestine, where, fearing ecclesiastical censure, he himself condemned those Dogmas of which he was accused, in the year of our Lord 415. But deceitfully and Equivocally, as Augustine teaches throughout his Writings. Freed from this fear, he returned to his vomit, and was therefore, with his disciple Coelestius, condemned and pronounced a Heretic. (1) By the African Fathers in two Councils: the Council of Carthage, and the Council of Milevis (2) By another certain Council which was also celebrated in Carthage. (3) by the Council of Ephesus along with Nestorius. Concerning which see Forbes, lib. 8. c. 1. num. 2, 3, 4 & 9.

§.12.

Pelagius indeed fostered many most dangerous Opinions, but the one which should be noted by us here consisted in this, that he defended a natural Free Will in Spiritual matters, and imagined that man could be truly pious by Nature. Although afterwards, when he feared anathemas, he rejected the word Nature, and substituted in its place the word Grace, yet with the greatest equivocation, while he explained Grace now by Creation, now by the Annunciation of the Law. A witness of the former Acceptance is

that Axiom of the Pelagians: By the Grace of God we are men, by ourselves we are Just. See Hildebrand, *Disp. Theol.* 15. num. 6. By the latter he understood, that God first reveals His decree and counsel to us in His Word, and therefore calls us Externally; this having been done, Man by Nature or by Natural Powers can assent to this Vocation, and do what God has commanded. Meisner, *Anthropol. Decad.* 2, quest. 2, p. 7. In the same sense he distinguished between the Grace of Nature, of the Law, and of the Gospel. He also taught that three things in Free Will should not be confused: To be able, To will, and To be: We, he says, distinguish these three thus and arrange them as if in a certain order: In the first place we put To be able, in the second To will, in the third To be. We locate To be able in Nature, To will in the Will, To be in the Effect. The first of these, i.e., To be able, properly pertains to God; who conferred it on His creature: The other two, i.e., To will and To be, are to be referred to Man, because they descend from the fount of the Will. Therefore, in a good Will and work, the praise belongs to man, indeed both to man and to God, who gave the possibility of the Will and the Work itself, and who always helps this Possibility with the aid of His Grace. See Augustine, *On the Grace of Christ against Pelagius*, lib. 1. Cap. 3. From which words it is most lucidly understood what kind of Grace Pelagius admitted, namely (1) the Grace of Creation, which he indicates by "To be able" (2) The Grace of the Law or of Vocation, which he comprehends in these Words; God always helps this Possibility with the Aid of his Grace. For thus elsewhere: For God helps us, he says, through his Doctrine & Revelation, while he opens the eyes of our Heart, while he shows us future things, lest we be occupied with present ones, etc. *Ibid.* c. 7. Thus Adjuvant Grace (which Pelagius acknowledged) is to be understood of only External and Revelatory Grace, Not of Internal, of which however Hildebrand seems to understand it, *cit. loc n.* 7. Doubtless so taught by the most famous Joh. Vossius whom he alleges in num. 10, who in *Hist. Pelag lib.* 3. part 2. p. 298 asserts that Pelagius indeed at first posited only External Grace; But afterwards, by disputing, he finally proceeded so far as to be forced to confess Internal Grace as well. He thinks this can be gathered from the fact that Pelagius asserts in express words that he places Grace not only in the Law, but also in the Aid of God. But that Pelagius played with this formula of speaking according to his custom, and concealed what he thought under an ambiguous Generality, Joh. Musaeus shows from Augustine in *Disp. de Convers. lectio* §. 29. & seqq.

§. 13.

But whether Pelagius for his whole Life acquiesced in only the External Grace of God (as seems to Musaeus), or, being recalled to a better mind by very frequent Disputations, also admitted Internal grace, which is the opinion of the most celebrated Vossius; it remains certain in the meantime (what Experience itself has proven), that he left behind after his death some Disciples, who, seceding somewhat from his party, both asserted Original Sin, Forbes, *Loc. c. cap.* 5. num. 1, and seriously inculcated that for salvation there is a need for the Internal Grace of God Illuminating the Mind and disposing the Will; Although they impiously added that this Internal Grace can be obtained from God by the Powers of Nature. These were called Semi-Pelagians, because they retained not

the whole, but part of the Pelagian Doctrine, teaching (as the Words in Prosper sound) that Man arrives at this Grace, by which we are reborn in Christ, through his Natural Faculty, by asking, seeking, knocking, so that he receives for this reason, finds for this reason, and has it opened for this reason, because he has made good use of the Good of Nature. These were found in the City of Marseilles in Gaul, whence they are called Massilians. Their leader was John Cassian, a Scythian by nation, who had been a Deacon in Constantinople. At that time, he was a Presbyter in Marseilles. Here again is a most noteworthy Occasion by which they were led to embrace this Absurdity, so that what we brought forth above from the gravest Authors may be confirmed by a new Example, namely: that it is a work of arduous effort and rare felicity to hold the Middle ground here. So that what is said in the common proverb must be sung again and again in this particular Article with a peculiar reason and Necessity: The Blessed held the Middle way. Augustine, the most tireless Assertor of Divine Grace, when he had proceeded further than was right in disputing against Pelagius, and had so denied all Free Will that he seemed to introduce a fatal Necessity, had some of his own Disciples opposing him, namely Prosper and Hilary, who earnestly besought Augustine to mitigate this overly harsh opinion of his. When the Massilians themselves, with Cassian as their author, labored to correct and mitigate this, they fell into the Charybdis just now shown. Faustus in Gaul was driven headlong into the same abyss. However, the writings of both, i.e., both Cassian and Faustus, Pope Gelasius of Rome and with him 70 Bishops in the Roman Council in the year 494 eliminated from the Church, until the Doctrine of the Semi-Pelagians was entirely condemned and struck with an Anathema in the Synod of Orange. Concerning which matter, the author most worthy of faith and reading, the lauded Forbesius, can be consulted in *Instruct. Historico-Theolog. lib.8.c.3*. Furthermore, among the Lutherans, Chemnitz in his locus on human powers, p. 204. Hildebrand, *Instit. sacris, Disp. 15. §.9.& 10*, and Others.

§. 14.

We should now proceed to a certain new discovery, not very dissimilar to Semi-Pelagianism, commonly called Synergism, but before we depart from the Semi-Pelagians, we cannot but note in a few words how many even today make themselves partakers of Semi-Pelagianism, even among those who never fail to flee this name, yet they openly profess their Doctrine, having cast off the name. The Papists lead the column among these. It should be observed, however, that this opinion cannot be attributed to all Papists in general; but especially to the Scotists and Ockhamists, as can be seen in Dreier's Vernacular Tractate which we cited, p.508. Whoever would wish to transcribe the same opinion to all and every Papist in this Article would be a whole heaven off, and would evidently betray how little he is versed in their Writings. They feel so variously and diversely here, that nothing is more constant than their Inconstancy; Meanwhile, there are many among them, and of great name, who, if they are not guilty of Pelagianism, at least pass straight into the camp of the Semi-Pelagians. Among them is Biel, 2. Sentent. Dist. 27. quest. unic. Art. 4. Who hints that Man can prepare himself for

Grace, and elsewhere states that man can by his Own Powers perform some Good, and love God above all things. The same is held by Bellarmine, Costerus, and indeed the Council of Trent itself. Evolve Balthasar Meisner who disputes against them ex professo in Anthropol. Decad 3. Disp. 2. p. 69, 70, &c. and who can stand in place of all, the Incomparable Theologian Daniel Chamier, Panstrat. Cath. Tom. 3. Lib. 1. cap 2. Where among other things he refutes at length Bellarmine's Argument for asserting Free Will from Ecclesiasticus c. 15, God left man in the hand of his own counsel, is taken from.

§. 15.

But would that these leaders of a perverse column had only those followers whom they profess to be subject, along with themselves, to the one and supreme Head of the Church, namely the Pope of Rome, and that some would not associate themselves, who otherwise falsely glory in having deserted Babylon in every respect; but even of these, not a few have been invaded and seized by the Semi-Pelagian heresy. We produce (1) the men of Helmstedt, otherwise most renowned and greatest, Mr. Calixtus and Horneius. Among whom, from Calixtus's Epitome Theologiae, published in the year [blank], with the Declaration of the same Epitome by Gerhard Titius under the Title de Ministerio Verbi, p. 150, it is certain that Man can be solicitous for his salvation, can undertake care for the means to it: And that God deigns those who perform the things just recited by the Natural Powers of Free Will with greater aids, so that they may understand the Word, from it recognize their sins, and have faith in the promises of the Gospel. But that Mr. Calixtus opines that Man can perform such things by Natural Powers is manifest from the following, where he teaches in express words that these things are performed by Man, before God supplies greater and more Special aids, Supernatural in their kind. Therefore, he contradistinguishes what was previously performed by Man from the Supernatural Gifts of God, by the help of which he hints that man aspires to the Supernatural. How close this is to Semi-Pelagianism, indeed that it is the very juice and Blood of Pelagianism, is clear from the collation of Calixtus's Words with the previously remembered Opinion of the Semi-Pelagians. The Semi-Pelagians taught that Man arrives at this Grace, by which we are reborn in Christ, through his Natural faculty, by asking, seeking, knocking, etc. But Calixtus teaches that Man can be solicitous for his salvation, can undertake care for the means, and in this way attain the Supernatural. To be solicitous for Salvation, to undertake care for it and its means, what else is it than to seek and search for salvation? It is objected in vain: That in Calixtus these words are not found: by his Natural Faculty, in which the nerve of all Semi-Pelagianism consists. For the Response is: That these are nevertheless contradistinguished by Calixtus from Supernatural Gifts, and therefore cannot but be held by him as Natural; So that Calixtus says the same thing, though not in the same words. Nor should you say that these are Pedagogical and Natural Actions, which can be performed by anyone by the powers of Nature. For besides the fact that thus the Principle is begged, the same error also remains with only the words changed, while these Natural Actions performed by man are held as a Necessary Antecedent, indeed as a Cause, at least a Logical or Ethical one,

of the supernatural goods to be bestowed by God. Whence not undeservedly Calixtus Junior is flogged by Aegidius Strauch in *Consensus Repetitus*, p. 484. Who, to him explaining the words of his Parent about External Pedagogy, recalls to memory: namely, that Calixtus Senior had conceded such a Desire for salvation to the Natural Powers of Free Will, as the Beroeans were held by in Acts 17:11, by which Desire of the Beroeans the most Noble and Excellent Georg Calixtus expressly explains his mind in the place cited before. But that this desire was not some Pedagogical Action, but one altogether salvific and working salvation itself, he shows. Hence Gerhard Titius is also in vain in his Declaration of the Calixtine Epitome, p. 20, where he thinks the opinion of Calixtus has nothing evil or inconvenient.

§. 16.

The same Contagion of Semipelagianism adheres to (2) the theologians of Jena. An example for us is the man otherwise most Celebrated and most Acute, Lord Joh. Musaeus, Professor of Ordinary Theology in the Academy of Jena, who everywhere in his writings, e.g., in the *Tractatus de aeterno Electionis Decreto*, and also the *Tractatus de Conversione*, when he comes to the Cause and Subject, makes Conversion depend on a Non-Resistance or a Non-Repugnance that is Contumacious, conceded to and owed by the powers of Nature; but all Non-Conversion he suspends from a Contumacious Repugnance. And although in the former Tractate, number 411, he explains why this one is converted and that one is not converted in such a way that he wishes Conversion not to depend on Non-Resistance, but on Grace; he nevertheless makes this Grace in turn depend on a Contumacious Non-Resistance, see his own words in the cited location and elsewhere. That he attributes Malicious Non-Resistance to the powers of the natural Free Will is clear from number 368, p.277. He contrives the same thing in the latter Tractate: Disp. 2, from number 63 to the end of the Disputation. Where, among other things, the Words in number 65 are especially to be noted: Those therefore, he says, who in such a way with a Contumacious Will resist the Holy Spirit, they are in the Ordinary Way not converted, as long as they so resist. And because not all resist in such a way, it does not follow: That no one is converted. He indicates not obscurely that those who resist contumaciously are not converted, because they so resist: But those who do not resist are converted, because they do not resist. From which it is demonstrated to the eye that this Author cannot escape being found guilty of Semi-Pelagianism. For since only those are converted according to him, who do not resist Maliciously, and indeed for this very Cause, namely, because they do not resist Contumaciously, and this Non-Resistance through Contumacy is possible for the very Powers of the natural Free Will; it most clearly follows from this that the Cause of our Conversion is our Natural Powers, or that which proceeds from our Natural Powers, or if it is omitted, is the Reason for Non-Conversion. And consequently, Semi-Pelagianism is incurred quite openly. Let Musaeus object: This Contumacious Non-Resistance is not the true Cause of Conversion, but only its *causa sine qua non*. Resp. Therefore, let another true Cause of Conversion be given. He will say, the Grace of God. Resp. But according to Musaeus, the

Grace of God is ordinarily conferred on no one, except him alone who does not contumaciously resist. It remains therefore, that according to Musaeus, Contumacious Non-Resistance is the Cause of Conversion not only sine qua non and equivocal, but true and properly so called, if not Physical and Influential, at least Moral and suasive or impelling. The Excellent Mr. President deduces these things more fully in his Commentary on Justification, vindicating the theologians and in particular the Blessed Wendelin from the false accusations of their Adversaries. More from the Lutherans could be adduced, who implicate themselves in Semipelagianism; but the plan of our Institute does not permit us to dwell longer on reciting these specifically.

§. 17.

We will assert below what seems to remain. In general, it is only to be observed that no Lutheran can be freed from Semipelagianism who states that man is not converted unless he employs the right use of Natural Light, or performs Pedagogical Actions, and does so by the Powers of his Natural Free Will. You may object: Yet the Lutherans to a man refute Semipelagianism in their writings. Resp. This is not unusual for the Lutherans, that they refute in others what they themselves cherish at home, and do not see what is in the bag on their own back. Thus they contradict Eutychianism, Nestorianism, Swenckfeldianism, Arianism with all study and effort; meanwhile, by their Ubiquitarianism alone, they embrace all those errors and recall them from the underworld.

§.18.

Briefly, two things still need to be examined (1) Synergism (2) Arminianism. We find Synergism to be twofold, the Crasser and the Subtler. The Crasser is that which is placed by Hutter, *Explicat. Libri Concordiae*, p. 226, and Joh. Musaeus, *Tract. de Convers. Disp.* 3, §. 44, in this: that man after the Fall is posited to be so corrupt that he cannot convert himself to God by his own powers; meanwhile, if the Holy Spirit makes a beginning, then Free Will with its own Natural powers may meet God, and thus Man may cooperate in his own Conversion. They make Victorinus Strigelius the principal champion of this Synergism, Hutterus c. 1. p. 227, Hildebrandus *Disp.* 15. n. 15, Möllerus Professor at Rostock, *Quest. Theolog. Semicenturia secunda*, *Quest.* 42. p. 218. Whether he held this opinion while he still professed the Lutheran Religion, we leave in the middle. Meanwhile, it is certain that, following the example of Carlstadt, he bid farewell to all Heresy before he was received by the Reformed Church. In the present matter, let his own *Loci Theologici* be Witnesses. Thus has his 4th Proposition in the Exposition of the true Opinion on the Liberty of the Human Will, *Loc. Theol. Part. I.* p. 369 & 370. It is necessary in true Conversion to God that the Mind be illuminated by the Son of God through the Gospel and the will be Efficaciously drawn by the Holy Spirit. When this happens, man assents to the promise of Grace not by his own powers, but through the Holy Spirit. And p. 372. It is not enough to teach, he says, that the Son of God gives eternal Life freely for the sake of his Merit, but the Correlative sentence must be added

at once, how eternal life is apprehended and received. It certainly must be received by us. it must be received, and unless it is apprehended by us, it is offered to us in vain. But let someone say, You yourself confess that we assent not by our own powers, but through the Holy Spirit. How then do you say that we receive Christ, or apprehend eternal life? Resp. both are true: that we perform these things through the Holy Spirit, and that we ourselves assent. For the rest, you may seek the true Supporters of this Crasser Synergism in the same Hutterus, cit. loc. p. 232 & seqq.

Subtler Synergism is that by which Men, in the very Moment of Conversion, before they are fully converted, are said to cooperate in their Conversion, not indeed with Natural Powers, but with Regenerated Powers. The Subtler Synergism is distinguished from the Crasser by this alone: the Crasser asserts Cooperation from natural powers, the Subtler from regenerated ones. And the Wittenberg theologians object this Synergism to the Rintelensians, Antapologia cap. 7. §. 9.10. & seqq. p. 202. And not without just cause. For they in their Epist. Apologet. p. 38, assert that Free Will is repaired and restored by grace, so that it is placed in an Equilibrium of Believing and not Believing. By grace, they understand Prevenient grace, and if a Man is endowed with it, they no longer doubt that he can convert himself and aspire to true Faith. Against whom the Wittenbergers rightly say: How can a dead man, before he has been recalled to life, cooperate in his own Vivification? The modern Königsbergers are accused of the same Synergism, and among them the primary Professor of Theology, D. Dreier, a Man of admirable Reading, whose words are these: It is to be well noted, That we can and should work with, not only when the Holy Spirit has already completed the whole conversion, but when he has only begun the rebirth and renewal, and we have thereby received new strengths. Tract. cited often, p. 526. He draws to his side, and thus shows us to be a participant in the same error, Chemnitz, whom on the following page he introduces speaking thus. It is not therefore to be thought; I will wait with a secure and idle Will, until the Renovation & Conversion according to the degrees of the Operation of the Holy Spirit has been completed without my motion. After this divinely made Motion of the Will, the human will does not behave purely passively, but assents and becomes a co-worker (σύνεργος) of God. Nor is it clear how the Rostock theologians free themselves completely from this Synergism, for Möller in the first Semicenturia of Theological Questions, Question 23, §§ 3 & 4, p. 66 says: After the Will of Man, having been regenerated by the Holy Spirit, gives assent, God draws the willing, not the unwilling, with the Reborn Will Cooperating not of itself but by the grace of God.

§. 18.

Finally, we are devolved to Arminianism, which is little removed from Semi-Pelagianism, reheated in the previous century by Jacobus Arminius, a Dutchman, and defended in the Synod of Dort by Simon Episcopus and his Accomplices. See the entire History of this Sect of the Arminians consigned in Hornbeek, Summa Controversiarum lib. 8. Their Semi-Pelagianism shines forth especially from num. 3 of the Opinion of the Remonstrants (by which title they brand themselves) concerning the Third and Fourth Article, which are completed in these words: Nor however do we believe that all zeal, care, and Study applied to obtaining salvation before Faith itself and the Spirit of Renewal is vain and fruitless, nay rather more noxious to man than useful and fruitful; But on the contrary we state that to hear the word of God, to grieve for sin committed, to desire saving Grace and the Spirit of Renewal (none of which however man can do without Grace) is not only not noxious and useless, but rather most useful and as necessary as possible for obtaining Faith and the Spirit of Renewal. By which they attribute spiritual works to man before the Spirit of Renewal. You object: The Remonstrants added: That Man can do none of these Works without Grace. Resp. Unless you wish to say that a Contradiction is in the words, it cannot be doubted that the Remonstrants here use the word Grace in no other sense than that in which Pelagius used it above, in the Broadest sense, for the sole Revelation of the Word of God, and thus they include Nature under the word Grace. Forbesius agrees with us, lib. frequently cited, 1.8. c. 27. & Hülsemannus, de Auxilis gratia p. 26. & seqq. Where he relates that certain Fathers, and the Arminians who follow them, distributed the Grace of Conversion into Universal and Particular. But that Universal grace is nothing other to them than the Vocation of all men, exciting in the unregenerate man from the innate Gifts of Nature a sufficient and proximate power to inquire into the true worship of God and to join himself to the Church. I pass over the fact that the same can be gathered from not a few Places both of the Declaration and of the Defense of the Opinion of the Remonstrants, which, along with their Opinions themselves, are seen compiled into a peculiar Volume in the Acts and Synodal Writings of the Remonstrant Ministers in the federated Netherlands. Among other Places, look at p. 21. num. 7. in the Declaration. Furthermore, I would like you to observe that they deny Irresistible Grace ex professo in the Defense, from p. 60 to 64.

§. 19.

We have handed down in general what the true Causes of Regeneration are, and what, moreover, being sold as true, introduce the gravest errors; Now, about to apply them in particular and to expound our own opinion as perspicuously as can be done, we shall dispatch the whole matter with this single question: Whether Man, sustained by Divine Grace before Conversion strictly so called, or in Conversion, but understood for its whole Complex, obtains Free Will to act. Before we respond, WE PREMISE for its better Understanding:

(1) That the State of Man according to Holy Scripture is Fourfold: (a) of Integrity, in which only the Protoplasts lived, Gen. 3. (b) of Defection, into which all Men, together with the Protoplasts, are thrust down on account of their Sin, Rom. 5. (c) of Restoration, which is completed by the new covenant, Gen. 3. (d) of Perfection, to which the Sons of God are elevated after this Life, Matth. 19:28.

(2) That Divine Grace is said with significant equivocation to be either of Creation, which contributes nothing to Salvation or Spiritual things, or of Revelation, which indeed shows what is to be done, but bestows no Powers to perform them, or finally of the Gospel, which both prescribes the way of attaining eternal life, and supplies the Means, and hence this alone is to be designated by the Title of Grace.

(3) That the five Degrees of Grace, more fully proposed in the first Disputation, differ in respect of themselves principally in Intensity and Excellence, in such a way indeed, that the latter always includes and implies the former.

(4) That Conversion strictly so called is the Conferral and Donation of the Habit and Seed of Faith, which will never perish or be taken away from believers, 1 John 3:9. But that the whole Complex of Conversion includes the first three Degrees of Grace: Because these, although not all of them constitute Conversion itself, are nevertheless all necessarily required for it; Not, however, the Fourth and Fifth, which are not so much Conversion as Consequences of Conversion, Gal. 6:1.

(5) That Liberty, from which the Will is denominated Free, is not (a) a Natural Inclination, by which someone acts in such a way that he is compelled to act so by no Extrinsic principle, but performs actions without any sense or Intellect. Just as fire Freely burns and consumes wood, water moistens, the stomach digests etc. For here, although there is no Coercion, there is nevertheless also no properly so-called Liberty, but mere Physical Necessity. For fire burns in such a way that it cannot not burn, Water moistens in such a way that it cannot not moisten, and so in the rest. Nor [b] Spontaneity, by which a Voluntary Agent acts Voluntarily indeed, yet in such a way that it also cannot not act, although without any Physical Necessity or Coercion: As God is Freely good, yet in such a way that He cannot not be such; Also the Angels and the pious in heaven unceasingly praise God and enjoy eternal joy, in such a way that they cannot do otherwise, nor can anything else happen to them. For this Spontaneity also, although it belongs to that which is endowed with Will, is nevertheless not Voluntary for operating Indifferently, but in a like manner Necessary with a Necessity at least of Immutability. But (c) Indifference to either of the Opposites, by which an Agent can both act and not act, do this and do that, which, on account of the twofold kind of Opposites, is twofold: one of Contrariety and Specification, the other of Contradiction and Exercise.

(6) Finally, That there is both an Act and a Habit of some Good, even a Supernatural one, e.g., of Faith. Just as in all Moral virtues, both their Habits and their Acts occur distinctly.

§.20.

These things being premised, WE SUPPOSE:

(A) that a certain Irresistible Grace must be admitted, which is conferred on Man in such a way that Man cannot not receive it; Because otherwise no crack appears, nor can it be shown, by which one may slip away, without being infected with Semi-Pelagianism. For if all saving Grace of God is asserted to be Resistible, it is finally left to the Natural Will of Man whether he wants to accept the offered Grace of God, or not. Whence it is clear to the eye, that the Principle of Conversion and salvation is attributed to the Good Use of the Natural Will, and thus Semi-Pelagianism is brought in with full sails.

(B) the Universal Grace of God, by which it is established that God seriously intends and sincerely desires the salvation of all and every one, and hence from Mercy alone gives Man Sufficient Means of salvation, is (a) so founded in the holy scriptures, that Universal Sayings, such as are Ezek. 18:32 & 33; Rom. 5:18; Rom. 11:32; 1 Tim. 2:4; Tit. 2:11; 2 Pet. 3:9; also concerning the Universal Merit of Christ, Gen. 17:35 & Isa. 53:6; John John 1:9 & 29. John 3:16 & 17. John 6:33 & 51. chap. 12:47. 1 Cor. 15:22. 2 Cor. 5:19. Gal. 4:5. Col. 1:20. 1 Tim. 4:10. 1 John 2:2, are restricted only very contortedly, and are explained Particularly. (b) condemned by no Council, let alone by the Synod of Dort. This is gathered both from the Synod itself, c. 3 & 4, Art. 8, p. 360, where these words exist: As many as are called by the Gospel, are called seriously etc. and Art. 9. That many who are called by the ministry of the Gospel do not come and are not converted, the Fault for this is not in the Gospel, nor in Christ offered through the Gospel, nor in God calling through the Gospel and conferring various Gifts on them, but in the called themselves: and from the Judgments of the Foreign Theologians (a) of GREAT BRITAIN on the second Article, Th. 3, p. 603. Also on the third & 4th Articles concerning the Antecedents to Conversion, all Theses from p. 672 to p. 677 exclusively. (b) of BREMEN, where the judgment of MARTINIUS is especially to be noted, which he begins on the second Article concerning the death of Christ with these words, p. 639. There is a certain common Philanthropy of God, by which he loved the whole fallen Human Race, and seriously willed the salvation of all. He ends, however, with these, num 26: p. 642. The principal reasons why I follow this opinion are three: [1] that the Scriptures may be reconciled without contortion (2) That the Glory of Truth, Mercy, and Justice may remain to God in the Commands, Promises, and Comminations of the Gospel: Lest God be judged to will or do something otherwise in them than the words sound (3) That it may be manifest that the fault of the ruin of the impious is in themselves, not in a defect of the remedy, by which they could have been saved. To which judgments (c) are added the Letters of the Most Serene Elector of Brandenburg, GEORG WILHELM of most glorious memory, which we find transmitted to the Synod and inserted in the Acts, p. 333. In which the most serene Elector appeals to the Confession of his August Parent SIGISMUND, the most pious INITIATOR of the Orthodox Religion in the March, published in the year 1614, which if you explain, you will see Universal Grace excellently asserted.

(C) That there is also some Resistible Grace, since without it Universal Grace can neither be conceived, let alone understood or explained. Not only infinite Sayings of holy scripture urge Resistibility, e.g., Matth. 23:37. Luke 19:41. Also the Sayings about the Apostasy of the Impious, Heb. 6:4, etc. but furthermore in the Synod of Dort, the Judgment of the Bremensians on Art. 3 & 4 concerning Grace of God, num 7, 8, 9, p. 725. We will only transcribe the beginnings of these numbers: The external Grace of Preaching, it says, is often resisted. Also the more Common Grace of Illumination is resisted. Also in these ways the Reprobate are accustomed to resist the Grace of God, as they are diversely affected, and indeed sometimes even the Elect.

(D) That the Act of Believing, especially an Incomplete one and proceeding not from a Habit of Faith or its Root but from any Power or Disposition whatsoever, and the Habit itself are distant by the longest parasangs, so that, though denoted by one proximate name, they are rendered equivocal. This is demonstrated from their Nature, since they differ as a Thing and its Mode, and are therefore as heterogeneous as possible. You object that one is denominated a believer no less from the Act of believing than from the Habit. Resp. [1] Indirectly: One is denominated Liberal no less from an Act of Liberality than from its Habit. (2) Directly [a] The Denomination is indeed from the Act but by reason of the Habit at the same time equivocally (b) The Consequence proceeding from the Denomination to the thing itself is denied. For this is the nature of equivocation, that it attributes the Name to the equivocal thing, but not the thing itself. It is also false that qualities are denominated from an act; since not even the Qualities themselves denominate, unless they are present at least extensively, intensely, and protensively.

§. 21.

These things being thus Supposed, WE CONCLUDE:

(I) that a man dead in sins is endowed with Prevenient Grace Irresistibly; Nor does he obtain any Free Will to reject this Grace, at least as to its Power. This is proved from Absurdity; Because otherwise Pelagianism is immediately incurred. For since the Non-Resistibility would be Free, and proceeding from the Natural Powers of the Human Will, and yet occupied with a saving Good, Man is established as the Cause of his own salvation, or at least of the means leading to the attainment of salvation, and indeed as a solitary cause as to its beginning, so that the Grace of God here becomes altogether not a Cause. Which Truth, as to the thing itself, other Lutherans outside the heat of disputation cannot deny, among whom is Möllerus, Semicent. Quest Theol. prima, Quast. 23. §. 3. p. 66. You object: Non-Resistibility and hence Non-Resistance (because the Controversy is chiefly about the Act) is only a Passion, whence no Cause is concluded: Since it is observed only in Actions. And consequently, there is no Danger of Pelagianism. Resp. Non-Resistance considered in the second Act, and indeed such that it can also be absent, with Resistance substituted in its place, proceeds either ἐκ προαιρέσεως (from choice) or ἄνευ προαιρέσεως (without choice). If the latter: Non-Resistance will belong to the Vegetative or Sensitive Power, which is absurd. If the former; This is not a bare

Passion, but an Action is implied at the same time. For the Deliberation, by which being made, man determines himself to the Passion, ought to be held not as a Passion but as an Action. Furthermore, this Action, i.e., Deliberation, and even Deliberability (so to speak), either proceeds from Grace or from Nature. If the former, the Question returns; Whether that Grace is Resistible, or Irresistible, so that one must finally acquiesce in some Irresistible one, which is our opinion. If the latter, Pelagianism is at hand, which was what was to be demonstrated.

§. 22.

WE CONCLUDE (II) that a Man endowed with Preparing Grace, i.e., with the Power of Believing in Christ, elicits the Act of Believing Resistibly and Freely, i.e., in such a way that he can not exercise it. This Conclusion is again proved from absurdity: Because otherwise there is no Universal Grace, corroborated by so many Sayings in the Holy Code. See above the Reasons of Martini, and in particular weigh with your mind that Apostasy is minimally intelligible without Universal Grace. For if no Grace of God is Resistible, but on the contrary all is Irresistible, then either all are converted, if it is offered to all, or it is not conferred on all, and therefore is not Universal, which was to be declared; Or two Contradictory things can be True at the same time, which is insanity itself. You object: The proof of the Conclusion, which is said to be taken from Absurdity, is so far from being taken from Absurdity, that it rather designates a Petition of the Principle, at least in respect to the Subject. Resp. This happens in all Demonstrations, if ever the Disputation devolves to Principles (the more remote of which must be supposed, lest the discourse be protracted too much or degenerate into something else altogether), and yet no Conclusion is thereby of a worse Condition. We have no doubt that whoever, having set aside a preconceived Opinion, has gazed upon the Universal Sayings of Scripture with a devout mind and intent Eyes, the Negation of Universal Grace cannot but appear absurd to him. And so we subject the Act of Believing to the Free Will of a Man endowed with Preparing Grace. By the Act of Believing, however, we do not understand (1) Faith itself, its Seed or Habit, which two things coincide for us, as those things which, once obtained, can at no time be lost. For this seed of Faith is communicated by God alone to Man through Conversion alone (as will be proved shortly after). Nor (2) an Act derived from the Habit of Faith; such as the faithful and those corroborated in Faith frequently exercise. Matt. 16:16. John 20:28: 2 Tim. 1:12. For since the Habit of Faith is not yet in these, such an Act also cannot be expected from them. But (3) an Act without a Habit, and that an Imperfect and Incomplete one, i.e., some kind of Cognition and Reception of Christ. Consult Voetius, who expressly distinguishes between a Complete and an Incomplete Act of Faith, and teaches that the latter precedes Repentance and thus Conversion in the order of Nature, Disp. de Regenerat. num. 6. Probl. 2. pag. 443. And he further states concerning this distinction: Which distinction, he says, being observed, will do not a little to reconcile the Dogmatic and Practical theologians. In the same sense (unless you wish to admit the greatest impropriety and to confuse Conversion with Sanctification) the greatest Part of our

Theologians ought to be understood. Ludovicus Crocius in *Assertio Augustana Confess.* p. 360. The mind of man, he says, while it is being illuminated, prepared etc., behaves Passively. But as to Assent, the Will, now taught by the word, also acts or actively concurs. See the same author expressly teaching our opinion in the book just cited, p. 359, num. 87, 88. The same is inculcated by the Anhalt Confession in Conrad Bergius, *Praxis Catholica*, p. 814. The whole Work of Conversion, they say, from the beginning to the end is and remains the Benefit of God alone, as the Prophet cries out etc. But with the order observed and by no means inverted, neglected or repudiated etc. For as long as the Will totally resists God who is drawing, there is no conversion. Nor are these alien from this opinion: Bucanus, *Inst. Theol.* loc. 18. Quæst. 10. p. 110. But with respect to the time in which Conversion itself occurs, the Will does not behave as a trunk, but while it is being healed by the Holy Spirit, it also behaves Actively etc. And Diest, *Mellefic. Catechet.* on the Conversion of Man to God. Quæst. 5. Sub-quest. 3, where he asks: Does Man in Conversion behave merely Passively? and he answers: Partly Passively, partly Actively. You object: Our authors require an Act in Conversion itself, and therefore are not addicted to our opinion, but labor under Synergism. Resp. It must be noted that it is common for our authors to use Conversion very often for a certain whole Complex of all the means of salvation. Which, besides other testimonies, the Great Voetius confirms by his own Example, who hence constitutes two Moments of Conversion, by which he comprehends Vocation, Regeneration, Sanctification, in a Word: all the Degrees of Grace, loc. cit. Probl. 4. p. 351. What can be objected to this opinion, I do not see, unless (1) That we concede an act of believing to a man not yet Converted, and thus foster Synergism (2) That we defend Universal Grace, which was condemned by the Synod of Dort. For these are the express words of the Opinion of the Synod: The Synod of Dort requests and enjoins all etc. that, having dismissed the five noted Articles of the Remonstrants, which are both erroneous, etc. See in the Acts of the Synod p. 382. But to both Objections the Response is very easy. To the first, I Respond: Synergism consists in this, that Man either concurs with the powers of Nature, or at least in conversion itself strictly taken is either a Cause or a Part. Neither is done by us. You insist: Meanwhile, by this opinion Merit is inferred, and thus Romanism, indeed Pelagianism is incurred. For since God only regenerates after this preceding act of believing, He certainly seems to be moved or impelled to our Regeneration by this reason. Resp. (a) Indirectly: Concerning Prayers, Good Works, indeed Faith itself, all of which are adorned with many gifts both temporal and spiritual, yet no Merit is involved in them. (b) Directly: Merit (such as has a place between God and a creature) and its Formal reason consists in this, that it is an Impulsive Reason, not only a *causa sine qua non*, or a Condition, and that without the mercy of God and the Merit of Christ. The Response to the second is likewise clear from the above, where we showed more fully that Universal Grace was retained by many members of that Synod, and therefore could not have been condemned by the Universal Synod. We now add the Distinctions (1) Between Arminianism understood Complexly with all its doctrines taken together, and Incomplexly for one of their Dogmas [2] Between the Universal Grace of God proposed in the Remonstrant manner, in which Nature is mixed in, and inculcated in the Orthodox

manner. It is not immediately Arminian, what the Arminians teach, but what they teach against the Holy Scriptures, and for that reason are legitimately condemned. Nor should it be neglected that the Remonstrants were condemned not for their dogmas alone, but because they caused disturbances in the Church and Republic of the Belgians, as is also commemorated in the Opinion of the Synod.

§. 23.

WE CONCLUDE (III) that Man in conversion itself properly so called behaves purely Passively, nor does he exercise any Act of Free Will. This is proved from absurdity. Because otherwise. (1) the gates are opened to Synergism. For if in Conversion itself Man is stated to behave also Actively, whether he is then said to work it by the powers of Nature or of Grace, Synergism arises. (2) Man is converted into God, and thus the lowest things are mixed with the highest and are confused. It is confirmed; because Conversion is the property of God alone, as has been said several times already [3] Because for Man to convert himself, whether as a whole or as a part, involves no less a Contradiction than: for a Man corporally Dead to give life to himself and to restore himself to life. You object. Man, instructed by Prevenient and Preparing Grace, is not dead, at least not entirely. Resp. I pass over that for a semi-dead or moribund person, as such, to be the Cause of his own Life, implies no less. For just as what one does not have, one cannot give to another; so what one does not have the power of, one can in no way communicate or procure for oneself. Then I distinguish: one prevented and prepared by the Grace of God is not dead in respect of Conversion taken complexly, but begins to live and lives in his own way and kind: I grant it; In respect of Conversion understood Incomplexly and most strictly as a *Terminus ad Quem*; I deny it. For otherwise he would be Converted: and thus at the same time converted and Not Converted. You insist: But it is Absurd that one endowed with Prevenient Grace, i.e., Regenerated, should be dead or assimilated to the dead. Resp. Not Absolutely and Formally, but Restrictively in respect of the Tendency to another, so that to be Dead or assimilated to the dead is nothing other than to be destitute of the *Terminus ad Quem*. This conclusion is furthermore proved by the Sayings of Holy Scripture, Jer. 31:18. Turn me, that I may be converted. The Prophet implies that Conversion originates from God alone, and indeed originates in such a way that while God is converting, Man cannot not be converted. For more sayings of this kind, see above. §. 1. No less Authority is at hand from both Reformed, Lutheran, and Pontifical authors. About our own, there is no doubt, there is no doubt, for they are all of one mind here. From the Lutherans, see Meisner, Decad. 3. Disp. 2. quest. 3. num 25. From the Pontiffs, Bellarmine, who is however two-tongued, see the same Meisner, loc. cit. p. 67.

§.24.

WE CONCLUDE [IV] that the Lutherans are convicted of Pelagianism, or at a minimum of Semi-Pelagianism. This is proven: Because they are Enemies of Irresistible Grace, and oppose it everywhere in their writings. See among others Joh. Meisner in his Examen

Catechismi Palatini p. 141. But we have already dealt with the other Lutherans above, §.16 & 17. We only add the very ingenuous Judgment of D. Calixtus: by which he opines that it is difficult to propose the Opinion of the Lutherans in such a way that it does not seem to have anything akin to Pelagianism. Jud. de Cont. Theol. Thef. 22. & 23. The Wittenbergers remain, to whom, besides this Semi-Pelagianism deduced by Proximate Consequence, another is deservedly attributed without any Consequence, by their own Judgment. For thus their words have it, which, borrowed from Hunnius, he approves in gründlichen Beweis p. 626. that man can so use the ordinary means by his natural powers, and so conduct himself according to the order of GOD, that GOD would thereupon give him faith. Also that man can by his natural powers attend the sermons, he also has a natural desire for salvation, also a hunger and thirst for God's word. Although it is obvious to everyone that Semi-Pelagianism is fostered by these, because it is nevertheless denied by the Wittenbergers in the cited place, let us hear the Consensus Fidei verè Lutheranæ signed by Strauch at their command, p. 484, v. 485, who to these words of Calixtus, It is certain that no one can be solicitous for his salvation, can undertake care for the means to it etc. (which do not even formally differ from those of Hunnius) subjoins the following: These are not Pedagogical Actions, but salvific etc. Therefore, in Actions exceeding the limits of External Pedagogy, such as are all those conjoined with solicitude for salvation, the συνέργεια (cooperation) of the human Will must be asserted with Calixtus. Synergism demands that every Action conjoined with solicitude for Salvation be derived from natural powers. Now, however: To have an inner desire for salvation and hunger and thirst for GOD's word, is this not an Action conjoined with solicitude for salvation, indeed salvation's solicitude itself? solicitude. But perhaps when two do the same thing, it will not be the same. Calixtus, having said such things, is guilty of Synergism, but not so Hunnius and with him the Wittenbergers.

§. 25.

WE CONCLUDE (V) That those of the Lutherans who incautiously decline to the other side (which, if in any matter, certainly happens frequently in the present one), nevertheless deny Universal Grace, for which they otherwise contend as for their altars and hearths, who acknowledge no Free Will in any way, no Indifference to either of the Opposites, nor any Vital Act freely elicited before Conversion itself strictly speaking. Which the Wittenbergers seem to think. Antapolog. c. 7. 8. 9. 10. &c. For from this it follows either that every man is converted, if Universal Grace is nevertheless to be held; Or if outside of Conversion another Universal Grace is given, that this is not sufficient, because nothing is given by which man might contingently aspire to Conversion; Or finally that Universal Grace is not given. The first contradicts Holy Scripture, indeed experience itself, and is worse than the error of Celio Secondo Curione, who asserted that more would be saved than damned. The second exposes the Dogma of Universal Grace to ridicule, so that it becomes like a Promise suspended on an impossible condition. The third is likewise false by the common Hypothesis. Hence, unless they desire to patch up this also with Contradictions, with which almost all their Dogmas

teem, under the guise of Mysteries and τερητό (trifles), they must necessarily abstain from this assertion, and hear Hülsemann, who urges Indifference before Conversion in express words. Universal Grace, he says, is so conferred upon hearers through the Word of God, that they can not morosely resist God operating through the Word, and do not resist with a Deliberate proaeretic Act. In the Extension of the Breviary Theolog. c. 15. Thef. 12. p. 414.

§. 26.

And so much for the Causes. The Subject of Conversion is one thing as to What, another as to By Which. The Subject as to What is an Adult Man, dead in sins either totally or partially. In this the Subject of Conversion differs from the Subject of Regeneration, so that, just as Regeneration is broader, so also it assumes for itself a broader Subject; but Conversion, because it is Stricter, is Stricter. We have proved above that Regeneration belongs to both Adults and Infants; Conversion belongs only to Adults, who can be born again through the living Word of God that remains forever, 1 Pet. 1:23. For conversion ordinarily happens through the word. Whence the Apostle James, c.1.18: He, because he willed it, begot us by the Word of Truth. We say, however, that the Adult to be Converted is either Totally or Partially dead. By totally dead we understand him who as yet enjoys no degree of divine grace, at least not Internal grace. A Conversion of this kind is not infrequent in the holy scriptures. Thus were converted the courtiers of Nero, Philip. 4:22. The inhabitants of Samaria, a most corrupt City, Acts 8:11. Paul, Acts 9:5. The thief on the cross, Luke 23:40,41. Where the last Examples, of Paul and the Thief, are especially notable, who in, as it were, a single moment were changed into plainly different men. Paul was so dead in sins, that in that very hour he was hurrying to Damascus to extirpate all piety, v.1. The thief, however, had devoted himself to the most cruel homicides, and on the cross itself, about to breathe his last, is granted sudden Repentance and Conversion. But he is partially dead whom God embraces with various Graces before Conversion, whom he repeatedly calls through the preaching of the gospel, and invites to himself with other benefits: Examples of which are daily obvious, so that it would be superfluous to commemorate them. The Lutherans commonly restrict Conversion to that Adult who does not contumaciously resist, See Joh. Musaeus: Tract. Theol. de Convers. Disp. 2. num. 3 and Hildebrandus Disp. 15. §. 12, and others. For they say that those who contumaciously resist are not only not converted, but are also the cause of why they are not converted. We, however, although we have no doubt that Contumacious Repugnance is the sole Cause why many are not converted: Meanwhile, if we look at the Omnigenous Corruption of human nature after the fall, if we look also at daily Practice itself, and revolve it in our mind, we are led to believe that scarcely any are found who do not resist divine Grace up to the very Moment of Conversion, and therefore have need to be drawn by God to Conversion and eternal Salvation, John 6:44. We are confirmed in this our opinion. (1) Because the Corruption of all men is the same and equal. Rom. 3:12. All have turned aside, they have together become unprofitable; there is none who does good, no, not one. (2) Because all Glorification is to be cut off from Man. Who makes you to differ?

says the Apostle, 1 Cor. 4:7. But one would have reason to glory over another, if this one were converted by not-resisting; that one by Resisting would procure for himself eternal ruin. You object: A Man endowed with Preparing Grace is, by our own Hypothesis, Indifferent before Conversion to eliciting or not eliciting some Act, where surely he who elicits it will snatch the palm from him who neglects this Act. Resp. Although we have so stated, namely that Man before his Conversion is elevated by the Preparing Grace of God even to Indifference, and that on account of Universal Grace, which is most celebrated in the holy scriptures; Nevertheless it is still asked and remains a doubt, whether a Man so free also exerts this Act without some new supervening Grace. We can hardly be persuaded to affirm this for the reasons already brought forward. Indeed, the negative is much safer and far more alien to Pelagianism. It is safest to say that a Man made Indifferent by the Grace of God does not determine himself, but is led to the better part by a new acceding Grace. Thus the whole business of our salvation is ascribed to God, every Occasion for glorying is cut off from Man, God is also said most justly to damn Man on account of Unbelief that is not only Negative, but also Privative, according to the Saying of Scripture, John 3. He who does not believe, when however he could have, will be condemned. In a word: Thus the most convenient Way and Reason for composing and reconciling Universal with Particular Grace becomes clear. Namely, that Universal Grace be said to be Sufficient, Particular Grace Determining. To the same purpose is to distinguish with the Venerable Mr. President the Will and Grace of God into Antecedent, which respects only the fall, and Consequent, which considers Man not only Fallen, but also Unbelieving. Also between the Absolute and the Compared Will and Grace of God. Comment. cap-3, de Electione.

§. 27.

The Subject By Which is understood from those things which we have handed down above concerning Regeneration in General. However, to repeat them briefly, the Terminus from Which and the Terminus to Which must be examined beforehand. For concerning the Subject, in which some act is to be received, in every mutation one must judge from its Termini from Which and to Which. Since the Subject of some Mutation does not extend more broadly than its Terminus from Which, which is removed from the Subject, and the Terminus to Which, which is introduced into the Subject. Therefore, the Terminus from Which of Conversion is Sin, Isa. 59:20. And the Redeemer will come to Zion, and to those who turn from transgression in Jacob, or the Death of sin. Col. 2:13. And you, being dead in your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, etc. He has made alive. Eph 2:1. And you He made alive together, when you were dead in trespasses and sins. Just as Temporal Death is a Privation of Life, and an Impotence for all Vital Actions, and indeed a Dominion into Life, Rom. 6:9. So the Death of Sin implies an omnigenous Absence and Privation of Spiritual Powers, and against Sin and all lawlessness not only a Power and Presence, but also a Dominion. Our Spiritual powers, which were Natural to us before the Fall, consisted chiefly in the Knowledge and Perfect Love of God, and of those things which are of God. Hence the ἀδυναμία (powerlessness)

of Spiritual powers is nothing other than the total Privation of the saving Knowledge and Love of God, and on the contrary, the Dominion of Spiritual Ignorance and hatred towards God and Christ. All of which the Apostle in the cited place Eph. 2:1, collated with the following, expressly indicates. You, he says, when you were dead in trespasses and sins, in which you once walked etc., implying the Dominion of Sin, or Reigning Sins: For he who walks in Sins, i.e., he who gives himself to unrighteousness, is a servant of sin, as the Apostle again judges, Rom. 6 from v. 16 to the end of the chapter. In a word: the Terminus from Which is both the Blindness of the mind to perceive the mysteries of Faith, or Ignorance of Salvation and the means of attaining salvation, and a defect of Powers to healthfully seek spiritual goods and to place Trust in them. Which are most commodiously included in the single Term of the Impotence to savingly believe in Christ. The Terminus to Which is, in place of Ignorance and Blindness, and also in place of a perverse Appetite and Desire, a saving Knowledge and Desire of Spiritual things. We require a saving Knowledge and Desire. For a non-saving Knowledge of Spiritual things also belongs to the impious, who can think of God, Rom. 1:21, speak, discourse and dispute, Ps. 50:16, acquire for themselves some knowledge of the Articles of Faith, namely Historical, and indeed even assent to them with the Devils, Jas. 2. Indeed, even a Velleity or inefficacious Will for spiritual things falls upon the unregenerate, as is established by the example of King Agrippa, Acts 26:28. But to judge spiritual things spiritually is the mark of the Spiritual or Converted Man alone, 1 Cor. 2:14. Likewise: to be carried toward salvation with a True and rooted Desire remains the proper Mark of the Converted. And these are the Limits of the Terminus to Which of Conversion; which are therefore to be well observed, lest this be confused with Sanctification, which proceeds to the various Exercises of spiritual goods. From which it is now not difficult to deduce the Subject By Which of Conversion; which is not both Essential Parts of Man, but only the Soul, and not the whole of it, but as to its most excellent faculties, namely the Intellect and the Will. The Intellect, which before Conversion was σκοτός (darkness), becomes Light in the Lord, Eph. 5:8. The Will, which was an Acquiescence in sin, Col. 3:19, whose god is their belly, becomes an Acquiescence in Christ, Phil. 1:21, for to me, to live is Christ. As to what pertains to the Sensitive Appetite and the remaining faculties and members of both the Soul and the Body, it must be confessed that these also are overwhelmed on all sides by sins, and therefore are no less in need of some Spiritual Mutation, or have need of the Grace of the Holy Spirit and its Operation. Meanwhile, the Spiritual mutation of these pertains not precisely to Conversion, which is completed by Faith alone, as we will show a little later, but to Sanctification.

SUBSECTION II. ON THE ESSENCE OF CONVERSION.

§. I.

We establish Regeneration as the superior and Inadequate Concept of Conversion. For this (as we have hinted elsewhere) is a Generic Concept which contains the donation of life that happens to Adults, and that which happens to Infants, as Species under it. The same Generic Reason, namely Regeneration, is to be attributed to both. Nicodemus called the Physical Regeneration of Adults most of all into doubt, when he had been taught by Christ the Necessity of Regeneration with respect to all who are to be saved: Whence he replies this to Christ: πῶς δύναται ἄνθρωπος γεννηθῆναι γέρον ὄν (How can a man be born when he is old?), John 3:4. Indicating that an old man, advanced in age, of tall bodily stature, is as unfit as possible to undergo Passive Generation. Perhaps if he had perceived that Christ was speaking of Spiritual Generation, he would have moved the same doubt, and would have asked, how a man nourished in sins from his mother's womb, not only begotten in sins, born, and therefore a Sinner by Nature, but moreover exercising himself in the same for the whole space of his life, and thereby having acquired a new Habit of sinning by Custom, how, I say, such a Veteran could emerge from the putrid swamps of his sins, in which he is suffocated. Certainly this question would have touched the mark and the thing itself more closely than the other, which was a whole heaven off due to a stupid observance of the propriety of the words. But although it could seem to be based on doubtful Reasons, and those not vain, to him who, destitute of the testimony of the sacred letters, would measure things by the Light of Nature alone, where reason would at once supply him with that trite saying: You may drive out Nature with a pitchfork, yet it will always return; Also: The jar will long keep the scent with which it was once imbued when new, etc. Meanwhile, he who does not refuse to seek the Response from the sacred fountains of Israel, and then to give Faith to the Response, will be no less persuaded of the Regeneration of Adults than of Infants. Nor will the inveterate Malice of Adults then do anything to the contrary: For even for healing this, the exuberant Grace of God is sufficient, which, where sin abounded, grace abounded much more, Rom. 5:20. Just as it was very easy for God to create All things from a Natural nothing, as from a matter not of Constitution but of Production; so it will not be a greater Difficulty for God to produce the very Essence of Spiritual Life from a Spiritual Nothing. This Contemplation serves both to exaggerate Divine Grace and Glory, and so that hence a most lucid and most solid Reason may be supplied, by which all Activity in the work of Conversion is entirely snatched away from Man. For since naturally not even by another can Custom (which is a second Nature) be expelled, surely no one will suffice to change his own nature. To which pertains that of Jeremiah: Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard its spots? Then may you also do good who are taught to do evil, chap. 13:23. From which it is manifest that Conversion is Regeneration or an Action of God. It is also clear that it acknowledges Regeneration as a Superior and Inadequate Concept: which must also be attributed to the new life of infants.

§. 2.

We resolve the Adequate and Reciprocal Concept into two Concepts as if into Partial ones: The first is Contrition; the latter is Trust. Contrition is that Part of Conversion by which Man acknowledges sin, grieves over it, and detests it. For these three things are required for all Contrition:

(1) Acknowledgment of Sin, Ps. 51:5. For I acknowledge my iniquity: to which Confession pertains, which is nothing other than Acknowledgment before another, 1 John 1.

(2) Serious grief for the same committed sin: I rejoice that you were made sorry to repentance, 2 Cor. 7:9. Lam. 3:40. Let a man murmur for his sins, Also v. 40, 59. All these to Jer. 31:19.

(3) Detestation of Sin, see all of Ps. 38. Contrition is supremely necessary; for Man will not displease himself before he has acknowledged his sin, what it is like, conceived grief from the Acknowledgment, that he has defiled himself with a most foul and execrable thing, and finally hated and fled it worse than a dog or a snake.

Trust, by another name, is called Faith: Which they commonly assert to consist of three parts: Knowledge, Assent, and Confidence. But badly: Because it cannot be understood how Assent differs from saving Knowledge (for we do not consider Historical knowledge here). Which the Excellent Mr. President teaches in his Commentary on Chap. 23. Therefore, Trust, which is the other Part of Conversion, is completed by Knowledge and Confidence. Knowledge pertains to the Intellect, Confidence to the Will. By Knowledge the Way of salvation is detected; by Confidence it is sought. By Knowledge God and Christ are known; by Confidence they are apprehended. It should be observed, however, that a General Faith, which has for its Object all things that are divinely revealed in the Holy Scriptures, and is usually called Historical Faith, is not sufficient for Conversion; But Conversion is terminated in a Special Faith, by which we believe in Christ, or by which we trust that on account of Christ and his Merit all our sins will be remitted to us, and therefore are remitted. This very thing is taught not obscurely by John in 1 *Epistle* 5:1, where these forceful words exist: *Everyone who believes that Jesus is the Christ is born of God.* Not who believes in general, but who believes that Jesus is the Christ, i.e., is his Redeemer, he is born of God, or, what comes to the same thing, is converted.

§. 3.

I cannot here pass over in silence the Error of certain Practical theologians, which arose indeed from a pious intention, but meanwhile is denuded of sufficient Theory, hence dangerous, and striking against not a few rocks of heresies: That the Object of saving Faith is not only Christ viewed under the title of Mediation or Redemption, but the First Object is God, as He is the highest End and the highest Good; the Second Object is Christ as Redeemer. But that God is not only the first Object, but also the primary and principal, while meanwhile Christ, as Redeemer, is only a Mediate Object, insofar as through Christ we tend to God. Furthermore, that Christ, as Redeemer, becomes the

Object of Faith not Exclusively of his other Offices, but is rather the Object both as Priest, as Prophet, and as King. Whence they opine that two parts of saving faith result, one of which is more Natural, namely to Seek God as one's highest end, highest good, and center of beatitude, which nature itself dictates should be done; the other more supernatural, namely to Seek Christ, that you may be made a partaker of that highest good, which not Nature but Scripture alone dictates to us. Not to cut everything to the quick now and to deduce more prolixly, how improvidently a certain part of Faith, a purely supernatural gift, is called Natural, and thus the most spacious gates are opened to Pelagianism and Socinianism, I leave only that to be weighed by Men both Learned and Religious, how they revive the Soul of Popery, afflicted for so many centuries by the Orthodox and soon to die, and supply it with rich fodder by hypotheses of this kind. For what can be said more pleasing to the Pontiffs, or what can more accurately express the living image of their Mercenary Faith, than if the Love of God, as the Highest Good, is held to be a Part of saving Faith? The Love of God joined with the Love of Neighbor, without which the Love of God is not the Love of God, is the most perfect Compendium of all good Works, as Christ teaches in Matth. 22:4 from v. 36 to v. 40 inclusive, and Paul repeats the same in Rom. 13:10. Indeed, all good Works expressed through the principal one. If therefore the Love of God as the highest Good enters into the Essence of Faith, and constitutes its primary part, as being occupied with the primary Object of Faith, the primary Reason for our Justification will be the chief and principal Work of good Works, which has hitherto been rejected and refuted by the Orthodox with every effort; indeed, detested by the martyrdom of so many thousands of men.

§. 4.

They indeed object:

(1) That when they make the Love of God, or our Renunciation and Dedication, a Part of saving Faith, and place it before justification, they do not state that this Love is the Cause of Justification, on account of which we are justified either by merit and condignly, as the Pontiffs will, or by a certain gratuitous acceptilation of God, as the Socinians state, but rather, that it is required only as a Condition and a mere *causa sine qua non*, because God does not wish to give us the justice of Christ, and to justify us for its sake alone, unless we first join with Faith in Christ the Study of Good Works.

(2) That this Love, or Renunciation, Dedication and submission in the business of Justification is not considered as a good Work (just as the word Faith itself is not in the business of Justification) but as a Part of saving Faith, and also as a Condition of the New Covenant in relation to Christ.

(3) That Good Works do not flow immediately from these, but with Justification intervening.

§. 5.

But these Exceptions are nothing but illustrious Explanations of an erring Opinion, by which it is all the more easily understood in what mire they are stuck. For as to the first, by this very thing they gradually arrive at the camp of the Pontiffs, when they teach that the Love of God etc. is to be held as a Condition and *causa sine qua non* of Justification: Since they vindicate for this Good Work all that the Orthodox otherwise ascribe to Faith. In Justification, according to the Orthodoxy of the Reformed, Faith is not an Impulsive Cause, but an Instrumental one, and that a Passive one, also a Condition and a mere *causa sine qua non*. If the same is predicated of the Love of God etc., what will prevent us from saying that we are justified by a good Work as much as by Faith? The second is inept, suspending the Object from the Intellect, as if the Intellect could conceive and know a thing otherwise than it is itself. The Love of God is nothing but a good Work, indeed the best, nor can it not be held and known as a good work. The case of Faith and the Love of God is different. For Faith can be considered in two ways, either Formally, by itself and Absolutely, or Concomitantly, by another and Relatively. In the former way, it is a good Work; in the latter, only a pure Passive Instrument, apprehending the merit of Christ. It is regarded in this, not that way, in Justification. But the Love of God does not admit these two respects any more than all other good works; but as much as it is, it is a good work, and therefore cannot but be held as a good work. The third does less for the matter: For whether good Works flow from the love of God etc. Mediate or Immediately, it remains in the meantime that a good Work obtains the same role in Justification that the Orthodox assign to Faith; which smacks of Popery. Whence, as we warned a little before, saving Faith is completed by Knowledge and Confidence in Christ as Mediator: the Love of God, and indeed the Reception of Christ as King, are not always separated from Faith, but being Really and Essentially distinct from Faith, they come to be referred to Good Works or Sanctification.

§. 6.

But so that those Practical theologians may perceive that they are impregnated with the error of the Papists all the more evidently, we will supply the judgment of the Incomparable Man, Mr. Keckermann, as a supplement, by which he teaches in express words that the Pontiffs require, among other things, also the Love of God for Justification, Syst. Theol. Lib. 3. c. 7. p. 423. and following. The Pontiffs, he says, call Preparation the Foundation of Justification, which they say consists in a certain first thing and certain second things. The first, they say, is Faith, but so defined that it is a certain General Knowledge and Certainty, by which we state that the Doctrine of the divine word is true. The second Preparatives, they say, are the Acknowledgment of our sins: the second, the Fear of hell: the third, THE LOVE OF GOD: the fourth, Repentance: the fifth, the Hope of Salvation, which when someone has obtained, they say he is fully and sufficiently prepared and disposed to receive Justification. They may object [1] that the Pontiffs make Nature the Principle of all these [2] that they add Merit from Condignity. Resp. Although the Practical theologians would be undeservedly accused of these errors, they are nevertheless still conspicuous in this, that they place a Good

Work, namely the Love of God, before Justification, unmindful of the Orthodox Axiom opposed to the Heretical Pontiffs: A Good Work does not precede the one to be Justified, but follows the Justified. Wherefore, having rejected the preposterous and inauspicious Practice of the Practical theologians, we proceed with the instant business.

§.7.

And to gather the words into a few: The Formal element of Conversion is the Habit and Act of Faith, taken with its necessary Antecedent, Repentance. It is otherwise called the Seed and Root of Faith, and is finally resolved into a Spiritual Desire, about which it would now be too prolix to discourse, if other things did not still remain to be pursued and the sails of the Disputation did not seem to need to be reefed. For the rest, that the genuine Formal element has just now been handed down is proved from this, that by these alone is Conversion contradistinguished from the Regeneration of Infants, which includes neither Repentance, of which infants are incapable, nor a Habit of Faith, which is established from the Final Falling away of many, about which below. You will say: Conversion is an Action of God, but repentance and Faith are Actions of Man. Therefore they cannot enter into the Formal element of Conversion. Resp. If you inspect the thing more deeply, and speak of it as is fitting to the truth, the Repentance and Faith of Man are not so much his Actions as Passions elicited in him by God. Nor when Man grieves for and flees sins, believes, and receives Christ, does he act as an Agent, a Principal Efficient, but as an Instrumental one, not only dependent and elevated, but acted upon and as it were impelled. By which Response the second Objection is also precluded: that Man is thus constituted an Agent in Conversion.

§.8.

The Consecutive Concepts can be sought from Disputation 1 on Regeneration. Above all others, on account of the calumnies of the Adversaries, the Liberty of Conversion is to be held. Our adversaries, both Lutheran and Pontifical, when they understand from the writings of the Reformed: that Man in Conversion essentially considered behaves purely Passively, nor performs anything that would deserve to be called an Action, and when they also read: that the Mode of operating or the Causality of the Regenerating God is not only Moral by reason of the adjoined Vocation, but also Physical, by which Man is directly changed; Furthermore, that it is Infallible by reason of God's Intention; Indeed Irresistible and Invincible by reason of the Mode and Efficacy of operating, to which although Man by his innate depravity can do nothing but resist in a Divided Sense, yet he cannot resist in Act in a Composed Sense, since the regenerating Holy Spirit removes the Resistibility: From these and similar things they gather that we state Conversion to be Coerced, and devoid of all liberty. Indeed, we confess that by these the Liberty of Indifference is removed; Meanwhile, not all Liberty. The consequence from the Species to the Genus is not valid Negatively: We still retain the Liberty which is called Spontaneity, opposed to Coercion, though not to Necessity: Since we have taught elsewhere that Necessity and Liberty conspire amicably. The words on this matter are

most worthy of note, which occur in the Confession of the English Doctors composed at Westminster, and exhibited to both Houses of Parliament in the year 1648, thus translated into German: When GOD converts a sinner, and places him in the state of Grace: He then frees him from the power and servitude of sin, under which he is by nature, and makes him by his grace alone to will and to do voluntarily, that which is spiritually good. chap. 9. §. 4. The same is the Opinion of all the Reformed, to which the Testimonies of the Fathers noted by Strigelius correspond, loc. cit. p. 378. Epiphanius against the Apostates: Piety, he says, is not extorted by Coercion, but is joined with a just Election of the Will. The same in the Refutation of Montanus. To those whom God calls, he brings no Necessity nor does he impose bonds, but leaves them a Spontaneous Election. See more in the said Author. The same absurdities are deservedly reproached against Arnoldus the Jesuit, and it is hinted that he is fighting with his own ghosts by Petrus Molinæus in his French Writing, which has been translated into the Teutonic Language, the name of the book is: Glaubensschild (Shield of Faith) p. 114. Where the Jesuit inconsequently gathers from our hypotheses that Man is impelled to the Good, coerced, and deprived of all Liberty. For thus he refutes the Jesuit: Concerning the reborn, and those who are sanctified by the Spirit of GOD and are ruled, it is so far from being the case that we should say, they do good by force, that on the contrary they do it willingly and with pleasure etc. See him discoursing more fully on p. 118 & 119. All these objections arise from a neglected Knowledge of Metaphysics, which does not permit its Follower to be ignorant that Necessity and Liberty are reconciled very well with each other.

§. 9.

Imperfection, and hence sometimes Succession, also follows upon the Essence of Conversion. For often it is not completed in one Moment, Day, or Year, but gradually through continuous and sometimes even slow progresses, until it attains Perfection in the celestial Life. This becomes most conspicuous in those whose Conversion is begun in Boyhood or Adolescence: for these, through Ordinary and continuous Acts, according to the measure and in proportion to the growing judgment of a boy, proceed from an imperfect to a more perfect Disposition of the new man. Examples are Timothy, Samuel, and the like, who, consecrated to God in Infancy, began to serve Him from their first adolescence. This Imperfection is proved by (1) the Struggle of the flesh and the Spirit, Gal. 5:17, also Rom. 7:23, by which this course is repeatedly interrupted. (2) the Remnants of sin, which adhere to us throughout our entire Life, Ps 19:13. Ps. 130:3. Indeed, there are not lacking (3) express places of Holy Scripture, which prove the Imperfection and Increments of Conversion. 1 Cor. 13:9. For we know in part and we prophesy in part. Phil. 1:6. He who has begun a good work in you will complete it etc. And very many like these. We speak, however, of Imperfection not Essential but Extra-essential and Modal: Seek the Efficient and Final causes of this Imperfection in Henricus à Diest. Mellef. Catech. p.417.

SUBSECTION III. ON THE COEXISTENCE OF CONVERSION.

§. 1.

The Modes of Conversion are those by which it is divided into Ordinary and Extraordinary. Ordinary is that which occurs through the Annunciation of the word in the usual manner and way. By which reason the greatest Part of the Elect are converted, who, born in the covenant and sanctified from their Mother's womb, imbued with Faith and piety in Infancy, are successively and gently, without any sudden change, transferred from the Kingdom of the Devil into the Kingdom of God. To this mode of Conversion is also to be referred the Conversion of Abraham, Gen. 12:1, of whom it can be said that he either received the External Word through his ancestors, handed down from hand to hand, or was called by the Voice of God himself, and was converted by this means. Extraordinary is a sudden Action of God, by which He, without the Ordinary ministry of the word, either by miracles, or by some other unusual way, transfers Man from Spiritual Death to Spiritual Life. This is accustomed to happen with a certain notable Concurrence and Traction from one extreme, as it were, to the other. Such was the Conversion of Paul, Acts 9. We say only that the Extraordinary happens with a sudden change and a certain observation, not the Ordinary. Whence it is not a reciprocal sign of Conversion. For someone will be able to be entirely converted, although at no time of his life has he observed any struggle arisen in himself with great noise and trepidation. Which Versinus defends very judiciously and most solidly against some Practical theologians, *De statu Electorum ante conversionem*, num. 6. Probl. 16. p. 415.

§. 2.

The Effects of Conversion with respect to the Converted themselves are (1) The Study of Piety and good works, which they themselves pursue with all their strength, as is to be seen in the jailer, Acts 16:33, collated with the preceding verse, also in Lydia in the same Chapter, v. 15. coll. with v. 14. [2] Certainty both of Conversion itself and consequently of eternal salvation. Whoever are converted, they also acknowledge that they are converted. Conversion is of Adults. But all Adults enjoy a Reflexive Act of the Intellect, by which means they can reflect upon all their Actions and Passions, and therefore also know, and that more certainly than by Logical Demonstration, that they are converted. You say: After the gravest Temptations, and also after greater Lapses, does not this certainty vanish? Resp. Not at all. Even here we can be certain of our Conversion from the Desire for the Grace of God and for Reconciliation with him, indeed we ought to be, according to the Admonition of the Apostle, restricted to no time, 2 Cor. 13:5. The effect with respect to other faithful is (1) Joy, Luke 15:7. Acts 11:23. (2) Glorification of God, Acts 11:18.

TO GOD ALONE BE THE GLORY.

THIRD DISPUTATION On PREPARATION

Section I. NOMINAL KNOWLEDGE.

§. 1.

Just as the Most Sacred Page distributes all of the Christian Name into two Species, into Adults, who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil; and into Infants, who are unskilled in the word of righteousness, Heb. 5:13 & 14; so also the external food of Christians, whether it is that which is applied to their Souls through hearing, is of a twofold Difference; One Solid, the other Milky. The former comprises the inner and more difficult Heads of Theology; the latter supplies the Elements of the oracles of God. The former is offered to Adults; the latter to Infants, i.e., to the more imperfect. For God acts according to the Capacity of the Subject, He impresses according to its Receptivity. Nor does God observe this custom only in the External feeding of Souls, but He also holds an accurate distinction of all these in the Internal. Whence, desiring to infuse Spiritual Life into spiritually dead Souls, He communicates it to each in that measure in which each is fit to receive it. We have dealt with the Spiritual Life which is conferred on Adults in the preceding Disputation; It remains that we see with what Infants are endowed.

§. 2.

This is an abstruse Matter and beset with the greatest difficulties, which few have touched upon, so much so that, as Maresius, a most celebrated Theologian of the Belgians, attests, scarcely anyone is found who has discussed it *ex professo* and accurately, and has studied to remove the grave Difficulties thence arising, *Sylog. Disput. Selectiorum* p. 158. Num. 7. From this it has happened that not even a peculiar name has ever been imposed upon this Thing. We, because we observe that the Regeneration of Adults is designated by Theologians with the name of Conversion, have striven to assign a name also to the Regeneration of Infants. Where the word Preparation seemed, for good reason, to be embraced above others.

§.3.

Preparation, by reason of the Object about which it is concerned, or of the thing which it precedes, can be taken either Commonly, for any Action or Theologically: that opens the Way for another to be either simply performed or more conveniently executed. Or Theologically, insofar as it refers to Sacred Things. And since Theological Things, or those which respect the Worship of God, are of a twofold kind, either External or Internal: Therefore, Theological Preparation can be taken either Externally, for the Action which disposes us and makes us fit to exhibit the External Worship of God: Such is the Preparation for hearing the Word of God, Eccles. 5:1, for using the Sacraments, e.g., the Passover in the Old Testament, which Preparation is most prolixly recounted in Exod. 12; the Supper in the New Testament, which consists in the Exploration of

ourselves, as the Apostle teaches, 1 Cor. 11:28. And this Action is so usually called Preparation, that in our Churches it is so called Absolutely; Or Internally for the Action which disposes us and makes us fit to perform the Internal Worship of God, e.g., for pious Meditations, for a serious desire for eternal Life, for Acquiescence in God and Christ etc.

§. 4

Moreover, this Preparation is used Theologically either Confusedly and More Broadly, insofar as it applies to every Theological Action. Or Distinctly and More Strictly for that Action of God and Passion of Man by which Man, freed from the bonds of impiety and spiritual death, enters upon a Life to be lived for God. And this is called by one name, Regeneration. Which if it is perfect in all its numbers, and includes all the parts by which a Man is made fit to perform the Actions of Spiritual Life (such as has place only in Adults), it is accustomed to be called Conversion; But if it enjoys only some parts, and those constituted in a small degree, such as is that of Infants, who, on account of their small Intellect and Will, and thus of their human Life, also participate in a small beginning of Spiritual Life, it is signified by Us with the Title of PREPARATION, the Denomination being sought from Preparing Grace as its Formal Cause. Meanwhile, it can perhaps also be designated by other words, e.g., of Covenant; because it belongs only to those who are Citizens of the divine Covenant, initiated with the Church and its Seed, or who by the Covenant alone attain to that grace of God. Also for the same reason, of Inheritance, because it is transmitted and obtained through parents.

Section II. Real Knowledge

SUBSECTION I. ON THE EXISTENCE OF PREPARATION.

§. 1.

Although it is not found Formally and κατὰ τὸ ῥητόν (according to the letter) in the Holy Page that this Preparation belongs to Infants; And not even Regeneration, extended somewhat more broadly, is attributed to Infants by name; Meanwhile, its equivalent, κατ' ἰσοδυναμίαν (according to equivalence), exists manifoldly and frequently in the Holy Scriptures.

(1) Matth. 18:6. Where Infants are said to Believe or have faith. And since an analogue, when posited by itself, stands for its more famous and excellent signification, by that grace is understood not a broader Belief or Historical Faith (of which they are scarcely capable), but a stricter Belief and in Christ, or a true and saving Faith, which constitutes the Formal Reason of Regeneration. The words in Matthew are these: Ὅς δ' ἂν σκανδαλίση ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων (But whoever causes one of these little ones who believe to stumble). And although by "these little ones" Some here understand not Infants properly, but improperly and metaphorically so called, i.e., Pious Adults, who are Infants in malice, 1 Cor. 14:20; To us, however, that acceptance does not seem congruent with the Text: Both because in the preceding Verses Christ had spoken of Infants or "little ones" properly so called, and continues this discourse in the cited verse: And because no Necessity urges us to depart from the Propriety of the Words: And finally, because the word τούτων (of these) is expressly added in the Text, by which Christ doubtless refers to the Boy whom He had placed in the Midst of the Disciples. You will say: τούτων cannot refer to that Boy, because it is of the Plural Number. Resp. Christ is no longer speaking of the single Boy brought into the midst, but of many of the same kind, of such Boys. And therefore both here and in similar places, properly so called "little ones" are understood. Piscator agrees with us. Hence we argue: Whoever believe in Christ, they are prepared or regenerated: Infants believe in Christ. E. The Consequence of the Major is Necessary and Essential, consisting of Essentially connected Terms; the Minor is of Holy Scripture.

(2) Ephes. 5:25 & 26, Where the Apostle says; Christ loved the Church, and gave himself up for her, that he might sanctify her, cleansing her by the washing of Regeneration. From which Passage, for the Regeneration of Infants, if only they too pertain to the Church (which will not easily be denied by anyone, unless by a Heretic), a twofold Argumentation is constructed. The First: Whoever are sanctified, they also are regenerated. Some Infants, who cannot but be understood under the name of the Church, are sanctified. E. The consequence of the Major is this: Because true Sanctification cannot be without Regeneration. It is confirmed: Because the Sanctified please God, but now without Faith, or, what is the same, without Regeneration, no one can please God. Heb. 11. Then, the Sanctified cannot be so except through Christ, and not through Christ unless apprehended by faith. E. The Sanctified cannot not believe.

The Minor is of Holy Scripture. The Second: Whomever Christ cleanses with the washing of water, they are regenerated. Christ cleanses the Church, and therefore also Infants, with the washing of water. E. The Major is again most certain, consisting of Inseparable Terms. But the Minor is of Holy Scripture. Although these Arguments fight only for Baptized Infants.

(3) The Third, Matth. 19:14. Let the little children come to me (these are the words of Christ) and do not forbid them to come to me: for of such is the Kingdom of heaven. In which Words the Possession of eternal life is attributed to Infants. And to whom the Inheritance of eternal life belongs, to them Regeneration certainly is not to be denied. For only those are pronounced Blessed in the Apocalypse, who become partakers of the first Resurrection, i.e., of Regeneration, Chap. 20:6. More Arguments could be brought forward, by which the Preparation of Infants is confirmed, but since they at the same time prove the faith of Infants, we will reserve them for another, more convenient place.

§. 2.

What the Cause of Preparation is, is hidden from no one who has noted from the preceding what Cause we attributed to Regeneration in general. For since God alone, by the Grace of the Holy Spirit alone, effects both Regeneration in General and Conversion in Specie, surely no other Causes, besides these, can be assigned to Preparation; And this becomes all the more certain and evident in Preparation than in Conversion, the less an Infant is capable of the Use of Natural Free Will than an Adult. Where whatever spiritual Life is present, all of it must necessarily be attributed to the Holy Spirit dwelling in Infants and exciting pious motions. A most worthy example of note occurs in John, Luke 1:44, who in his Mother's womb leaped for joy at the presence of Christ, ἐσκήρτησεν ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει (he leaped in exultation). The exultation was without doubt not a common one, which not rarely happens to pregnant women for physical reasons, nor a common joy; Otherwise both of these would not have been so studiously praised by Elizabeth and explained to Mary the Mother of the Lord; But it had a Supernatural Cause, namely the Holy Spirit, who worked these things in the Infant according to its Condition. This Lord Valcknier, formerly a Professor at Leiden, himself concedes in his Disputation de Fide Infantum. You will say: Therefore it is gathered that an Infant is as incapable as possible of Spiritual Motions, because he concedes that those motions were excited by the Holy Spirit. Resp. This follows no more than if someone, because an Adult Man behaves merely Passively in Conversion, should conclude: that Conversion cannot possibly belong to him. Both are true: Both that an Adult is converted by God Alone, and yet that he himself repents and rests in Christ with true faith. In the same manner, both stand on a firm footing: Both that the Holy Spirit Alone was the Cause of these Spiritual motions, and yet that John himself leaped with joy. You insist: But in Adults not yet Converted there is a certain fitness of the Rational Soul and of the Will for Conversion. Resp. There is indeed in an Adult a Free Will, but only of Contradiction, and in evil things. Indeed, this Aptitude for acting and not acting, viewed in General, is so far from bringing any moment to Conversion, that it even obstructs it in many ways: Because from it there is a

perpetual Reluctance and Struggle against the Good. For which reason, Preparation will be more easily introduced into an Infant, because, although he is, as much as he is, filled with perversity, nevertheless on account of the perfect Use of Free Will inclining only to evil being denied to the Infant, no such vehement Repugnance has a place here, and therefore a Suppositum is more commodiously present for admitting Preparation.

§. 3.

The Subject of Preparation has been already mentioned Confusedly, so that we may have it known a little more distinctly, we ask here: Which Infants are endowed with this Internal Grace of the Holy Spirit? To properly enucleate this Question, we note:

(1) that Men are of two kinds: Some Outside; Some Inside the Church; Or there are Some Covenanted, Others constituted outside the Covenant. We speak of the Covenant not of the Law, but of the Evangelical Covenant, which indeed at the beginning and through itself God made with all men in Adam, Gen. 3:15. The seed of the woman will bruise the head of the Serpent. But from thence it was taken away by the ingratitude of Posterity, to the point that in the Scriptures a Distinction is made between the Sons of God and the sons of men, Gen. 6:2, i.e., between those who have been adopted by God as sons by the Evangelical Covenant, and those who, with the covenant rescinded and released from the communion of God, live left to themselves. Between the sons τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῆς διαθήκης (of the prophets and of the covenant), and those who are opposed to them, Acts 3:25. Where expressly the Sons of the Covenant or the Covenanted are said to be only the Posterity of Abraham, because God had renewed the Covenant with Abraham and his posterity, and had restricted it to them: I will be your God and the God of your seed, Gen. 17:7. Between the Circumcised and the Uncircumcised, Rom. 2:28, 29. And lest anyone here think that by the Circumcised the Apostle understands only the Jews, he adds circumcised in Heart, and calls them Jews, i.e., sons of the Covenant of Abraham, Rom. 4:12. Who follow in the footsteps of believing Abraham. Indeed, he distinguishes expressly between Those who are outside, and Those who are inside, 1 Cor. 5:12. The former the Apostle calls Men of this world, v. 10. The latter, Brothers, v. 11. Because on account of the Covenant struck in the Mediator, they have one and the same Father, God himself. Eph. 4:6.

(2) We note: that from Parents of this diverse Condition, Children are also procreated, who are separated by the same distinction by which their Parents differ from each other, so that Some are held as Covenanted, Others as exiles from the Covenant. The foundation of this Distinction is again expressed in the Holy Scriptures, where God promises to be the God both of Abraham and of his Posterity, and therefore of his Children, loc. cit.

§. 4.

These things having been expedited, we repeat the Question: Do All Infants indiscriminately, or only the Covenanted, obtain this Preparation? Which Question can no longer be calumniated as ineptly formed by some of the Remonstrants, who, as D. Johannes Bergius notes in Vom Willen Gottes, p. 220, contend that no one is excepted from the Covenant, but that all Children universally are to be held as Covenanted; Because all are Children of Adam, who made a Covenant with God. For from what has already been handed down, it is not obscurely understood that all indeed, insofar as they are viewed in Adam, are Covenanted, and therefore no one is Non-covenanted in Thesis and Absolutely; But that some, through the Inobedience of their Ancestors, in a long or shorter series preceding them, have been removed from the Covenant, and are therefore Non-covenanted in Hypothesis and Privatively. Therefore, to the Question we Respond: that Preparation belongs only to the Covenanted, and is not common to the non-covenanted:

(1) Because God does not Ordinarily extend His Spiritual and Saving Benefits beyond the Church. He does not cast pearls before swine, nor the holy to dogs, Matth. 7:6. But now those constituted outside the Church are dogs, For outside are dogs, Apoc. 22:15.

(2) Because those who are not Members of the Christian Church are alienated from the Civil state of Israel, strangers to the Covenants of Promise, and also have no Hope and live without God in the world. Ephes. 2:12, coll. with v. 11. Certainly those who do not even have the Hope of eternal Life do not by any means attain to the spiritual gifts of the Church. You object: This is said of Adults, who by their Actual sins and pertinacious Unbelief repeatedly repudiate the Grace of God; Not of Infants, who cannot despise the Grace of God, because they are immune from Actual sins and Unbelief. Resp. Besides that this cannot be proved from the Text, which rather testifies the Contrary, when it discusses the converted Ephesians, that they were formerly, i.e., before the Time of Conversion, whether that comes under the name of Infancy, or Adolescence, or Virile age, without Christ, without God, without any Hope; we furthermore deny that Infants lack Actual Sins: since they betray them in many ways even in their first years by anger and other affections, and which flow from their Original Sin as from a perennial fount. Namely Gen. 6:5. Every imagination etc. is evil all the time. Also c.8.21. The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth. What? That although it is conceded that Actual Sins are not committed by Infants, it is certain in the meantime that posterity is afflicted by God with this and similar punishments on account of the Covenantal sins of their Parents.

(3) Because the Infants of Pagans and the like are not Holy in any way, but impure, 1 Cor. 7:14. But those to whom Preparation happens are purified, so that they cannot be called impure.

§.5.

These things being duly weighed, some of our Theologians write that the Infants of the Non-covenanted are not saved but are damned. D. Maresius in his *Epicrisis adversus Dallaeum*, Exercit. 10. Num 34. p-562. The Children of the Non-covenanted, he says, dying in infancy without the Guilt of a New Sin, perish eternally. To which Joh. Bergius also inclines, l. cit. p.215 & 221, and Others. Because, namely, they are held as impure by Scripture itself, and the same Scripture exterminates the impure from the Celestial Kingdom, Apoc. 21:27. For nothing is more testified than that he who does not believe will be damned, John 3. But he who does not believe is judged already. Also, Matth. ult. And just as it is consonant with the Truth that Jews, Turks etc. do not believe, and therefore perish eternally; so it is no less consonant with the Truth that the Children of the Non-covenanted are impure, and do not believe, and are therefore exiled from eternal felicity. Nor should anyone say: that in this way all Infants will perish, since all are impure, i.e., infected with Original Sin. For since Holy Scripture is not ignorant of this matter, which testifies everywhere of the Original Impurity of Infants; yet it nevertheless names some Covenanted and Holy; others Non-covenanted and impure: it is manifest that another Impurity and Sanctity is supposed here, by which the Covenanted and Non-covenanted are distinguished. The Children of the Covenanted are called Holy by this Grace of Preparation; but the Non-covenanted are called impure, because this Benefit is denied to them, as being alien to the Church. Which being denied, scarcely any other Judgment can be made of them, than that to which the adduced Authors decide the Matter from the very Mouth of Christ: Unless one is born again of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of heaven, John 3. Although, in the meantime, not a few are found who, in this and Similar Questions, as being not in every respect testified from the Holy Code, prefer to suspend judgment, led by the Example of the Apostle himself, who, 1 Cor. 5:12 & 13, wishes to state nothing whatever concerning those who are outside the Church: For what have I to do with judging those who are outside? Do you not judge those who are inside? For God will judge those who are outside.

§.6.

Lest this Controversy should delay us further; in the meantime, the firmest opinion sits in our mind; that Only the Covenanted, but not the Uncovenanted, are the Subject of Preparation. And so we return to those who are inside, to inquire further concerning them: Whether, just as Only the Covenanted are prepared; so also All covenanted Infants are affected by God with this Grace. To enucleate which Question, we again note. (1) Covenanted Infants are either Baptized or Unbaptized; And that Baptism does not happen to these either from the Contempt of the Parents, or because this Sacrament could not be legitimately obtained. The Lutherans, emulating the Pontiffs in this part, commonly deny eternal salvation explicitly to the unbaptized in former times, and still implicitly and by Consequence, while they deny Regeneration and therefore Preparation, and suspend them from Baptism. Whence for Christianus Nisanius, Provost of the Churches of Isenberg, Unbaptized Infants and Infants in a State of Wrath are

Grammatical Synonyms. Exercitatione de Fide Infantium §. 2. p.7. Indeed, the perverse Saying and Opinion of the Lutherans concerning Unbaptized Infants, though born of Christians in the true Church, is so received in these Regions and other places of Germany, that it is now most well-known in Belgium, by which they, not without blasphemy, call Unbaptized Infants Heathens, and the Pastors are accustomed to address their Auditors thus: GOD has given me a Heathen; I pray you will make him a Christian. See Mr. Maresius & Mr. Valcknier in their Disputations de Fide infantium. The Lutherans state this to consult their own Hypothesis, no less absurd: Namely, that Baptism is the sole Medium for infusing or conferring Faith, necessary for Faith and therefore for Salvation, not only with a Necessity of Precept, but also of a Means. Although in the meantime they do not a little obstruct their other Hypothesis concerning Universal and sufficient Grace in this way. For if Infants before Baptism are to be reputed as Heathens, and yet cannot be regenerated without Baptism; But indeed many, forestalling Baptism either by some Necessity or by a premature death, are kept from it; How Universal and Sufficient Grace can belong even to all the Covenanted, outside the Case of Divine Grace maliciously and contumaciously repudiated, cannot be understood. For what can be answered by Us, who likewise defend Universal Grace, concerning the Uncovenanted, is ready at hand: Namely, that Sufficient Grace nevertheless befell the Uncovenanted in their Ancestors. You will say: The Lutherans can escape in the same way of responding in the Question of Covenanted Infants. Resp. Not at all: For since the Parents of the Covenanted have not rejected this Grace of the Covenant, surely Sufficient and Immediate Grace cannot be denied and withdrawn from their Children, which however is denied to them, when without any new Fault, either of their own or of their Parents, they are deprived of Baptism, the Necessary Medium of Regeneration according to the Lutherans, and therefore of Sufficient Grace: But this by the way. It is especially to be observed that the Lutherans, by this very fact, whenever they irrigate any Infant with Baptism, contradict this Assertion, by which they contend that Unbaptized Infants are unregenerated: When from the Sponsors, being asked before Baptism: Whether the Infants believe in God the Father etc., they extort this Responsive Voice, rendered in the place of the Infants: I believe. Whence it is gathered, either that that Response is vain and feigned, or that the Infant before Baptism believes, and consequently is regenerated, or that Faith is not of the Essence of Regeneration or Preparation, so that one can believe, and yet not be Regenerated. I will not commemorate another Contradiction, in which they implicate themselves here, when they believe that Unbaptized Infants are saved, and yet urge against certain of our Theologians, who deny Faith to Infants; that No one can be saved without Faith.

§. 7.

We note (2) that Covenanted Infants are either Perfect, consisting of all their parts, both Essential and Integral, or Imperfect Embryos and still lurking in the Mother's womb. What the Lutherans again think of the latter, besides what anyone can easily guess from the above, we produce the express words of Deutschmann, Professor at Wittenberg, in

his Disputation de Fide Infantum sine Baptismo discedentium, Sect. 2. §.8. Indeed, he says, although it Ordinarily happens to them [he speaks of such imperfect little infants begotten from a Christian bed and not yet emerged from the mother's womb into this Light, but extinguished there] to die before being born and reborn, yet etc. By which Words he denies Preparation, considered absolutely, although at the end of that sphere he asserts doubtfully that it can happen that God works Faith and Salvation in them Extraordinarily, and in the meantime advises that they be commended to God in prayers. He adduces Forster in Thesaurus Catech. De Bapt. Decad. 4. Probl. 9, as the Patron of his opinion. By which reason he certainly supplies little Solace to Christian Parents, at least he leaves them doubtful as to where their Infants migrate, whether to Heaven or indeed to Hell. Hülsemann is more correct, Extens. Breviar. in Supplem. Capitis 15 de Fidel. Perseverantia §. 10, Where he thinks it is not doubtful but certain from the Promise of God, Acts 2:39, that in the sons and embryos of the Faithful who die before the Application of the Ordinary Means of Conversion, God excites faith in an Extraordinary Manner, p. 432.

§-8.

These things being premised, we affirm the Question concerning Covenanted infants endowed with a rational Soul, whether they are baptized or not, whether they are Perfect or Embryos. We prove our opinion from the most general Formula of the covenant sanctioned with Abraham, which exists in Gen. 17:7. I will establish my covenant between Me and You throughout their generations, that it may be a perpetual covenant. Which Words the Apostle Peter teaches concern not only Abraham and his Posterity, but all the Faithful entirely, whether they be Adults or Infants, Acts 2:39. To you, hearers, to you and to your Children the Promise of Salvation was made. From these we construct such an Argument: To whom the Promise of Salvation was made and whose God is God, they are regenerated or prepared. But also to the Seed of the Faithful, i.e., to all Infants, the promise of Salvation was made, and their God is God. E. The Reason for the Connection of the Major is: Because God never promises eternal Salvation to the Unregenerated, as such, but threatens eternal punishments, He never promises to be their benign God, but announces in His Word that He will be a most rigorous Judge to them. On our side are the most renowned English theologians, Davanant, Ward, Cornelius Burges, whom Voetius cites, Disp. Select. Part 2, p. 410 & 412. The last of whom distinguishes Regeneration into Initial and Actual, and says the former consists in the Participation of the Spirit of Christ, and belongs to infants. Although they still differ from us in this, that they postpone Regeneration to Baptism and think that this is required as a causa sine qua non, against the most common Opinion of the Reformed, which, led by Holy Scripture, believes and teaches that Spiritual Benefits are not produced by the Sacraments, but are signified by them, confirmed and augmented with them. Since We are most tenacious of this Doctrine, perhaps nothing will remain which in our Opinion will displease the Great Voetius, since he does not reject the Opinion of the Lords Authors just cited, because they state that in Covenanted Infants the Initial Regeneration

of the Holy Spirit has a place; but he only rejects this, that they opine it is conferred on Infants only through Baptism. The same we also reject as a Papist Figment built upon the Opus Operatum, and hence apprehended and defended by the Lutherans, who not rarely retain the Opus Operatum in practice itself. For the rest, there is still one thing, in which we do not agree with the Excellent Mr. Voetius, just as there was one thing which he himself did not approve of in the English Theologians, Namely, when it is asked: Whether Internal Preparation along with External is to be ascribed to all Covenanted Infants. Where he embraces the Negative, with the added Distinction between the Non-Elect Covenanted and the Elect Covenanted, on account of his Hypothesis of only Particular Grace to the exclusion of Universal, Loc. cit. p. 412. Probl. 4. We, however, cannot but absolutely defend the Affirmative from our Hypothesis of asserting Particular and Universal Grace at the same time.

§. 9.

A question arises here concerning the Infants of Heretics, Whether they too attain Preparing Grace? Since we have hitherto proved that Preparation is restricted to the Covenant, whatever Controversy is moved, it finally devolves to this: Do Heretics pertain to the covenant? The Affirmative of this Question affirms at the same time the first Question, as being essentially connected and supposed; the Negative on the contrary denies it. For the Negative it is adduced (1) that Heretics attack and subvert the Fundamental and Essential heads of Faith, e.g., the Antitrinitarians the Holy Trinity; the Socinians the Merit of Christ etc. And this (2) with signal pertinacity, so that they most sharply oppose the truth sufficiently proposed and manifested, and refuse to perceive its meaning out of perversity of mind. Compare Amesius, De Conscient. Lib. 4. c. 4. §. 2 & 3. The Affirmative is persuaded by (1) because they profess the Christian Religion and Christ: Which is also a Requisite of a Heretic. And therefore (2) they embrace the Revealed Word of God as divinely handed down. Indeed (3) Not a few of them observe the true administration of the sacraments. Hence they participate in the Marks of the Church or of the Covenanted, at least in part, and that the greater part. However, as we do not simply incline to either part; so we think a Distinction is necessary: Between heretics broadly so called, who subvert some Articles of Faith fundamentally and essentially, and for this purpose defile Holy Scripture with false glosses; but meanwhile formally preserve the Word of God, and indeed administer the Sacraments, especially that of Baptism, integrally; And between heretics strictly so called, who reject the Word of God and Holy Scripture for the most part, either as to its Authority formally, or pervert and evert it with abominable and profane Interpretations. What should be said of these and their Children cannot be in doubt, namely, that being alien from the Covenant of God, they are in no way made partakers of Spiritual Benefices. As to the former, we think it is safer to incline to the milder part, especially since the Apostle himself not obscurely leads us to this, when he attributes Sanctity and therefore the Grace of Regeneration to Infants begotten of only one faithful parent, 1 Cor. 7. What? That it is not likely that the Infants of the Israelites, who followed Baal and Moloch, but

meanwhile retained Circumcision, were exterminated from the Divine covenant, and consequently deprived of Regeneration.

SUBSECTION II. On THE ESSENCE OF PREPARATION.

§.1.

We comprehend and exhibit the Essence of Preparation in a brief Definition: Preparation is a Regeneration by which Infants are endowed with some actual Faith.

WE SAY (I) IT IS REGENERATION: By which Word we suppose the Corruption of Infants, both Original, against Pelagius and Socinus, who are entirely focused on denying the Existence of Original Sin, and thus subverting the Whole of Christianity, whose Center is Christ the Mediator; And Actual, which can be seen as soon as they begin to enjoy the use of this temporal Life. To which pertains that Decision of God himself: Every imagination of the Heart of man is evil from his youth, Gen. 8:21. It is objected in vain that Infants possess no use of either Intellect or Will, and therefore cannot sin Actually. For the Resp: (a) What is supposed as certain is false, nor is it conceded that Infants are deprived of all use of Intellect and Will: Since the Intellect and Will, as they are of the Essence of Man, seem less able to be separated from all Act and use. (b) It is known in theological matters: that not the human Intellect and Will are the Norm of Right and Oblique, of Good and Evil, but the Law of God, which whenever it is transgressed, whether it happens immediately from the Will, or without the Will and Purpose, a sin is committed, according to that: Ἡ ἀμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία (Sin is lawlessness), 1 John 3. We also suppose by the word Regeneration, that both the Intellect and the Will of Infants are in some way restored and renewed, according to their natural Capacity, however; Because spiritual Regeneration is placed chiefly in this, that through it the human Intellect and Will are vindicated from their native stains and vices. Finally, we suppose: that this Mutation is made by God himself, and by him alone; because (as we have proved above) Regeneration is an Action proper to God alone. Whence Baptism contributes nothing Effectively to it in Baptized Infants, to which divine Properties cannot be communicated; But it only concurs Adjunctively and Significatively. So that it should not be vaunted as a speaking medium conferring salvation, whose nature is to influence the thing, for the acquisition of which it is used. Much less the Minister administering it. This is all the more clear, because not even Faith itself, which is the Formal element of Regeneration, can be called an Active medium of salvation without the Peril of Pelagianism. If therefore not even faith, to which such excellent Predicates are added in the Holy Scriptures, deserves to be called an Effective medium of salvation; how much less will Baptism or even the Ministerial Cause of Baptism work Preparation and Regeneration, in which eternal Life consists as to its Inchoation.

§.2.

WE SAY (II) THAT BY THIS REGENERATION SOMETHING IS GIVEN TO INFANTS: By which reason we exclude all Merit, both of the Parents and of the Infants themselves. Concerning the Infants, the matter is clear: For they, because they are evil by their Nature, and are conceived and born in Sins, Ps. 51, by no merit of their own do they obtain the Grace of Preparation from God. And how could they merit it, when as soon as

they are born, indeed as soon as they begin to live in their Mother's womb, they are prevented by God with this Benefit? Nor can God foresee anything Good in them, which would move him to bestow it, both because many of them are extinguished even in the womb, and because this Preparation is the first and sole Reason for all Good that will henceforth proceed from them. Whence what is said of Esau and Jacob in Rom. 9, v. 11, 12, 13, has a place here: For the children not yet being born, nor having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, i.e., not of works but of Him who calls, it was firm, etc. Jacob I have loved, but Esau I have hated. Especially if by Esau and Jacob not precisely they, but their entire Posterity is understood. Certainly, it is entirely owed to Divine Grace that, the Posterity of Esau having been passed over, only the Posterity of Jacob, as Sons of the Covenant and members of the Church, enjoyed the Spiritual Benefits of the Church and Consequently also regenerating Preparation itself. Thus in respect of Infants, this Grace is entirely gratuitous. It is to be considered no less gratuitous in respect of Adult Parents, if only that of Christ comes to mind, Luke 17:10. When you have done all those things which you were commanded, say, 'We are unprofitable servants. We have done what was our duty to do.' An express Passage on this matter is Isa. 43 from v. 22 seqq. For you have not called upon Me, O Jacob; And you have been weary of Me, O Israel. You have not brought Me etc. I, even I, am He who blots out your transgressions for My own sake; And I will not remember your sins. By Jacob here are primarily understood the more Adult in Israel, who can offer such sacrifices as are recounted in the Text. If therefore God extinguishes their Iniquities for his own sake alone, how much more those of their Infants. And those who could not merit for themselves to be freed from their sins, how will they merit it for others, namely for their own infants?

§. 3.

WE SAY (III) IT IS A DONATION OF FAITH: The word Faith being freed from all equivocation, so that by it is understood a true, sufficient for their age, and saving Faith, by which when they die, they live no less than Adults, according to the Saying of the Apostle: The just shall live by his faith, Heb. 10:38. We will prove this with three Arguments sought from Holy Scripture: The first, by which Faith is attributed to Infants Explicitly, the rest by which it is attributed Implicitly. The first will confirm the matter Immediately and Proximately: The other two Mediatly through the Formal Cause and Effects. The first exists in Matth. 18:6. ὃς δ' ἂν σκανδαλίση ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ (but whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in me to stumble). The same words are found in Mark 9:42. They are to be compared with the preceding Verses of Matthew, where these little ones are called by another name, children. Falsely and Sophistically, the Lutherans, and among them Nisanius, bring in and urge here τὸ βρέφος (the infant) from Luke chap. 18, v. 15, p. 30, and τὸ ἐναγκαλισάμενος (he took him in his arms), p. 31 at the end & 32, from Mark 10:16. Since these two Places are not parallel to that Place which is in Matthew, but in which another History is narrated of other Infants brought to Christ. To whom also τὸ πιστεύειν (to believe) is not attributed

by Christ, but of whom it is only said that they were received into his arms by Christ, and having laid his hands on them, he blessed them. Whence in passing it may be noted how injurious the Lutherans often are to our Theologians, or rather to the Sacred Founts themselves, which they corrupt by composing what should be divided, and dividing what should be composed, so that they may just destroy the Doctrines of the Reformed, caring little whether it is done by right or wrong. We persist in this single Place of Matthew collated with the others cited at the same time, and from it we observe that τὸ πιστεύειν is said (a) of the μικροῖς, i.e., of the Little ones (b) of the παιδίοις, i.e., of the small Children. Because παιδίον is a Diminutive from the name παῖς, Boy, and signifies an Infant or small Boy. From which it is established that not only Boys but also Little ones and Infants believe. There are those who urge τὸ σκανδαλίζειν (to cause to stumble), and by it they labor to explain what kind of Infants and what kind of little Children are understood. Namely, not Little ones, but somewhat Older ones, to whom a Scandal is presented by a Bad Example. But besides that not every Scandal is Actual, but sometimes only Potential, as can be gathered from that of Christ, saying to Peter, Matth. 16:23. Get behind me, Satan! You are a stumbling block to me. Where what was said by Peter did not bring Scandal to Christ, but was only composed and compared to presenting a Scandal; a Scandal is also given by a Deed, not only by an Example, e.g., When what was rightly and deservedly to be exhibited to someone is not performed, although he does not perceive it (which Scandal can be committed in various ways with respect to Infants). Furthermore, it is plain that those little infants can be scandalized by an Example, of whom (if we were to rely on the Testimony of the senses) it would have to be judged entirely that they know absolutely nothing of Christ. Many little infants, certainly, who are well educated, are averse to some Misdeed, about whom the Articles of Faith are not yet established. For that reason, those who find this Exception less suitable for attacking our Thesis, flee to another, thinking with the Anabaptists (who deny all Faith to Infants) that τὸ μικρῶν is to be taken improperly, and does not signify those who are Small in stature and age, but in Faith, or also simple and sincere in Morals. But how greatly the Text is twisted in this way, we have shown above, where we also warned that one should not depart from the Proper signification to the Improper without a grave Cause. What? That never in the Holy Scriptures are those who are sincere, or of even a small Faith, called μικροί, but ἐλάχιστοι or ὀλιγόπιστοι, and by other Names. Hence also from the alleged Place of Matthew, Ludovicus Crocius proves that Infants believe, against Socinus and Smalcus, and confirms this more fully in his Antisocinismus, Disput. 16, de Fide Iustificante, quest. 6. Also Disput. 21. quest.1. p. 317.

§. 4.

Our second Argument is: Because Infants have the Holy Spirit, by whom they are sanctified. This is clear from the Example of John the Baptist, who was filled with the Holy Spirit while he was still in his Mother's womb, Luke 1:15, and of Jeremiah, to whom God himself said: Before you came forth from the womb, he says, I sanctified you. Jer. 1:5. And lest anyone should object to us that a false Collection is made from the Singular to

the Universal, we subjoin the Saying of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 7:14. Where all covenanted Infants are called Holy. Which sanctity certainly cannot be without at least some faith. Since what is without Faith can in no way be called Holy, if, that is, it is capable of Intrinsic Sanctity. For Faith is the Origin and Principle of all Sanctity. Hence it is that all the works of all the Heathen, although excellent and good in themselves, are called evil, because they proceed from unbelieving Subjects. The most Celebrated Mr. Maresius professes the same, Disp. cit. §. 84. Infants, he says, are endowed with the Spirit of Sanctification, which is also the Spirit of Faith, 1 Cor. 12, etc. For there is no doubt that Infants, if they depart to better things by a premature death, are incorporated into Christ by the Holy Spirit, are Regenerated and Sanctified, and are suitably prepared for the Kingdom of Heaven.

§. 5.

To the Examples they object in general: That they are Peculiar and Extraordinary. In Specie concerning John, they say: It does not follow that those who are filled with the Holy Spirit immediately believe or acquire faith. Concerning Jeremiah, however: that by being sanctified, nothing else is signified than a Separation and Election or Destination to the Prophetic Office. Finally, to the alleged Saying, they distinguish between External Ecclesiastical or Federal Sanctity, and Internal and Proper Sanctity. But Resp. (a) to that which was said of the Examples in general: They cannot be called peculiar if you look at the Thing itself, not the Mode of the Thing; because the same is affirmed of all Infants in the Saying, 1 Cor. 7. Hence Polanus says that from these Examples God provides a document of what He can do in the rest, indeed of what He in reality also performs in the rest, although it is not always so observed by us. Syntag. Theol. lib. 6, c. 37, p. 3013. (b) In Specie: Concerning John, that the Consequence from the Inhabitation of the Holy Spirit to Faith is badly denied there: Because the Holy Spirit cannot otherwise dwell in our Hearts than by faith, Eph. 3:17. Then, unless the Holy Spirit had excited Faith in John, He was plainly idle in him. For other Holy Works could not then be produced on account of his age. What? that if He effected other holy works in him, Faith must again be supposed, as that without which nothing holy among men deserves to be called so. Concerning Jeremiah, Resp. The Position of one is not the Exclusion of another. Indeed, by the very fact that he is said to have been destined for the Prophetic Office from the womb, it is not obscurely understood, or at least probably gathered, that he was also affected there with a peculiar Grace of the Holy Spirit. Finally, what is especially to be noted, in the Text itself, the Destination to the Prophetic Office is explained in some words, and its Sanctification in others. For thus the Words: Before you came forth from the womb I sanctified you: I appointed you a prophet to the Gentiles. As to the Distinction applied to the Saying of the New Testament, I acknowledge indeed that it is Formal but not Real. Federal External sanctity is one thing, Federal Intrinsic is another; Meanwhile these Sanctities always remain conjoined in Infants, although not in the same degree and mode as in Adults and the Converted. Because with the latter denied, the former is denied, or at least becomes equivocal, belonging also to hypocrites, of which it

is manifest the Apostle is not speaking in the cited place. Nor are there lacking among our own who explain this Place of Internal and Inherent Sanctity: Let us hear the Excellent Mr. Voetius, loc. frequently cited, p. 420. Probl. 36, where he asks: Whether in 1 Cor. 7:14 only Relative and External Grace of the External Covenant is to be understood. And he responds: Not a few of the Commentators urge nothing further from this Saying etc. Also the Leiden theologians, contending not only from that place but also nowhere else from the whole of Holy Scripture can anything else be sculpted out. They rely on this reason: That Infants are incapable of Regeneration. We not only think that the Thesis in general is to be retained from the Reasons and Scriptures hitherto brought forward by our side, but also that the Explanation of the cited Place is to be extended to Inherent Sanctity.

§. 6.

The third Argument is: Because All covenanted Infants are saved; which Christ confirms: Of these is the Kingdom of Heaven, Matth. 19:14. Also: The Father does not will that any of these little ones should perish, Matth. 18:14. In which Voetius also concurs, pag. 417. Probl. 25, when to the Question: Whether Covenanted Infants dying in Infancy are to be held as Elect? he Responds: That he inclines to the Affirmative with the Synod of Dort, Cap. 1. Art. 17. He adds the reason: Because, he says, they never opposed an obstacle to the External Divine Grace. Now, however, without faith no one can please God, Heb. 11:6. He who does not believe will be damned, John 3:16. Whence the argument. No Non-Believer is saved. All Covenanted Infants are saved. E. All Covenanted Infants believe. Some nibble at the Major, Others at the Minor. To the Major, which is of Holy Scripture, they say: It is to be understood of Adults only, not of Infants. To the Minor, which we have also given as proved from the Holy Scriptures, they retort, especially the Anabaptists: That the Kingdom is said to be not of Children, but of Such, i.e., of those Like Children. But to the Former, I Resp. that they ineptly restrict what is said absolutely in Scripture, and is not restricted elsewhere: Nor can they give any Cause for their Restriction, which is not the Question itself, and begs the Principle. For they bring forward no other Cause for the Restriction than that they think Infants are incapable of Faith. But we have already asserted the Contrary, so that they cannot escape the Petition of the Principle. The Testimony of the Senses, on which Alone they build their Hypothesis, we will examine below. In the meantime, we confirm the Universality of our Major: Because otherwise two Ways of Salvation are devised besides Holy Scripture: One which is without Faith; Another which is with Faith; Thus something is added to Holy Scripture against that: to these words add nothing nor take away. Deut. 12:32.

§.7.

But here too they have a ready exception, distinguishing between the Objective and Subjective Way of Salvation. They call the Objective way Christ himself with his Benefits, Gal. 3:23; but the Subjective way, the Appropriation of Christ and his benefits. They generously grant that the former is Simple; but that the latter is Duplex. But from where

will they prove this duplex Subjective Way, one of which is with Faith, the other without Faith? Where in Holy Scripture is there a Vowel or a Trace: that some, indeed one Part of those to be saved, will be saved without Faith? They are finally reduced to this, who oppose only false and fallible Senses to Holy Scripture, that they are forced to invent what is unheard of in the Holy Scriptures, and they nourish a horrid Monster. Christ, unless apprehended by Faith, profits no one. Only he who eats the Flesh of Christ and drinks his Blood, i.e., who believes in him, applies Christ to himself, has eternal life, as the Savior himself testifies, John 6:54, coll. with the preceding v. 53. Holy Scripture knows no other Mode of saving, nor has it revealed it to us. To those objecting above, I Resp. That τὸ τοιούτων (of such) must refer either to Christ, or to the Disciples, or to the Infants. For there are no more Subjects present. The First is false, which anyone will easily concede. Nor is the Second consonant with the Truth: For he speaks this to the Disciples themselves about others. E. The Third, which is most open from an ocular Inspection of the Text, which Immediately applies this Relative to the Infants, about whom Christ was speaking. To which is added the other Saying brought forward by Us, which is greater than every Exception.

§. 8.

WE SAY (IV) IT IS A DONATION OF ACTUAL FAITH. Before we confirm this more prolixly, it will be to the purpose to collect the diverse Opinions of Authors on this matter in three words, as they say. Some opine that nothing certain is to be stated; Others attribute to Infants a Habit of Faith; Others an Inclination of Faith; Others a Seed; Others Faith in the First Act. Others, finally, no Subjective faith, but only the faith of the Parents and Imputed faith. Seek the Supporters and Defenders of each Opinion in the Disp. of Mr. Valcknier, Num. 17 & 18. Also in Nisanius's Exercit. § 20. p. 107. seqq. The Lutherans also vary here: some stating Actual Faith; Others certain pious Motions; Others both of these; Others, finally, stating nothing, because they deem this Doctrine can be neither understood nor explained. See Martinus Becanus the Jesuit in his Manual, Lib. 2. c. 2. Art. 2. §.9. Only the Pontiffs, who otherwise in many Doctrines, e.g., in Predestination, in the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, in the Original Sin of Mary, the Mother of Christ, and many others, so disagree that they apply Anathemas to each other, in this however for the most part they agree, assigning to Infants a bare Habit of Faith, lacking all Act. Our theologians, although they differ in Words, for the most part agree in the Thing. Thus those who advocate a Habit, those a Seed, those an Inclination of Faith, explain and expound themselves in plainly the same way. If we survey the number of all the remaining dissenters, we find that those who deny all Subjective Faith constitute the First Class. The Second, those who think that Faith in the First Act belongs to Infants. The Third, the greatest part of the Lutherans, which advocates an Actual Faith of Infants plainly the same as the Faith of Adults. The Fourth, the Opinion of the Pontiffs, which leaves a bare Habit of Faith. The first Class has already been refuted. The third we will refute below: The second we will reconcile with ours. The Refutation of the fourth (since

we must hasten to the end) we will commend to be read and reread in the Disput. cit. of the Excellent Mr. Maresius, §. 33. to §. 45.

§. 9.

We therefore attribute to Infants an Actual Faith, by which, by the very Act, they apprehend Christ as their Mediator by the Power of the Holy Spirit. And thus not only Actual because it exists in Act and does not yet lie hidden in Causes, but also because it produces some Acts and operates. Our Opinion, although sufficiently proved already in the Antecedents, namely by those Arguments with which we advocated Faith itself. For, as Mr. Maresius observes: those places, which treat of the Necessity of Faith for Salvation, if they are urged for the faith of Infants, are not satisfied by a seed or habit of Faith destitute of all Act, Syst. Theolog. Loc. 11. Num. 27 in fine p. 414. Since an act is of the Essence of Faith, although not always, it must sometimes be exercised. For Faith without the Actual Apprehension of Christ is Fire without smoke. Nevertheless, so that it may stand on a firmer footing, we assert one more Reason for it, this: Because to whomever Christ gives the power to become Sons of God, they have Actual Faith. But Christ gives infants the power to become sons of God. E. The Truth of the Major shines forth from the Words of the Apostle John 1:12. As many as received him (Christ), to them he gave the power to become Sons of God, to those who believe in his Name. Where we suppose (what no one will deny) the Proposition: As many as received him, to them he gave etc., is not only Universal but also Reciprocal, indeed Necessary καθόλου πρώτον (universally in the first instance). Which being supposed, it becomes manifest: that All to whom Christ gives the power to become Sons of God, actually believe. For they themselves who believe in the Name of Christ are said to receive Christ: But to receive Christ is the very essence of Actual Faith. The Minor, besides being certain from many sayings, e.g., Matth 18:14, The Father does not will that etc., from which such a Ratiocination is constructed: Those whom the Father does not will to perish, to them Christ gives the power to become sons of God. But. E. The connection of the Major rests on the Consent of the Will of both, who, as they are one in Essence, so also in Will. 1 John 5:7. It is also proved: Because Infants believe: Now, those who believe in the Name of Christ, to them Christ gives the Power to become Sons of God. Calvin excellently in Inst. Lib. 4. c. 16. Sect. 18. We deny, he says, that Infants cannot be regenerated by the Power of God, which is as easy and ready for Him as it is incomprehensible and admirable to us. Then, it would not be safe enough to take this away from the Lord, that He cannot show Himself to be known to them in any way: and Sect. 19. But since they think it very absurd that there should be any knowledge of God in Infants, whom Moses deprives of the Intelligence of Good and Evil, let them answer me, I pray, what danger is there if they are said to receive now some Part of his Grace, the full bounty of which they will enjoy a little later. By which Words Calvin explains not only Actual Faith or its Actual Parts, but also its Mode, of which below. Of the same Opinion is Wendelinus, Systemat. Theolog. Majori. Lib. I. Cap. 22. Thef. II. Explicat. Num. 6. Resp. ad Obj. Anabaptist. 4, p. 859. And Cap. 24. Thef. 8. Explicat. Num. 6. p. 1034. Nor is the Heidelberg Catechism alien from it,

which in Question 74, where it is asked: Should Infants be baptized?, responds: By all means: And among other Reasons also asserts: Because the Holy Spirit, the Effector of Faith, is promised to them no less than to Adults. It does not admit that the Holy Spirit, the Effector of Faith, is ever idle in Infants; Whence Actual Faith cannot but follow in them. Most clearly of all, the Incomparable Alstedius, Theol. Casuum Conscient. c. 26. p. 489 & 490. Elect infants, he says, who depart from this Life before they reach the years of Discretion, are by all means endowed with Faith: Because the Holy Spirit dwells in those Infants, and therefore works some Knowledge and such a Faith, as is sufficient for their salvation. But such a Faith can only be Actual. Finally, since the Theologians of Great Britain in the Synod of Dordrecht concede some Act of Faith to Hypocrites: (See in the Acts of the Synod, the Opinion of these Theologians on the 5th Article, Theses I & 2, p. 764 & 765) no Reason remains why we should not assign it to Infants.

§.10.

Hildebrandus, formerly a Professor in the Academia Julia, recedes far from this, who in Instit. Sac. Cap. 18. Num. 43, discourses in this manner. The Faith of Infants is certainly not Actual, since no Actual Knowledge of the things to be believed has preceded in the Infant. Whether, however, a Habitual Aptitude for believing, or something else Analogous to Faith is communicated to Infants, is a Question undecided in the Holy Scriptures etc. Here, what other Lutherans believe must be affirmed with the utmost certainty, he denies with asseveration: Indeed, he remains in doubt, Whether Habitual Faith can be attributed to Infants. Let those of the Lutherans, therefore, whose Highest Good it is to rail against the Reformed, now depart, and reconcile themselves with Hildebrand, or him with themselves, and learn hereafter not to extract the mote from others' eyes before they have cast out the beam from their own. With what moderation and humanity they receive Hildebrand, it is right that they should also embrace our own, of whom few will assert the same with such full assurance.

§. 11.

For the rest, it is Objected:

- (1) Faith comes from hearing, Rom. 10. Thus it cannot be for Infants.
- (2) For it, a multiplex Operation of the Mind is required, namely, Cognition, Assent; But neither do these find a place in Infants.
- (3) If Infants are endowed with Faith in their Infancy, there will be no need for Information, if ever they reach the years of Discretion.
- (4) The Necessary Adjuncts of Faith are Repentance, Charity, Invocation of the Deity. But who will attribute these to Infants?

(5) If Infants enjoy Actual Faith, nothing prohibits their being admitted to the Holy Supper.

(6) When they have become older, they never remember their Infantile Faith. Therefore they did not have it.

(7) This opinion about the Faith of Infants is inimical to Perseverance.

(8) The Sayings of Scripture fight to the Contrary, Isa. 7:16. Where a boy is said not to know how to spurn evil and choose good, & Jon. 4:11. Where Infants are said not to know the difference between their Right and Left hand.

(9) In this way all Covenanted Infants would be saved.

(10) It is Ridiculous to wish to attribute something to Infants that is against all Testimony of the Senses.

§. 12.

But all these Objections are not of such weight that we should have to depart a hair's breadth from Our Opinion. For Resp. to the first (a) Indirectly: If Hearing the Word is necessarily required for Faith, then no one, not even an Adult, will be converted without the word; which is against the Common Hypothesis, indeed against the express Scripture, in which there are Examples of those who were converted before they had heard the Word of God. See Disp. Precedent. 2. (b) Directly with Ludovicus Crocius in Antisocinismus, Disp. 16. 2. 5. Distinguishing between the Common Operation of the Holy Spirit, by which Faith, consisting of Knowledge and Confidence, is effected through the Hearing of the Word; and the Singular, by which Infants are insensibly regenerated by the Holy Spirit, like John leaping in his mother's womb, and are endowed with Faith. Or with Polanus, who to the Objection taken from the Epistle of Peter, by which man is said to be regenerated from the incorruptible Seed of the Word, responds: that Peter's Place is wrongly used here, comprehending only those faithful who were taught by the preaching of the Gospel. He adds: To such indeed we confess that the Word of the Lord is Ordinarily the seed of Spiritual Regeneration, but from this we deny it is to be gathered: that God does not regenerate infants whom he wills by the internal Virtue of the Holy Spirit, which is as easy and ready for him as it is incomprehensible and admirable to us. Syntag. Theol. lib. 6. cap. 37. p. 314. Resp. to the second: By denying, if you speak of Deliberative, Imperate, and Perfect operations; By conceding, however, with Calvin in the place above, if you understand the matter of Elicited and Imperfect Operations. Various Operations of the Mind are indeed required for Faith, but not always perfect ones. The most Consummate Theologian Ludovicus Crocius returns the same Response in the place cited before to the Sophisms of Socinus: The Faith of Infants, he says, although it is Voluntary, is nevertheless not elicited by a Natural Act of the Will, which has as its prerequisite a Practical Judgment and Knowledge of the Object (understand a Perfect one), but is insensibly excited by the Holy Spirit to the

Apprehension of Christ. Resp. to the third (a) By an Instance of an Adolescent, to whom faith is conceded by common Hypothesis. For thus some explain "the little ones" in Matthew. (b) Directly: Our faith, as long as we sojourn on this earth, conflicts with much imperfection, whence, so that we may daily grow and be augmented in the same, diligent Information is most necessary. Hence also it happens that with the Father of that Lunatic, it befits us to pray unceasingly: I believe, Lord, but you support my Unbelief, Mark 9:24. Resp. to the 4th (a) By distinguishing between a Complete and an Incomplete Actual Faith. These Adjuncts belong to a Complete Faith, but not to an Incomplete one, which rests in some knowledge and confidence. See Voetius discoursing on this distinction, loc. cit. (b) By denying that Faith cannot be without these Adjuncts, even Complete Faith. For I distinguish between Actual Faith with respect to External and Internal Operations. The Internal necessarily belong to a Complete Actual Faith, but not always the External. This is clear in Agonizing Adults. Resp. to the 5th: By denying the Consequence: Because for the use of the Holy Supper, some faith is not sufficient, but furthermore Repentance is required, also an exact Exploration of ourselves: we do not deny that the Faith of Infants is destitute of these parts. Indeed, if no one who enjoys Actual Faith is to be kept from the Holy Supper, a nine-year-old Boy will have to be admitted: because no one will doubt this one's Faith. But to wish to permit the use of the Holy Supper to such a Boy is equally absurd. Resp. to the 6th: That from a denied Memory of the Occult Motions, which the Holy Spirit excites in us below the years of discretion and discipline, the Consequence to the Negation of the Motions themselves is not valid. For many things happen to us in Infancy that are quite manifest, both pleasant and unpleasant, of which we nevertheless retain no memory. This happens because in Infancy we do not enjoy a Reflexive Act of the Intellect, or at least we enjoy it in the minimal degree. Hence we also subjoin the distinction between the Sense of Faith and the Act of Faith. The Question here is not: Whether Infants understand the Motions of Faith, and thereby feel that they believe: Which is not even perpetually required for the Essence of Faith; Just as we urge this most pressingly against the Remonstrants, whom we think confuse the Direct and the Reflex Act of the Intellect. But only this comes into Question: Whether Infants believe. Which, as we have asserted, is thus not overturned by this Objection. Resp. to the 7th: That nothing whatever is derogated from the Perseverance of the Saints or of the Believers by this Opinion. Because the Faith of Infants is imperfect, and that in its Parts, indeed that Act of Infantile Faith is not the Essence of Faith, as we will inculcate a little later. But Perseverance belongs only to the truly and perfectly Believing. Whence it is also called the Perseverance of the Saints, because it belongs to those who are corroborated and exercised in the Faith. See Disp. Primam Sub sect. 2. §. 2. Resp. to the 8th: By distinguishing (1) between the Cognition of Natural and Spiritual things (2) between Cognition sprung from a Natural and a Supernatural Principle. More Responses can be sought from the very places of Scripture, if they are unfolded. Resp. to the 9th: By conceding the whole thing, indeed by confirming it with the words of Christ so often brought forward. Of these is the Kingdom of Heaven. Whence Forbesius reputes all covenanted infants dying in infancy as elect. If those born in the covenant, he says, never Actually transgress the covenant:

As those who die in the age of infancy etc., it is certain that they are Elect. Cit. loc. lib. 10. c. 16. N. 8 & 10. num. Resp. to the 10th. Again with Crocius in Antisocinismus Disp. 21. quæst. 1. p. 317 & 318. If, he says, a certain Faith is attributed to Infants, which may function in place of the Faith of Adults, and be a certain interior motion and Illumination of the Holy Spirit, the Reason for which is neither known nor explicable to us, nothing Ridiculous is certainly asserted, unless perhaps to mockers, Atheists and Epicureans of this age, who deride the whole foolish Preaching of the Gospel. Distinguish between that which is against, and that which is beyond the senses. Although the Faith of Infants escapes the Senses, it does not therefore follow that it is adverse to the Senses.

§13.

WE SAY (V) THAT PREPARATION IS A DONATION OF SOME ACTUAL FAITH, i.e., a Small and Incomplete one. By which we distinguish the Faith of Infants from the Faith of Adults. For we are not so absurd as to go on to affirm that the Actual Faith of Infants is plainly the same as that of Adults, even as to its Essence. To which Absurdity some Lutherans are carried. See Nisanius loc. cit. p. 144, who vindicates for Infants not only all the Parts of Faith with his Danhawer, but furthermore all the Consequences of Faith. Whence also that of the Psalmist: Out of the mouth of babes you have perfected praise (which in the Hebrew Text has it a little differently), he so understands, as if Infants or Sucklings were singing praises to God with their own mouth, p. 22, 23, & elsewhere. For which reason, not undeservedly, he is flogged by Mr. Valcknier, Num: 42, who distinguishes between Preaching taken Subjectively or Formally (we add Immediately) and Objectively or Materially and Mediatly. Inspect furthermore page 144 of Nisanius, in which with express Words he prepares a Distinction between Faith considered as to its Essentials and Accidentals, and asserts that all Essentials belong to Infants. To Nisanius add Hülsemann, In Extens. Breviarium, Cap. 10. Thef. 15. p. 227, Who says of Baptized Infants: They conceive and have a Justifying Faith of the same Species as the Faith of the rest of those to be Justified. Which Doctrine D. Georg Calixtus not undeservedly numbers among the Novelties and Errors, In Append. ad Quest. de Mysterio Trinitatis, §. 10. We have no business with these Doctrines of the Lutherans, who attribute to Infants an Actual, yet Imperfect Faith. Whence we asseverate that this Faith is destitute of:

(1) NECESSARY ANTECEDENTS, e.g., Repentance, to which Infants on account of their Capacity do not ascend; since they cannot acknowledge their sins, grieve over them, and detest them. To which pertains that of Isaiah c.7.16, that Infants do not know Good and Evil.

(2) NECESSARY CONSTITUENTS (a) Perfect Cognition, even as to the Essentials and Fundamentals of Christianity. But the Faith of Infants does not extend so far. It is safest here to say what D. Philipp Melanchthon & D. Pezelius state of Baptized Infants, Part. 8. Argument. p. 81. It is most true, they say, that in all Adults Repentance and Faith are required. But concerning Infants it is better here to hold: That the Holy Spirit is given to them through Baptism (add also before Baptism), who effects in them New Motions, new

inclinations to God according to their own mode. See Crocius in Assert. August. Confess. Disput. 3. Num. 70. p. 182. Whence (b) No Reflection occurs in the Faith of Infants, by which they could know that they Believe, which however is detected in Believing Adults unless they labor under Melancholy or some other disease of the Brain. That the matter is otherwise in Melancholics or Phrenetics is a lesson from Franciscus Spira, whom we can hardly be induced to believe departed from this Life in Desperation. The same thing happens to Infants on account of the very Imperfect Direct Act of their Intellect, by which Reflection cannot occur. This is illustrated from physics or astronomy, by the example of the smallest stars, which because their rays scarcely reach the earth, also reflect little or nothing. Although, as we have said above, the Reflection of an Action is not always of the Essence of Faith.

(3) Finally, Infantile Faith is also destitute of NECESSARY CONSEQUENCES, e.g., a more Perfect and more Intense Charity towards one's Neighbor, and other External Works of Genuine Christians.

§.14.

And this is also the genuine Mind of many of our own theologians, whose intention it is not to deny all Act of Faith to Infants, but only that which is in Adults. Which, besides those who ascribe Faith in the First Act to Infants (as is to be seen in the Disp. of Maresius, Num 6), is also done by those for whom, whenever they deny the Actual Faith of Infants, it is customary to immediately add the Restriction: Such as is in Adults. I produce Ursinus, In Cateches. Heidelb. Ad Quest. 21. Explicat. Quæst. 6ta Object. 2. p. 152. Infants, he says, do not have Actual Faith as Adults do, but they have a Power and Inclination to believe, which the Holy Spirit works in them according to their capacity and measure. For since the Holy Spirit is also promised to Infants, He cannot be Idle in them. It remains therefore, what was said, that Faith belongs to all the Elect. In the Same Manner, Henricus a Diest, Mellef. Catech. de Fide, Quæst. 7. Infants indeed, he says, do not have Actual Faith, as Adults do, Rom. 10:17, but they have the Holy Spirit, Luke 1:15. Nor does D. Joh. Bergius himself mean anything else, when in the cited Tract. pag. 219, he says this: That children have no Actual Faith which consists in the Knowledge of and Trust in GOD in Christ (understand, in the way that Adults do, which the following indicates) on account of their Age, is beyond dispute. Those who nevertheless wish to ascribe a Faith to them etc. To them we will gladly give our Assent, if they will only give us a Definition or Description of it.

§.15.

What difficulty still remains to be examined is small. It is asserted:

(1) that by this Doctrine an occasion is at least supplied for calling Perseverance into doubt: And that We cannot explain ourselves happily enough here.

(2) That two Ways of Salvation remain, to escape which we have moved almost heaven and earth.

(3) That by this Reason, a Greater Grace is exhibited by God to Infants than to Adults: Since they, if they die in this their Faith, are saved, when however many Adults endowed with this Act of Faith perish eternally.

But Resp. to the first. This fear is vain, by which the Concussion of Perseverance and the Certainty of knowing and hoping for it is feared. For since Perseverance belongs only to those Faithful who have at some time enjoyed a Faith Complete as to its Parts, i.e., with Serious Repentance, perfect Cognition of Christ, and explored Confidence in him, surely nothing is taken from it, although it is stated that Infants, if they become older, often fall from their Faith, which is Essentially Imperfect. Let us hear the most Excellent Theologians Davanant & Samuel Ward (whose outstanding Erudition and Ante-Pelagian Orthodoxy D. Voetius praises, Disp. Select. Part. 2. p. 407) who in their Vindications of Sacramental Grace, the Sum of which Tractate the same Voetius recites in the cited place, have these things, corresponding exactly to Our Opinion. [a] That a State of Salvation is conferred on Infants through Regeneration according to the Condition of Little ones, but not according to the Reason of Adults. b) That this Grace, or Regeneration, differs Specifically from Conversion. c) That it does not have an infallible Connection with Salvation, because in adult age an obstacle can be placed to the Second Regeneration (which they call Actual Conversion). Forbesius relates that this same Opinion pleased certain Catholic Men, David Paraeus & Robertus Baronius; Who, when the Objection concerning Perseverance was brought against them by the Pontiffs and Remonstrants, responded: that this controversy is not about that Potential Faith of Infants, nor about the Perseverance of the Faith of Infants. For they can neither fall away nor persevere, properly speaking, but about the Perseverance of the Faith of Adults, whose Faith is Habitual, etc. cit: loc lib. 10. cap. 16. Num 1. Not to mention that by most, some faith is conceded to the Reprobate, joy, and other things of that kind, Indeed by some, expressly a true Faith, who distinguish between a True and a Saving or Justifying Faith. In what way these detract nothing from the Perseverance of the Saints and its Certainty, neither do we. To the second, I Resp. that two Ways of Salvation are not introduced by our Opinion, but are declared. For according to us, the Way to attain eternal life is one, namely, Faith in Jesus Christ, *John 3*. But that we ascribe one Faith to Infants, another to Adults, does not open two Lives, but only indicates two Modes of this Way. Both Infants believe and Adults, but differently and differently, or with a different and different faith. Modes do not vary the Thing or the Essence. But that a varied Mode of salvation harbors no absurdity is proved by the various Modes of saving Adults: the Calling into the Vineyard, *Matth. 20*. The calling to the Wedding, *Luke 14*. Also the calling of Sodom and Bethsaida, *Matth. 11*. Where a greater and lesser degree of Grace and therefore various Modes are expressly shown. Finally, to the third, I Resp. that God does not give a greater Grace to Infants than to Adults; since the older ones retain the same as long as they do not cast it out by their Repugnance. But that Infants are saved by it,

and Adults not, is to be ascribed to the perversity of Adults, who, endowed with the full Use of Reason, reject the Grace of God, while Infants, as not possessing the use of Reason, at least not a more perfect one, and being incapable of it, retain it, and thus prepared for eternal Life, they enter into celestial joys.

Thus imposing an end on our Theological Dissertation, we render most devout thanks to God, the Best and Greatest, for His Aid and Grace, and we earnestly pray that He may further lead Us into all Truth.

More Outstanding Errors, which have crept in from extreme haste.

- A. 2. Col. 1. lin. 3. read παλιγγενεσία
- A.3 Col. 2. lin penult, read Somnum,
- A. 4. Col. 1.lin.2. 2.Cor.5. 17.
- B. 1.Col.1 lin ult, utilissimo & necessario,
- B. 2. Col. 2. lin. 1. γεννηθέντας.
- B. 2. Col. 2. lin. 21. Christi stat.
- C. 4. Col. lin. 12. Obturamus.
- F. 1. Col. 1. lin.6- Errorem.
- F.3. Col. lin.antip. adspirare
- F. 3. Col.2. lin. 18, largiendorum
- G.3. Col.2- lin. 19. satis.
- I. 4. Col. 2. lin. 13. mutatione
- K. 3. Col-2. la. 22. delete to suorum
- K. 4. Col.2. lin. 33. Pontificiis.

FINIS

Inquiring of the converted, what conversion means to him,
he hints with a suppliant heart and prays.
For the voice is the key that unlocks the secrets of the heart,
And what hearts press down, the tongue is wont to bring forth.
This is an excellent work, than which there is none more outstanding,
To which every man is bound to perform.
He is therefore happy, he is thrice and four times blessed
Who constantly sets sail for this work.
That fortune awaits you, most learned Strimes, indeed.
You prove doctrine to us with Piety.
I congratulate you therefore, and I pray that in due time
You may become a firm Column of the Assembly of Christ.
To testify my benevolence, therefore,
I have written this.

JOHANNES Riesselman D.

p.t. Dean of the Faculty of Theology.

From the Israelite gulf you draw a wave,
How one, from the Kingdom of Death, might live again.
By what reason the New lives, while the Old perishes,
It has been your care, in this divine Book, to propose.
And that the Born may be reborn, then being Born of Jove,
Whom Christ bids to be the heir of Heaven.
Indeed, with your Natural Acumen of Mind, you inquire into
The Life, which moves all things with a strong Deity.
You teach that you have lived very well here for five years,
Where the ODER makes FRANKFURT famous with its rapid waters.
Second to none in talent, STRIMES, and in Piety,
You prove that you have perpetually cultivated the Muses.
You show yourself a BRITON worthy of a famous Race,
For a good Plant is wont to resemble its Root.
May you continue to live so, that the Republic of Christ
May one day rejoice to have you, a living Member, as its Leader.
To the Lord AUTHOR, on the occasion of his public
Disputation of his Theological and Philosophical
Treatise, with congratulations.

ELIAS GREBENIZ, SS.

Ordinary Professor of Theology.

To the Excellent, most Outstanding and most Learned

Mr. RESPONDENT, his most diligent Auditor.

Those who undertake arduous things, provided they are at the same time
just,

Are wont to fly swiftly through the mouths of good men.

Why should you not, Strimes, who have undertaken the motto of the Birth

Of the Saints, be able to fly through the mouths of good men?

JOH. WALTHERUS LESLE, D.

When a most worthy Friend teaches with wise writings:

What God's life is, and how He honors those

Who live steadfastly in Him through the power of his Spirit,

Which through the New-Birth creates such life in us.

So He makes it very clear for everyone to recognize

That Christ lives in Him after whom we call ourselves,

And that He from the fount which is open to all

Of life, I mean, has been watered by God.

Who from this would not also be able to easily understand

That He has now resolved to go on the way,

Which springs from the true source of life, GOD,

And leads us into Paradise to the tree of life.

So noble Strimes, so! it has succeeded very well,

Slandrous tongues must now fall silent

Which out of proud envy have sought His reputation and honor,

And are intent on hindering the course of his fortune.

May GOD then further bless his praiseworthy beginning

And one day let Him gain through this,

That for which He has steadily striven with highest diligence

By which one lives contentedly here and blessedly Forever.

In honor of the Lord Author as his
most worthy Friend, this was sent
in greatest haste by

**MATTHIAS Fromhol, Electoral Brandenburg Preacher appointed
to the Christian Reformed Congregations
in Frankfurt and Cottbus.**