

**THEOLOGICAL TREATISE
ON PREDESTINATION, ELECTION,
AND REPROBATION OF MEN,**

FOR PROMOTING
ECCLESIASTICAL CONCORD,

COMPOSED BY
BARTHOLD HOLTZFUS,
Doctor and Public Ordinary
Professor of **Sacred Theology** in
the **University of Frankfurt.**

THIRD EDITION. LEIDEN,
At the house of **PETER VANDER
EYK.**

Remigius, in the name of the Church of Lyon, from Chapter III of *On the Three Epistles*, found in Gilbert Mauguin, page 73.

“God foreknew that the world would be, and He predestined that He would make it.

He foreknew that man was to be created, and He predestined that He would create him.

He foreknew that the Human Race, having fallen through the first Man, was to be redeemed by the Blood of His only-begotten Son; and He predestined that He would redeem it.”

DISSERTATION I: ON PREDESTINATION IN GENERAL.....	4
CHAPTER I.....	5
SECTION I.....	5
Subsection I. On the Name.....	5
Subsection II. On Reality.....	18
Subsection III. Proposing the Position of the Reformed Theologians.....	30
(α) The WALDENSES.....	72
(β) The BOHEMIAN BRETHREN.....	73
(γ) The GERMANS.....	76
(δ) The MARCHIC (Bradensburg).....	80
(ε) The ANHALTINES.....	84
(ζ) The PALATINATES.....	85
(η) The HASSIANS.....	86
(θ) Those of BREMEN.....	95
(ι) The SWISS.....	99
(κ) The ANGLICANS.....	104
(λ) The FRENCH (Gallicans).....	110
(μ) The DUTCH.....	116
Subsection IV.....	125
DISSERTATION II. CONCERNING THE ELECTION OF MEN.....	166
DISSERTATION III. ON REPROBATION.....	188
BARTH. HOLTZFUS, D. Theol. & Ord. Prof. in the Univ. of Frankfurt	
ADMONITION To the Christian and Pious Reader, Concerning the Theological	
Tractate on Predestination, Election, and Reprobation.....	240

DISSERTATION I: ON PREDESTINATION IN GENERAL.

God, being omniscient, did not resolve to create and did not create His creatures, especially rational ones, with a thoughtless and rash impulse, nor for an uncertain end, but assigned to them a certain end or outcome by way of Reward or Punishment. This plan of God is called Predestination.

Which, taken more generally, is the most wise, most free, and eternal decree of God concerning the future supernatural and eternal state of rational creatures, Angels and men. We have no doubt that this subject can and ought to be treated soberly and modestly in the Church and in Theological Schools, according to Holy Scripture, for the edification of the faithful, since Christ and the Apostles in Matthew 20:16, Chapter 22:14, Chapter 24:22, 24; Mark 13:20, 27; Romans 8:28, 29, 30; Chapter 9; Chapter 10; Chapter 11; Ephesians 1:3, 4, 5, 6; 2 Thessalonians 2:13; 1 Peter 1:2, and the Doctors of all Ages have treated of the same.

Following in their footsteps, We also shall treat soberly of Predestination, by the grace of God, according to the Norm of Holy Scripture. We shall review the diverse opinions of Doctors, both Heterodox and Orthodox, without bitterness of words; we shall modestly propose our own opinion, saving a better Judgment; we shall confirm it with reasons and fortify it with the Consensus of St. Augustine, Prosper, Fulgentius, the Church of Lyon, as well as the Confessions and the great Doctors in the Reformed Church, for the Glory of God, for the Edification and Consolation of the faithful, including the weak, and for the promotion of Christian Concord.

CHAPTER I.

SECTION I.

Subsection I. On the Name.

SUMMARY.

§. I. The Etymology and meaning of Predestination.

§. II. Synonymous, but inadequate, terms: Πρόθεσις (purpose), Πρόγνωσις (foreknowledge), Προορισμός (predestination).

§. III. Πρόγνωσις (foreknowledge) taken more broadly.

§. IV. Πρόγνωσις (foreknowledge) taken more strictly: The Order of the Words: Πρόγνωσις (foreknowledge), Πρόθεσις (purpose), Πρόγνωσις (foreknowledge), Ἐκλογή (election), Προορισμός (predestination).

§. V. The Word Predestination, according to some, is taken: 1. Most Generally, 2. Generally, 3. Specially. In what sense Most Generally.

§. VI. In what way Generally, namely, that it may be extended also to the Angels.

§. VII. Specially, either more broadly or more strictly.

§. VIII. The reasons of those who use this word more broadly are brought forth; where Augustine, Prosper, Fulgentius, and the Church of Lyon are cited.

§. IX. A caution to be observed concerning the broader acceptance of this Word is indicated, and what is judged more advisable for the sake of peace.

§. I. The word Predestination is composed of *Præ* (before) and *Destinatio* (destination); and so, by the force of the word, it is, as it were, a certain prior Destination. The Scholastics advise that the Particle *Præ* here denotes an Antecedence of Duration, or of Eternity to Time. Whence Predestination, preceding all time, is an eternal destination, by reason of its signification. Jerome also observed this in his *Commentary on Ephesians*, Chapter 1, saying: "Between Predestination and Purpose, those who are accustomed to dissect words assert this difference: that Predestination prefigures in the mind of the one destining what is to be, long before the thing itself; whereas Purpose exists when the action is already near, and the effect almost follows the thought." And Augustine in *Tractate 105 on John*: "That had to be predestined which did not yet exist, so that it might come to be in its own time, just as it was predestined before all time that it should come to be." Likewise: "To this end is what He says, 'now glorify me,' that is, 'as then, so also now': as then by Predestination, so also now by Perfection."

§. II. In Hebrew it is called קצבה (qatsebah - ordinance); in Greek it is called Πρόθεσις (purpose), Romans 8:28, Ephesians 1:11, Romans 9:11, 2 Timothy 1:9. Πρόγνωσις (foreknowledge), Acts 2:23, 1 Peter 1:2, Romans 8:29. Προορισμός (predestination), the abstract form of which is indeed not found in Scripture, but only the concrete form in Acts 4:28, 1 Corinthians 2:7, Romans 8:29, 30, Ephesians 1:5. By which words it is implied that God has defined nothing except by the best reason and from certain knowledge.

§. III. Πρόγνωσις (foreknowledge) or Prescience is otherwise much broader than Predestination: for God's Prescience extends not only to all creatures, both irrational and rational, to both evil and good men, but also to all works, natural, preternatural, and supernatural, good and evil. By this, namely, He intimately knows whatever will ever be, and whatever will at some time happen, whether it be evil or good: while He predestines only the good, or the punishment due to sins. Whence Augustine, in *On the Predestination of the Saints*, Chapter X, says: "Predestination cannot exist without Prescience; but Prescience can exist without Predestination. For by Predestination God foreknew those things which He Himself was going to do; but He is able to foreknow even those things which He Himself does not do: such as any sins whatsoever. For although some sins are such that they are also punishments for sins, yet here it is not the sin of God, but His judgment." And the author of *Hypognosticon* 6: "This rule of disputation, which is clear from divine testimonies, must be held unshakably: that sinners are only foreknown in their own evils, but that punishment is predestined for them." Prosper, in his *Response to the 12th Objection of the Gauls*: "The will of God never wills anything but good; His prescience, however, foreknows both good and evil; but the good things which either He Himself does, or commands us to do; but the evil things, all of which He Himself did not do, nor persuade nor impel to be done." And in his *Response to the 15th Objection*: "God only foreknew, but did not

also predestine, those things which were not to have their cause of operation from Himself." The Church of Lyon agrees with these against John Scotus Erigena, Chapter II (Edition of Gilbert Mauguin), p. 594: "After this, the said Disputant, in his usual manner, adds as if by definition: 'Prescience and Predestination are one and the same thing.' We, however, repudiating the error of this novelty, let us hold to the most certain and firm rule of faith: and, with God's help, let us faithfully discern that what is sometimes called Prescience cannot at all be Predestination. Because almighty God, just as He foreknew good things, so also did He foreknow evil things, that is, the future sins of men or of angels: which, however, being just and holy, He could not predestine to come to pass." The Synod of Valencia, whose President was Remigius, Bishop of the Church of Lyon, decreed the same, Chapter II: "We faithfully hold that God foreknew the Good, that they would be good entirely through His Grace, and through the same Grace would receive eternal Rewards: and He foreknew the evil, that they would be evil through their own malice, and by His Justice would be damned to eternal punishment. Nor did God's Prescience impose upon any evil person the necessity that he could not be otherwise, but what he was to be by his own will, that God, who knows all things before they happen, foreknew from His own omnipotence and immutable Majesty." See also Augustine, *To the Articles Falsely Imposed Upon Him*, Articles XI, XIII, XVI.

§. IV. Although it is true that by Πρόγνωσις, Prescience (in a special sense), a practical Knowledge of Approbation is generally denoted, which is conjoined with Benevolence and Love; yet it is so far from excluding theoretical Knowledge that it rather presupposes it and includes it most closely and inseparably: for without it, the Divine Will would be a blind impulse rather than a will. Whence Augustine excellently says in his book *On the Gift of Perseverance*, ch. XVII: "To dispose His future works in His own Prescience, which cannot be deceived or changed, this is altogether, and nothing else, to Predestine." And Prosper in *Response to chapter XIV of the Gauls* and in the *Sentence upon Chapter VI*. Also to *chapter XV*: "There is no doubt that without any temporal difference God both foreknew and at the same time predestined those things which were to be done by His own Authorship, or which were to be rendered to evil merits by a just judgment." And it must be well observed that these words, although they are sometimes used interchangeably, are nevertheless generally placed in a certain order, doubtless to designate the various aspects of this Decree, which cannot be so aptly explained by a single word.

For just as this Decree can be considered either in relation to the directing Principle from which it arises, and also in relation to the End and the Means; or in relation to the Objects or Individuals with which it is concerned; or in relation to the infallible Application of the means by which it is brought into action or fulfilled; so in relation to the first, i.e., the directing Principle, as well as in relation

to the End and the Means, it is called Πρόγνωσις (foreknowledge) and Πρόθεσις (purpose), which signifies the Prescience, Counsel, and Purpose of God, as the first cause of this Decree (whence Scripture teaches that Προορισμός (predestination), and its execution, happens κατὰ Πρόθεσιν (according to purpose) Eph. 1:11, Rom. 8:28, 2 Tim. 1:9). In relation to the second, or the Objects or Individuals, it is called Πρόγνωσις (foreknowledge) and Ἐκλογή (election), which consists in the Foreknowledge, Approbation, and Separation or Setting apart of certain persons from others for salvation. In relation to the second and third, it is called Προορισμός (predestination), i.e., the Preordination of certain men and the infallible Preparation and Application of the means necessary for obtaining the end.

§. V. But so that it may be known more accurately what is understood by Predestination, it must be noted that the word Predestination is taken in a threefold way: (1) Most Generally (according to certain Theologians) and thus improperly. (2) Generally, and (3) Specially. As for the first, the most general acceptance of this word, there occur in the Writings of the Doctors of the Church certain passages in which the name of Predestination is not taken for the Preordination of men and Angels to certain ends or outcomes, but is extended also to other things, and to any decree whatsoever concerning the future existence of things and their administration and Governance. In this sense, Irenaeus, in Book III *Against Heresies*, Ch. XII, calls Christ the predestined Judge of the living and the dead; Ambrose teaches that the day of Judgment will occur at a predestined time. Augustine, in *Tractate 105 on John*, approves this same latitude of the word, saying: "He who has predestined all future things by certain and immutable causes, has done what He was going to do." The author of the book *On the Predestination of God*, which appears among the Works of Augustine, Vol. 7, writes: "God predestined that the Heaven should revolve, but that the earth should be held immobile as the center for the revolving heaven, that the Sun and Moon should preside over the day and night, and that day and night should succeed each other in turn at fixed times." Alphonso Mendoza also takes the word Predestination in this sense in his *Scholastic Question on Predestination*, Sect. 6, Conclusion 3, where he says: "According to this conclusion, the whole universe, as it embraces natural and supernatural things, good and evil, substances and accidents, and all modes of being and operating in the universe, not only in general, but in species and in individual, are to be considered as the one total object of divine Predestination: so that there is nothing at all which escapes the breadth of that Object and which does not fall under that act of Predestination." From the Lutheran Theologians, Brochmandus acknowledges this most general signification in *Syntagma Theologiae, on Predestination*, Ch. I, Sect. 2, page 249, saying: "The word Predestination, in its most general sense, signifies the Decree of God concerning the governance of all things. To this should be referred these statements of the divine monuments, Acts 4:27, 28; 1 Corinthians 2:7; Acts 17:26."

Hülsemannus, in *Disputation on Predestination*, §. 2: "Predestination, taken most correctly or broadly, is attributed to divine Providence extending itself to all things, and signifies God's Decree concerning the administration and governance of all things, as can be seen in Acts 4:27, 28; ch. 17:26; 1 Cor. 2:7." Likewise Gerhard in *Disputatio Isagogica* XVIII, Ch. I, §. 4, and Roberus in *Collectanea Theologica*, Disp. V, Thesis 7. But it is less accurately so taken, because Predestination is only a part of Divine Providence, and indeed does not extend as broadly as it.

§. VI. Taken generally, this word embraces the Predestination of Angels and Men. Since Intelligent Creatures are either Angels or Men, Predestination, according to the common opinion of both Pontifical and Reformed Theologians, with the Lutherans dissenting, concerns both. It is beyond controversy that Angels are not the Object of Predestination taken specially and strictly. For the good Angels were never Sinners and Miserable, so that they needed to be raised from a fall and misery by Mercy, to be rescued, and to be chosen, or could have been chosen. And consequently, they cannot be said to be Elected in Christ, because, standing and persevering in the good, they did not need a Mediator, whence Christ had to be not θεάγγελος (Theangelos - God-angel), but Θεάνθρωπος (Theanthropos - God-man); not the Mediator of God and Angels, but of God and Men, 1 Tim. 2:5. Nor did He take upon Himself angels, but the seed of Abraham, Heb. 2:16. This, however, does not prevent Angels from being established as the object of Predestination, taken generally, as both Reason evinces and Scripture proves. For since all His works are known to God from eternity, Acts 15:18, Reason teaches that God both foreknew and approved the Obedience of the good Angels, and their Perseverance in it, and foresaw the voluntary disobedience and rebellion of others, and having foreseen it, disapproved it indeed, but nevertheless permitted it. And consequently, He destined Confirmation in the good as a reward for free Obedience to the holy and good who persist in the Truth and keep and persevere in their Origin, by a pact; He distinguished them from others, and thus chose them. But for the fallen and those voluntarily refusing obedience to God, He decreed and destined punishments by His Justice as a penalty for their avoidable Disobedience and Rebellion, and thus cast them off and eternally reprobated them. Since God in time confirmed the good Angels in the good as a reward for Obedience, but punished the evil for disobedience and will punish them even more severely at the final Judgment, it is clearly apparent that this did not happen without a Decree of God: since God does nothing in time which He does not decree from eternity either to effect, if it be good, or to permit, if it be evil. Hence Scripture also makes mention of Elect and Reprobate Angels. In 1 Tim. 5:21, he implores Timothy in the sight of God and the Lord Jesus Christ and the Elect Angels. For although we do not deny that this epithet is often attributed to excellent things; in which sense elect sepulchres are mentioned in Gen. 23:6, and elect cedars in Jer. 22:7; whence Calvin also combines both senses and says that Paul calls the Angels Elect, not only to

distinguish them from the reprobate, but also for the sake of Excellence, so that their testimony may have more reverence; yet it does not follow from this that the same is done in this passage, always, and solely for the sake of Excellence and Pre-eminence. Especially since Holy Scripture also makes mention of judged, and therefore reprobate, Angels. Matthew 25:41: eternal fire is prepared for the Devil and his angels. 2 Pet. 2:4: God did not spare the fallen Angels, but cast them down into chains of darkness, to be reserved for Judgment. And Jude v. 6: The Angels who did not keep their own Origin, but left their own dwelling, are reserved in eternal chains under darkness for the judgment of that great day.

§. VII. The name of Predestination taken specially regards only men. Yet this word, so taken, is used either More Broadly for the Destination of the Elect to life, and of the Reprobate to death; or More Strictly for the Destination of the Elect to life, and thus for Election alone.

Most of the Fathers used the word Predestination in its stricter signification, as a grammatical Synonym for Election, and said the Reprobate were not Predestined but Foreknown. Augustine himself mostly takes the name of Predestination for Election: whence he not only gave a book the title: *On the Predestination of the Saints*, but also left such a Definition of Predestination: in *On the Gift of Perseverance*, Ch. XIV: "The predestination of the saints is nothing other than the Foreknowledge and Preparation of God's benefits, by which all who are delivered are most certainly delivered." This only befits Election. In this sense, the same Augustine wrote in *The City of God*, Book II, Ch. XII, that the Cause of Predestination is sought and not found; but the cause of Reprobation is sought and is found. And in *The City of God*, Book II, Ch. XII, he says that "Predestination is uncertain for us, while we are engaged in the perils of this present life," and he asks: "Who from the multitude of the faithful, as long as he lives in this mortality, would presume himself to be in the number of the Predestined?" The Disciples follow their Teacher in the use of the word as in doctrine: Prosper of Aquitaine, as is clear from the little book *On the Articles Falsely Imposed on Augustine*; and Fulgentius, Bishop of Ruspe, who mostly take the name of Predestination in a good sense, for Election. Indeed, in the ninth century, there was a sharp dispute about the use of this word, with John Scotus Erigena, in his book *On only one Predestination*, stating that it applies solely to Election, against Gottschalk, whose cause the Church of Lyon and its Bishop Remigius undertook.

Today, the Pontificals, both Thomists and most all Scotists, by Predestination designate only those acts of the divine Intellect and Will by which God determined within Himself to lead certain men to Grace or Glory, but they call the reprobate not Predestined but Foreknown, and they do not subordinate Reprobation to Predestination, but oppose it. The Lutheran Theologians also take this word more strictly and properly refer it to Election alone. Indeed, not a few of the Reformed restrict the word Predestination, not, to be sure, to the

preparation of Grace alone, which many Scholastics do, but, with the Lutheran Theologians, they embrace under the name of Predestination both the Decree concerning the giving of Glory to certain men and concerning the conferring of Grace upon them. Among these is Peter Martyr in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, where he says: "I separate the reprobate from the Predestined for this reason, that the Scriptures, as far as I know, never call the men who are to be damned, Predestined. Which opinion, even if I did not see the reason for it, I would nevertheless judge ought to be followed on account of the authority of the word of God." Benedictus Aretius in *Problems of Sacred Theology or Commonplaces*, Place VI, p. 75: "We speak of Predestination more narrowly, so that we refer to it only predestined men, First, because Scripture does not say the evil are predestined, but applies it to the elect alone. Second, because the Scholastics have retained this property of the word, so that they use it only in a good sense." Jerome Zanchius, Book V, *On the Nature of God*, Ch. II, question 1: "The Scriptures by this name properly are accustomed to signify the Election of the Saints and their appointment to eternal life before the foundation of the world." David Pareus in his *Commentary on Romans*, Ch. VIII, v. 29, p. 732 & 733: "To destine is to decree and order a thing to a certain end: to predestine is to decree a thing to an end, before you send it to the end. Therefore, those whom GOD foreknew and elected, He also ordained to conformity with Christ as to a form, to the means and to the end, to which He would send them in His own time. This is the proper signification of this word. Commonly in the Theological Schools Predestination is used more broadly, and indeed in a twofold way: I. For the whole προθέσει (purpose) or counsel of God, concerning the saving or damning of men, so that it embraces under itself the Decree of Election and of Reprobation. Use has established this signification: Whence Fulgentius wrote Book I to Monimus, *On the twofold Predestination of God*; one of the good to Glory: the other of the evil to punishment. But it is held more obscurely from the Scriptures. II. For the holy Predestination, and that whole, consisting of two acts: Election, by which GOD distinguished those to be saved from those not to be saved: and ordination to the end, and to the means to the end, that is to eternal Life, and to the antecedent means of vocation, faith, justification, sanctification, the cross, etc. The word Predestination is also scarcely found in Scripture in this sense, unless one is pleased to extend what is said in Eph. 1:5 to both acts of Predestination: 'Who predestined us, whom He would adopt,' that is, He elected and ordained us, to sonship and Glory in Christ. Properly, however, Predestination is only the latter act of the purpose, the ordination of the Elect to the end and to the means of Glory. So also in this place, because it is distinguished from Election in Eph. 1:11, Acts 13." Bartholomaeus Keckermannus, *Systema Theologiae*, Book III, ch. I, p. 243: "The word Predestination properly does not contain Reprobation under it, but signifies Election to eternal life by its nature. Destination or Predestination is the constitution of an end and the ordination of means to the end: since therefore eternal damnation is not the end

of man, but only the extreme, which the Greeks call τὸ ἔσχατον (the last thing); for this reason the genus of Reprobation cannot properly be constituted as Predestination. For these things conflict with each other: to ordain to an end, and to ordain to damnation: for every end (as we have diligently noted above) is by its nature something optimal, and the perfection of a thing: but Damnation is the extreme evil and the highest imperfection; so that it is an improper expression by which it is said that God has predestined some men to damnation: because Predestination, as we have said, is an ordination to an end, or is the Counsel of GOD concerning the ultimate end of man, and the means leading to this end: but Damnation is not the ultimate end of man, but his Extreme or ultimate evil. Wherefore, speaking accurately, Predestination and Election to eternal life are equivalent: nor can Election and Reprobation be contained under one proximate genus; because they are conflicting things; but of conflicting things the remote genera are the same, but not the proximate." The Leiden professors in their *Synopsis of Purer Theology*, Disp. XXV, Th. 5, teach that the word Predestination in the Holy Scripture of the New Testament is used only of the gratuitous Decree of Election, because this whole matter, however much it may be, whether we consider the means or the end, depends on the Disposition and efficacy of God's mercy alone. Antonius Walaeus, *Commonplaces of Sacred Theology, on eternal Predestination*, Vol. I of his Works, p. 320, col. 2: "The use of the word προορισμός, Predefinition or Predestination, in Scripture is twofold: For it is used either of things or of Persons. When it is used of things, it is either taken in a good sense for the destination of divine benefits; as in 1 Cor. 2, v. 7: 'we speak the wisdom of God in a hidden mystery, which God had predefined before the ages for our glory': Or it is used for the Predefinition of the Divine Counsel and Providence of God concerning the actions of men, which are also conjoined with signal wickedness, as in Acts 4:27: 'For they were gathered together in this city' (say the Apostles) 'truly against your holy Son Jesus, whom you anointed; Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the Peoples of Israel, to do whatever your hand προώρισε (predefined), had predefined, to be done.' But when it is spoken of Persons, although its signification is by other Writers sometimes extended also to Reprobation, not badly from the analogy of the place just cited; as by Augustine, *Enchiridion to Laurentius*, chapter C: 'to the damnation of those whom He justly predestined to punishment.' Fulgentius to Monimus, book XVII: 'Predestination is nothing other than the preparation of the works of God, which in His eternal Disposition He foreknew He would do either mercifully or justly': Nevertheless in Holy Scripture it is taken only for gratuitous Election, as in Rom. 8, v. 30: 'Whom He foreknew, them He predestined.' Eph. 1, v. 5: 'He predestined us to the adoption of sons through Jesus Christ.' And verse 11: 'Who were predestined according to the purpose of Him, who effects all things according to the counsel of His will.'"

§. VIII. Meanwhile, to excuse those Authors who have used the Word Predestination in a broader sense, it deserves to be considered (1) that Holy Scripture extends the Word προορίζειν (to predestine) to the Passion of Christ, which was promoted by the wicked acts of impious men, Luke 22:22: "The Son of man goes κατὰ τὸ ὁρισμένον (according to what has been determined)"; and Acts 4:28: Herod and Pontius Pilate are said to have done nothing other than what the hand and counsel of God προώρισε γενέσθαι (predestined to happen). (2) That there exist in the Sacred Writings equivalent phrases: Prov. 16:4: "God makes all things for His own sake, even the impious for the day of evil," i.e., He destines and draws him to his deserved punishment. Jude v. 4: "prescribed for damnation." 1 Thess. 5:9: "appointed to wrath." Which passage Joh. Frid. König in his *Theologia Positiva Acroamatica*, after other Lutheran Theologians, understands of Reprobation, although D. Joh. Ad. Scherzer and Joh. Andr. Quenstedt contradict it. (3) That there is given not only damnation in time, but also that this Damnation was decreed before the foundations of the world were laid. Which Decree can not ineptly be called Predestination: since the nature of the Latin word, *Destinare*, does not reject this use: for Cicero in book III of *De Officiis*, ch. X, writes of a "day of death destined" for Damon; And Livy in book II, ch. LIV, writes of being "destined for Death." Likewise Paulina in Tacitus, book XV of the *Annals*, ch. XXXVI, says that "death was destined for her." Whence no reason appears why the compound verb, *Prædestinare*, may not also be taken in the same signification; especially since ὁρος (horos - boundary), from which ὁρίζειν (horizein - to define) and προορίζειν (proorizein - to pre-define) are derived, can signify not precisely the End intended in itself and the intention conceived in itself, but also the ἐσχάτον (eschaton), the Extreme, the Ultimate, and therefore the Event. (4) It cannot be denied that some of the Ancients, Augustine, Prosper, Fulgentius, etc., sometimes use the word Predestination as a Genus, which embraces under itself, like Species, Election to Life and Reprobation to Death.

Thus Augustine in Book XV of *The City of God*, Ch. I: "We have divided the human race into two kinds, one of those who live according to man, the other of those who live according to God. Which we also mystically call two Cities, i.e., two Societies of men, one of which is predestined to reign eternally with God, the other to undergo eternal punishment with the Devil." Likewise in Book XXI of *The City of God*, ch. XXIV, he says: "Who, although they are still established in this life, are nevertheless predestined to go into the eternal fire with the Devil." In Book IV *On the Soul*, ch. XI: "God is for those whom He has predestined to eternal death, a most just retributor of punishment." In the *Enchiridion*, ch. C: "making good use even of the evil, as the supremely good one, for the damnation of those whom He justly predestined to punishment." Epistle XLIX, q. 3: "The iniquitous spiritual creature is predestined to everlasting punishment." Question 49 on Judges: "The enemies are altogether predestined to the punishments of hell, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth." Tractate III on John: "That world, deservedly

predestined to damnation, did not know." Tractate XLIII: "These are predestined to everlasting death." Tractate XLVIII: "How then did He say to them: 'You are not of my sheep'? Because He saw that they were predestined to everlasting destruction." Tractate CVII: "The Son of perdition was called the Betrayer of Christ, predestined to perdition."

Prosper of Aquitaine concurs with Augustine. "Predestination," he says, "is always in the good, pertaining either to the Retribution of justice, or the Donation of grace." *Response to ch. XIV of the Gauls and sentence upon ch. VI*. Likewise to *ch. XV*: "There is no doubt that, without any temporal difference, God both foreknew and at the same time predestined those things which were to be done by His own Authorship, or which were to be rendered to evil merits by a just Judgment." Furthermore: "Whose Predestination is never outside of justice etc., but He has plainly predestined His judgment, by which He will render to each one either good or evil."

Fulgentius adds his assent to these in his *Book to Monimus*, teaching that some are "predestined to punishment," "predestined to torment," "predestined for torment," "predestined to that which they justly suffer unwillingly," "predestined to the second death of the soul, i.e., to the lake of fire and brimstone." Isidore, *On the Highest Good*, Book II, ch. VI: "Predestination is twofold, either of the Elect to rest, or of the reprobate to death." The Church of Lyon approves these sayings, especially of Augustine. "Augustine," it says on page 1057, "commends this rule of Faith to be held by us most firmly and faithfully in his books on *The City of God*, saying thus: 'We have divided the human race into two kinds etc.' Likewise in the book: *Enchiridion* etc. From these books let them acknowledge that this word of divine Predestination, applied to the party of the reprobate, because they are most truly and rightly said to be predestined by divine judgment, not indeed to the fault, but to the punishment, he himself did not censure in his own sayings, nor was he censured by any who think catholically and soundly." Likewise, in the *Response to chapter XI of Scotus*: "Although in the prophetic testimonies, which the Blessed Apostle proposed with such authority, the word predestination does not expressly sound, yet because the things pertaining to both Predestinations appear most manifestly, the Apostle most confidently assumed it for the confirmation of so great a matter. By his own authority and example, of course, informing us that we should not contentiously and superfluously dispute among ourselves about the word predestination itself, or (God forbid) even quarrel: But with a peaceful and pious Intelligence, wherever the thing itself is most manifestly declared, we ought without any doubt both to acknowledge and to assert divine Predestination." And finally, the Synod of Valencia, chapter III: "We confidently confess the Predestination of the elect to life and the Predestination of the impious to death."

5. The Remonstrants themselves do not simply disapprove of the broader use of this Word. For thus Stephanus Curcellæus, in *Institutio Religionis Christianæ*, book VI, ch. I, §. 2, p. 347: "From the usage of Scripture the word Predestination is wont to be restricted to the eternal state of men, whether happy or unhappy. For although the word προορίζω (to predestine) is found mostly applied to salvation, as can be seen in Rom. 8:29, 30; Eph. 1:5, 11; nevertheless, since it is also said of those things in which the sins of men have intervened, as in Acts 2:23 & ch. 4:28, concerning the betrayal of Christ to death and similar actions, what prevents it from being used with equal right of damnation? This also follows from the nature of opposites, since from the Predestination of the faithful to salvation it is necessarily inferred that the unfaithful will be excluded from it. Whence those seem to me to be too scrupulous who think that the words Predestination and predestining ought not to be used, except concerning eternal salvation; especially since they do not deny that the decree of God also concerns eternal damnation." Philippus a Limborch, *Theologia Christiana*, book IV, chapter I, §. 3, p. 295, states indeed that the words usually employed here do not so much designate the decree of Election to Glory, as the Decree of Election to grace; yet in §. 4 he writes thus: "Some are accustomed to apply the word Predestination solely to the decree concerning the saving of men, which is otherwise wont to be called Election, so that for them only those are Predestined who are Elected to salvation. This signification is a frequent acceptation of this word among the Fathers: and most consonant with the phraseology of scripture. For it is always used of the gifts of divine grace, by which salvation is prepared for men, and men are called to salvation; but never of the acts of divine wrath or severity, which is seen in the just damnation of the impenitent. But truly, since the word is general and God has made a decree not only concerning the salvation but also concerning the damnation of men; according to the common acceptation today, we will accept Predestination in this general signification, so that it comprehends the decree of God concerning both the damnation and the salvation of men." Cf. Arnoldus Poelenburg, *Refutation of the Inaugural Disputation of D. Frid. Spanheim*, Th. 2, p. 10.

§. IX. From this we are persuaded it is clear that the word Predestination is used by many of the Reformed in the manner of a Genus, for both Predestination to Life and Predestination to Death, not against the mind, nor without the consent, of at least some Catholics. Here, however, it must be observed what the Leiden Theologians most wholesomely advise in ch. I, th. 6, that if anyone wishes to use this name in this way, it should nevertheless not be held as a Genus that is in all respects Synonymous, but only as analogous, because although the act of Reprobation itself is from God, as a just Judge, yet not all things with which Reprobation is concerned are from Reprobation. Far be it from us in any way to

state that God predestines the reprobate not only to Punishment or eternal death, but also to guilt or sins. On the contrary, we sincerely believe that God destines No one to Death except for Sins, and we say in good faith with the Synod of Orange, held in the Pelagian cause, and of Valencia in the cause of Gottschalk: "That some are predestined to evil by divine Power, as if they could not be otherwise, we not only do not believe, but also, if there are any who wish to believe so great an evil, we say Anathema to them with all Detestation." With the anti-Pelagian Catholics Augustine and Prosper, from the little book *On the Articles Falsely Imposed on Augustine*, Article X, we sacredly profess: "Detestable and abominable is the opinion which believes God to be the Author of anyone's evil will or evil Action, whose Predestination is never outside of Goodness, never outside of Justice." After a little: "Therefore, the Predestination of God did not excite, or persuade, or impel the fall of the falling, the malignity of the iniquitous, nor the desires of sinners: but it plainly predestined His Judgment, by which He will render to each one according as he has behaved, whether good or evil. Which Judgment would not be future, if men sinned by the Will of God." Article XI: "With what foolishness, therefore, or with what madness is it defined, that what cannot be wholly ascribed even to the devil is to be referred to the Counsel of God: for in the crimes of sinners he is to be believed an Assistant of temptations, not the Generator of wills? Therefore, God has predestined none of such things to happen, nor did He prepare that soul which would live shamefully and wickedly for this purpose, that it should live in such a way, but He was not ignorant that it would be such, and He foreknew that He would judge justly concerning such a one. And so nothing more can be referred to His Predestination, except what pertains either to the due Retribution of Justice, or to the unmerited Bestowal of Grace."

With these things religiously observed, it will be apparent that this dispute about the word Predestination, and its broader or stricter use, is not of great moment, and it is almost the same whether you think the name Predestination is equivalent to Election, or that it is a Genus of Election and Reprobation. We permit anyone to abound in his own sense. However, because this broader Signification of Predestination gives rise to the Suspicion in others that the reprobate are predestined not only to Damnation but also to the causes of damnation, we think it more advisable, with the Fathers and other Doctors, to let go of the broader Signification of Predestination, or at least not to urge it greatly. Meanwhile, only for the sake of better doctrine, we will accept this Word in the latter sense, and in what follows we shall, with God's favor, treat pragmatically, according to the mind of Holy Scripture and the Catholic Church, (1.) of Predestination in general, (2.) of Election, and (3.) of Reprobation, in particular.

Subsection II. On Reality.

SUMMARY

§. I. The Existence of Predestination.

§. II. The Essence & Definition of Predestination.

§. III. The Object of Predestination & the Order of the Divine Decrees, which differs according to Different people.

§. IV. The Opinion of the Jews.

§. V. The Position of the Socinians.

§. VI. The Order of the Divine Decrees according to the Greeks.

§. VII. According to the Pontificals, Thomists, Dominicans; Scotists, Franciscans & Capuchins.

§. VIII. According to the Jesuits, Bellarmine, Gregory of Valentia, Vasquez, Becanus.

§. IX. The Series of Divine Decrees according to the Synodical Arminians.

§. X. According to the Lutheran Theologians.

§. XI. A Modest Critique of the preceding opinions.

§. I. That Predestination is a given is proven by:

(1) The following sayings of Holy Scripture: Acts XV. 18. Unto God are all his works known from the beginning of the world. Rom. VIII. 29. 30. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified. Eph. 1. 5. Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by JESUS Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his Will. And v. 11. In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will. Prov. XVI. 4. God worketh all things for himself: yea, even the wicked for the day of evil. 1 Pet. II. 8. Being disobedient, they stumble at the word, whereunto also they were appointed. Jude v. 4. For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation. I Thess. V. 9. For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ.

(2) The examples of Jacob and Esau, Malachi I. v. 2. 3. Rom. IX. v. 10. 11. 12. And not only this; but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac; (For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;) It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated. Of the Apostles, Luke X. 20. Rejoice, because your names are written in heaven. Of Pharaoh, Rom. IX. 17. For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. Of Paul, Acts IX. 15. But the Lord said unto him, Go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel. Of Judas, John XIII. 18. I speak not of you all: I know whom I have chosen: but that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me.

(3) The Nature of God, the Best and Greatest. For since He is omniscient, He must be considered to have foreseen all things from eternity; since He is most wise, to have destined and ordained all things to certain and best Ends most wisely; since He is holy and just, to have willed nothing except holily and justly; since He is omnipotent, to be able to execute all things potently and efficaciously.

§. II. The Essence of Predestination follows its Existence, which the following Definition conveys: Predestination of men is the divine Decree, by which God, according to the good pleasure of His Will, before the foundations of the world were laid, out of men who in His Foreknowledge are fallen, called, and relapsed, resolved to elect certain ones in Christ and on account of Christ, to bestow on

them rooted faith, to justify them through faith, to adopt them as sons, to sanctify and to eternally glorify them; but to pass over certain others, namely the unfaithful and finally impenitent, out of His Justice, on account of their sins, not only original, but, in adults, also actual sins, whether committed against the law of Nature or against the Gospel, their unbelief and final impenitence, and to eternally damn them, to the praise of His glorious Grace and Justice.

We say the Genus of Predestination is a Decree, an Act of the Intellect and of the Will, on account of the supreme and greatest conjunction of the Intellect with the Will and their identity, by which the Will can decree nothing unless it is known by the Intellect. Yet immediately and formally this Act is to be referred to the Will of God according to the statements of Holy Scripture. Isaiah XLVI. 10. My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure. Ephes. I. 5. & 11. The efficient Cause of Predestination is God, by the argument of the places alleged in the preceding Thesis.

§. III. The Object of this Predestination is men; with respect to Quantity, all and single individuals, which the places Exodus XXXII. 22, Luke X. 20, John XIII. 18, Acts IX. 15, Rom. IX. 10. 11. 12 prove; but with respect to Quality, they are in the divine Foreknowledge fallen, called, and relapsed, and therefore guilty of either only original sin, or also of very many actual sins. Concerning the Object of Predestination and the order of the divine decrees, there are various opinions, not only of different Sects among Christians but also of the Theologians of one and the same Religion.

In this all amicably agree, and this they place beyond controversy, that God, by one and most simple act, has decreed those things which are to be; it is likewise certain and undoubted among all Theologians of all parties, that we cannot comprehend that single and most simple divine decree because of the imbecility of our Intellect; and therefore, according to our mode of conceiving, a certain series or some Order of the divine decrees must be formed, and that the best order of all is that which agrees most exactly with the Execution. But as to what that Order might be, in this they marvelously dissent.

§. IV. The Jews believe that the Blessed God, in his council, chose for eternal life whomever He saw would receive the fundamental Articles of the Judaic Religion out of the natural powers of Free Will, and would observe the Mosaic Law; but that He reprobated those whom He saw would be disobedient to the Law. This is clear from R. Moses Maimonides' Tractate on Repentance, where he expresses the opinion of the Jews in these words: "Power is given to man, if he wishes to incline himself to the right way; and to be just is placed in his own hand and choice. But if he should prefer to bend himself to the wicked or evil way, and give himself to improbity, that also is situated in his power. And a little after: Let it not come into your mind what the foolish gentiles and many crude and stupid

Israelites are wont to say, that the Blessed God decreed of man from the beginning of his Creation or birth either that he should be just or wicked. The matter is certainly not so, but any mortal is born fit to become just, like Moses our Master, or wicked like Jeroboam; either wise or foolish; Merciful or cruel; greedy or liberal; and the same is to be thought of the other virtues. Nor is there one who compels him, nor who has made a decree concerning him, nor who determines him into either part, but he himself of his own accord and by his own judgment turns himself to whichever way he pleases. To this Jeremiah refers: Out of the mouth of the Most High, he says, proceedeth not evil and good. As if he were to say; God the creator did not conceive a Decree for man that he be evil or good. Since these things are so, it is discovered that the sinner himself casts himself headlong into ruin, and therefore he himself ought to weep for his sins, and deplore the stain which he has sprinkled upon his own soul, and the retribution for evil which he has deserved. To which pertains that which is written a little after in the Prophet Jeremiah, Lamentations III. 39. Wherefore doth a living man complain, a man for the punishment of his sins? and this is repeated several times. For since we perpetrate all things from our own choice and the sentiment of our mind, hence it is most fitting that, having forsaken impiety, we should perform penitence, since this is of our choice and power. To this pertains that which is read positioned a little after: let us search and try our ways, and turn again. This thing is truly an article of great weight, and the foundation of the law and of divine command, according to that which is written, Deut. XXX. Behold, I have set before you this day life and death etc. Likewise, that they had such a heart. Deut. V."

§. V. The Socinians indeed admit an eternal Decree of Predestination, but a general one; however, they maintain that Election and Reprobation are at length made in time, when men actually believe or do not believe, live piously or badly. This is clear from Joh. Crellius's Book concerning God and his Attributes, prefixed to Joh. Volkel's books on the True Religion, ch. XXXII, p. 342. "Predestination, as the word itself in a way indicates, preceded the Faith and Piety of men, Election at length follows it. And so the former was made before the foundation of the world, the latter occurs at various times, according as men themselves do not believe and live piously at the same time. To the former, God was impelled by no merits of men, not even by any works at all; to the latter, He is impelled not indeed by the merits of works, but yet by works flowing from faith. The former was only generally made by God from eternity, the Decree of Election concerning each pious person is made by name: although from these singular Decrees, a certain universal one is again collected. That Decree had the force of a conditional: This one is absolute, according as the Condition has either been entirely fulfilled, or not yet. For this Election begins as soon as someone begins to perfect and animate his faith with true Piety, but it is not entirely completed, except when the entire life has been enacted with Piety. And so, if faith or Piety

ceases within that final limit, or perhaps suffers shipwreck in the very harbor, Election also ceases, while Predestination in the meantime does not cease, nor is it changed in any way. Finally, Election follows necessarily from Predestination, the Condition which the latter demanded being posited: so that Election is, as it were, a conclusion, deduced from the major Proposition, which Predestination posits, and the minor, which the Faith and Piety of men provide. For the Decree of Predestination is: Every believer will be saved. But that Paul, for example, believes, is the Assumption; Whence the Conclusion follows: Paul will be saved: which as long as it consists in the Decree, is Election, which includes Justification in itself; When it is brought to effect, it is Glorification. The Major, as we have said, the Grace of God alone proposes, the Minor the Grace of God and the Will and Probity of men, excited by the former and subservient to it, [proposes]. Wherefore also the conclusion." And from Jonas Schlichting, Disputation for Socinus against Meisner, p. 16. "We do not say that God predestined from eternity certain individuals to Life, and reprobated certain ones, and did so because He foresaw that the former would live piously, and use Free Will rightly, but the latter would not use it. We reject both of these, both Predestination and Reprobation made in the particular or individual, and that Foreknowledge, as being both hostile to the pursuit of Piety, and contrary to Holy Scripture. But we assert only this, that God has predestined to Eternal Life all those, whoever shall have obeyed his Precepts to their utmost ability even to the end; but has reprobated those, who shall not have obeyed. But whether anyone obeys or does not obey GOD in this manner, we say is free for each one, nor do we contend that anyone was, by GOD, before he existed, either Predestined, or even infallibly Foreseen for Obedience or Disobedience. And so Election and Reprobation in general is entirely certain and immutable: but in the individual it is mutable, inasmuch as it is left free by GOD for anyone to be from the number of the Elect, or even from the number of the Reprobate." Which opinion Joh. Volkelius in Book V of the True Religion, Chap. XVII, p. 523 and following, defends and impugns ante-secular Individual Predestination.

§. VI. The Greeks believe:

1. That God decreed to create men innocent.
2. To permit the Fall, foreseen from the infinite Perspicacity of His Intellect.
3. To have mercy on all fallen men, and to send a Mediator for them all.
4. To call all indiscriminately to the Mediator and in him to Eternal Life, to instruct the Called with sufficient powers for fulfilling the Condition of the new covenant.
5. Whomever He foresaw would believe in Christ and would obey God according to the Prescription of the Gospel, to elect in Christ and on account of Christ; but whomever He foresaw would be unbelieving, contumacious, and disobedient, them to reprobate.

From which opinion, indeed, Cyrillus Lucaris departed in his Confession, Chap. III, in Joh. Hend. Hottinger's *Analecta Historica*, Dissert. VIII. Append. p. 313, 314. But the opinion of this man was rejected in Two Synods, the one held in the year 1638 under Cyrillus of Beroea, Patriarch of Constantinople, p. 71, 73; the other in the year 1642 under Parthenius, Patriarch of Constantinople, p. 119.

§. VII. Among the Pontificals, Johannes Baptista Gonet of the Order of Friars Preachers, of the Province of Toulouse, of the stricter Observance, Lector at the Academy of Bordeaux, in the *Shield of Thomistic Theology*, Volume Four, Part III, Tract. I, Disp. V, §. 5, p. 448, Col. 1, proposes the opinion of the Thomists and Dominicans from Scripture, Councils, and the Fathers thus:

After God knew all possible things by the knowledge of simple Intelligence,

First, he decreed the manifestation of his own Attributes.

Second, for that end, from many possible worlds, he chose this one, composed of diverse grades and Natures of things.

Third, he willed to adorn Intellectual Nature with the gifts of Grace.

Fourth, he decreed to permit the sin of man.

Fifth, having foreseen sin, touched by Mercy, being able in many ways to destroy the sin of man, either by purely mercifully pardoning, or by accepting an unequal and imperfect Satisfaction, He decreed its Expiation, and our remedy, in the most fitting way, namely, through a condign and equal satisfaction.

Sixth, to exhibit such a Satisfaction, he willed that the Word should assume human flesh.

Finally, in Christ he chose certain ones from among men to Glory, leaving others in the mass of perdition, by a just Judgment, but one hidden from us.

The received hypothesis of the Scotists, Franciscans and Capuchins is, that the Son of GOD would have been incarnated, even if man had not sinned. They distinguish, however, Incarnation itself from the mode of Incarnation. They will that Incarnation itself depends only on the Glory of GOD; but the mode of Incarnation (namely, that by which Christ came in passible flesh) they will to depend on the Redemption of men: And therefore, if Adam had not sinned, Christ would have come no less: Not, however, as Redeemer, but as Glorifier. To which they refer the saying of a certain one of the Ancients: He who came to heal the sick, would have come to visit Friends. Upon this hypothesis they build the Order of Divine Decrees, in the business of our salvation, which, from their number, Johannes Gabriel Boyvin, in the *Theology of Scotus* freed and vindicated from

Prolixity and obscurity, Part I, Tract. I, Chap. IV, last Disp. II. on Predestination, Quest. X, p. 255, 256, delineates thus:

In this opinion, therefore, we ought to say, that God conducts himself thus with respect to the predestined:

First, he predestined Christ to the highest grace and Glory, and this before the election of Angels and Men; So that it is true, what Paul said in many places, that in Christ were all things created, whether those which are in the heavens, or those which are on earth.

Second, God, in view of Christ, by an antecedent will, willed to give glory to all.

Third, seeing the fall of man, he ordained the incarnation of the Word to be made in passible flesh, so that through the passion Christ might merit aids of grace, by which fallen men might be able to rise again from sin; to some indeed exceptional aids, to others only common ones, but for all sufficient.

Fourth, at last, by an absolute will, he decreed to give glory to those who would consent to grace, and would persevere in it.

§. VIII. The Jesuits explain their mind in various ways. Bellarmine, Book II on Grace and Free Will, Chap. IX, near the end, posits this order of Predestination:

First, God foresaw that, if he were to create man, he would fall with all his posterity, and at the same time He saw that He could in various ways liberate either all, or some, according to his own choice.

Second, He willed to create man, and to permit that he fall, and to mercifully liberate some from the number of the fallen, leaving others in the mass of perdition.

Third, he devised remedies suitable for saving men, in which the Incarnation and Passion of the Savior held the first place.

Fourth, he approved those remedies, and then chose Christ, and us in him before the constitution of the world.

Fifth, he disposed, ordained and in a certain manner commanded, that it should so be done.

Gabriel Vasquez disposes the Decrees of the divine mind thus:

1. God wills to communicate Himself to Creatures from a Will of simple Affection, by which He desired glory for them.

2. From this Will He decreed to bestow gifts in the state of Innocence with the permission of the fall.
3. God predestined a remedy for fallen man, Christ, and his merits.
4. From the foreseen merits of Christ He chose certain ones to glory.
5. He decreed to give efficacious Grace, then Glory.

According to Gregory of Valentia, this is the series of divine decrees:

First, God saw from eternity not only the natures of all men, but also their sins, since those also, as they are committed by a defect of nature alone, pertain also to the natural order.

Second, he prepared for them a Redeemer by predestining Christ.

Third, he willed on account of the foreseen merit of Christ to confer on all sufficient aids of grace, and generally also abundant ones, by which they could obtain salvation by the benefit of Christ the Redeemer.

Fourth, those whom he saw (I do not say because he saw, but whom he saw) would end their life in divine Grace either through their own Cooperation with the aid of God, or through the application of Baptism, he mercifully predestined; but others, because they either did not cooperate with divine grace, or because Baptism was lacking to them, he did not deign with the benefit of Predestination, but rather justly reprobated them on account of Sins, either actual, or original, in which he foresaw they would end their life.

Martinus Becanus in his Summa of Scholastic Theology, Vol. I, c. XV, qu. V, expresses his mind in this way:

From our opinion, the order of Predestination and Reprobation is this.

First, God Resolved to create the whole human Race for eternal beatitude, and with simple affection desired all to arrive at it.

Second, from this will he decreed to give them grace in the state of innocence, permitting them the free use of their will, in which is also contained the permission of sin.

Third, he saw the first man with all his posterity fall, i.e., he saw the actual sin of Adam, in which all have sinned, I say nothing as yet of original [sin] contracted in single individuals.

Fourth, willing to prepare a remedy for fallen man, he predestined Christ and his merits.

Fifth, he resolved to apply the merits of Christ in a diverse manner to men. For he willed to preserve the blessed Virgin from original sin through the merits of Christ, all the rest he permitted to be conceived in original sin. These are again divided. For he reprobated certain little ones on account of original [sin], to others from pure mercy he granted Baptism or another remedy, and predestined them to life. To adults, truly, he provided for all with sufficient grace, although he decreed to bestow greater grace on some.

Sixth, he absolutely saw that those would use grace well, these badly.

Seventh, he absolutely willed to give to these eternal reward, to those eternal punishment and damnation.

For the Scale of Adamus Tanner, See Scholastic Theology, Vol. IV, Disp. I, Qu. I, Dub. VI, Assert. V, p. 70.

§. IX. The Arminians of the Acts and Writings of the Synod of Dort, Part II, Dogmatics, p. 10, 11, establish this order in Election and Reprobation:

1. God, for the glory and praise of His overflowing goodness, decreed to create man in his own image.
2. To man thus created He posited a law, which it was not only possible, but also most equitable for him to fulfill, with a commination of death therefore added, if he should transgress it.
3. Since Adam most freely transgressed this law, and therefore had involved not only himself in the evil of death and condemnation, but also, by God's ordinance, all his posterity through natural generation, the affection of Mercy indeed remained in God to liberate miserable man, but because Justice, which had been injured, and the truth of the divine commination stood in the way, preventing Him from benefiting such a transgressor, God did not will His mercy to go forth into act, unless justice should first have been satisfied, and before all things it should be made manifest, that God seriously hates sin and loves justice.
4. But that this might be satisfied, He willed to constitute a Mediator, who would become a propitiatory victim for all sinners, and undergo death for them, and who through his blood, shed for their reconciliation, would acquire the right of conferring salvation and eternal life upon them under a certain law.
5. This blood having been shed, or considered as shed, God decreed that all those who would truly believe in that Redeemer and would persevere in faith even unto the end of life, would, out of mercy and grace, become partakers of salvation and eternal life through him: but those who would not believe in him, and would persevere in that unbelief and disobedience

of theirs, should on that account be punished with the penalty of eternal death and condemnation.

6. But because it could not happen that sinners of themselves or by their own natural powers should believe in this their Redeemer, and persevere in such faith, and therefore that non-believers would be charged with the crime of unbelief, hence it is that God decreed to supply to them the necessary and sufficient means for faith and repentance, by which they would either actually and in reality be rendered fit for conceiving faith, or would be more and more disposed, prepared, and, as if by certain steps, advanced for at last conceiving faith.

From which, at length, the final Decree flows concerning saving by name those who, by the benefit of those means, would believe and would persevere in faith, but damning or reprobating from salvation those who would remain impenitent and unbelieving even to the end of life, or at least would die in unbelief. The opinion of Jacobus Arminius exists in the Articles to be Weighed, p. 21.

§. X. The Lutheran Theologians teach:

First, God decreed to create all men for eternal life in Adam. **Then**, he foresaw that Adam would fall with all his posterity. **After that**, however, he decreed, as a remedy for the fall, to send the son, who would in turn repair life for all men. And because medicine is not beneficial without application, he also decreed to offer the benefits of the son through the word to the whole world, and by the efficacy of the Holy Spirit to kindle Faith in the hearts of men. **Then**, however, he foresaw that some would maliciously repudiate the word and the offered goods; but that some by the efficacy of the Holy Spirit through the word would perseveringly believe in Christ. Which foreknowledge, at length, Election and Reprobation followed. For He reprobated the former, but elected the latter in Christ. See Formula of Concord (Leipzig Edition in octavo) p. 802, 803; also Balth. Meisner, Anthropology, Dec. II, Disp. XIV, qu. II, §. 25, p. 136.

According to D. Valentinus Alberti in *Interest of Religion*, Art. V, Thesis I, §. 2, p. 257, the Scale or Order between the Acts of the Divine Intellect and Will is such:

1. The Decree concerning the Creation of Man.
2. The Foreknowledge of the fall.
3. The Decree of Redemption.
4. The Counsel concerning the Means.
5. The Foreknowledge of those who would use them or not.
6. The Good Pleasure of glorifying those who use them.
7. The special Foreknowledge of them.
8. The Love of the Foreknown.
9. The Election and Predestination of the Loved.

§. XI. In the opinions recited up to this point, and indeed:

I. In the opinion of the Jews and Socinians, is disapproved:

1. that they do not acknowledge an Ante-secular and Individual Decree of Election and Reprobation.
2. that they deny Original Corruption.
3. that they extol too much the natural powers of Free Will.
4. that they ascribe their Conversion and salvation to their own Free Will, aided by a certain general and indifferent Grace; and thus
5. they incur Pelagianism.
To which
6. is added, that the Socinians impugn the Foreknowledge of future Contingents.

II. In the Opinion of the Greeks, Scotists, Franciscans, Jesuits, Molinists, and Arminians, it is not disapproved that they lay under the Order of Divine Decrees a certain Universal Sufficient Grace: For we judge this to be conformed to Holy Scripture and to Purer Antiquity; But in it is lacking:

1. that they admit no Grace, unless it is universal, equal, and indifferent, in such a way that, all the Operations of Divine Grace being posited, by which God works to effect the conversion of men, Free Will nevertheless remains in equilibrium, and Conversion itself remains so in our Free power, that we are able to convert or not to convert, and thus
2. that they believe that the Free Will of Man determines that equal and indifferent Grace, and that Man distinguishes himself from another; and
3. that they suspend Election and Conversion from a creature, and its Free Will and
4. That from their opinion Predestination is not so much occupied with Persons, as with the Qualities and State of Persons.

The Thomists, Dominicans, Augustinians, etc. approach more closely to the Reformed, who, besides a Sufficient Aid, by which it happens that men are able to believe and be converted, acknowledge an intrinsically efficacious Grace, by which it happens that man not only is able to believe and be converted, but also actually does believe and is converted. From the Jesuits, Bellarmine, Toletus, Pererius, Suarez, Salmero, Maldonatus, Tannerus do not dissent much from these, whom Wendelin praises on that account in *System of Theology*, Lib. I, cap. III, p. 289, 290. Cf. also Sam. Maresius, *Select Disputations*, Vol. II, p. 324 and following.

The Lutheran Theologians also approach most closely to the Reformed, when they maintain that there is no Cause of Divine Election in Us, that Faith is the Gift

of God, that Man in the first moment of Conversion behaves merely passively. See Formula of Concord, Leipzig Edition in octavo, p. 621, n. 4, p. 662, 663, 668, 672, 673, 809, 810, 821. Also the Leipzig Liquidation.

Subsection III. Proposing the Position of the Reformed Theologians.

SUMMARY.

§. I. The Position of the Reformed Theologians, and indeed of those who are called Supralapsarians, is proposed.

§. II. The Opinion of these is not the Position of the Reformed Church, as professed in the Public Confessions.

§. III. John Calvin was not a Supralapsarian. Nor was Joh. Piscator; at least, he did not remain such.

§. IV. This is modestly refuted by eight Reasons.

§. V. The position of the theologians who are infra- or Sublapsarian (as they are called) is proposed. And indeed 1. that of those who are named the Categoricals.

§. VI. 2. The Position of those who are called the Hypotheticals, or Universalists.

§. VII. This is delineated & distinctly proposed.

§. VIII. And is said to be asserted & contained in the Confessions and Edicts of Electoral Brandenburg.

§. IX. This is proven by Reasons, sought from:

- The Distinction made by God himself between the Devil the seducer & Man the Seduced.
- The General Philanthropy of God.
- The Universal, most sufficient Ransom of Christ.
- The General, promiscuous & Serious Vocation not only of the Elect, but also of the Non-Elect.
- The Guilt & Inexcusability of the Reprobate.
- From the execution, which takes place in time, and which is depicted for Us in Matthew XX. & XXII, also Luke XIV.
- From Rom. VIII. 28. 29. 30.
- From the Testimonies of Scripture, in which men are said to be elected in Christ.
- From Chap. IX. to the Romans.
- From the Examples of the Elect & Reprobate.
- From the Sacraments, Baptism & the Holy Supper.
- From the Certainty of Faith & Salvation, especially of those who doubt their own Election.
- From the Doctors of the primitive Church, even St. Augustine, Prosper, Fulgentius, the Church of Lyons.

- The Consent of the Reformed (a) Waldensians. (b) Bohemian Brethren. (γ) Germans, implicitly, while they embrace & receive the Body of Doctrine of Philip Melanchthon. (δ) Explicitly, of Brandenburg. (ε) of Anhalt. (ζ) of the Palatinate. (η) of Hesse. (θ) of Bremen. (ι) of Switzerland. (κ) of England. (λ) of France. (μ) of the Synod of Dort.

§. X. The Form & End of Predestination.

§. I. Reformed Theologians, although they confess with one mouth that the Election and Salvation of men is to be attributed solidly to divine Grace, but that Reprobation and Damnation is to be attributed to the fault of men, nevertheless do not in every way agree in ordering the Decrees of God, but foster three different positions concerning the Series of the Divine Decrees.

The first is that of those who are called Supralapsarians (because in designating the Object of divine Predestination they ascend above the fall). These weave the Order of the divine decrees in this manner:

First, God decreed to declare His Mercy and His Justice, His Mercy indeed in saving certain ones, but His Justice in destroying certain ones.

That He might attain this end, (2) He willed that in one man all his posterity, or the whole human race, should be made miserable, and so resolved to create the first man with original Justice, but mutable; to permit his fall, and to impute it to all the posterity whom He willed to procreate from him by continuous generation.

(3) That He might obtain the Glorification of gracious mercy, He willed to deliver certain of those men from the misery of the fall through Christ, and conferred Him upon them as Redeemer, and willed to call the same efficaciously to him through faith, to justify, sanctify, and glorify with eternal beatitude.

(4) On the contrary, however, that He might obtain the Glorification of Justice, He willed to leave certain other men in that misery, and by His eternal Counsel denied Christ the Mediator to them, denied the Vocation through faith, Justification and Sanctification, and willed to eternally damn them, both on account of that common misery in original sin, and on account of any actual sins whatever. Wittich. *Theologia Pacifica* Cap. XVII. §. 256. pag. 221.

§. II. This Position is indeed that of some learned Doctors in the Reformed Church: Theodore Beza, William Whitaker, William Perkins, Franciscus Gomarus, Johannes Maccovius, William Twisse, Gisbertus Voetius, & a few others; It is not, however, the expressed, acknowledged & professed position of the Reformed Church itself in its public Confessions. From which, nevertheless, the Synod of Dort wills that the genuine position of the Reformed Church be sought: "Wherefore, as many as piously call upon the name of our Savior Jesus Christ, the Synod of Dordrecht beseeches them through the name of the Lord, that they judge concerning the Faith of the Reformed Churches, not from Calumnies scraped together from here and there, nor even from the private sayings of some Doctors, both Ancient and Recent, often either cited in bad faith, or corrupted, & twisted into a foreign sense, but from the public Confessions of the Churches

themselves, & from this Declaration of Orthodox Doctrine, confirmed by the unanimous consent of all and of the single members of the whole Synod."

§. III. Indeed, John Calvin & Joh. Piscator are also usually counted among the Supralapsarians. But truly, as pertains to Calvin, that the greatest injury is done to him, his own words, in which he professes the contrary, will prove:

In the *Institution of the Christian Religion* (which book the Man is said to have written as a Youth of 25 years) he did not indeed arrange the instances of the Decrees so accurately. In the meantime, however, there are not lacking passages there by which Calvin can be freed from the imputed Position of the Supralapsarians. Calvin, *Institutes*, Book III, chap. XXIII, §. 3: "By way of reply, let us in our turn ask them, what they think God owes to man, if he wishes to judge him by his own nature. In what way we are all vitiated by sin, we cannot but be hateful to God, and that not by a tyrannical cruelty, but by the most equitable reason of justice. But if all are liable to the judgment of death by their natural condition, whom the Lord predestinates to death, of what injustice of his towards them, I ask, may they complain? Let all the sons of Adam come, let them contend and dispute with their Creator, because by his eternal providence, before their own generation, they were addicted to perpetual Calamity. What will they be able to cry out against this defense, when God will in turn call them to a recognition of themselves? If all are taken from a corrupt mass, it is no wonder if they are subject to damnation. Therefore let them not accuse God of iniquity, if by his eternal judgment they are destined for death, to which by their own nature, whether they will it or not, they themselves feel they are led. From which it appears, how perverse is the affectation of crying out, by which they designedly suppress the cause of damnation, which they are forced to acknowledge in themselves, so that the pretext of God may free them."

The same man most evidently defends himself from the imputed Supralapsarianism in his *Book on the eternal Predestination of God*, Geneva, in octavo, An. 1552, pag. 114, 115: "When Sermon is had concerning Predestination, I have constantly always taught, and today I teach, that the starting point should be from this: that all the reprobate, who are dead and damned in Adam, are justly left in death: that those who by nature are sons of wrath justly perish, so that no one has cause to complain about the excessive rigor of God: since all carry their guilt enclosed within themselves. But if one comes to the first man, that he, though he was created whole, fell of his own accord: and thence it happened, that he brought upon himself and his own destruction by his own fault." Id. *ibid.* pag. 120: "But the other part, that from the damned offspring of Adam God elects whom He has seen fit, and reprobates whom He wills, just as it is far more apt for exercising faith, so it is treated with greater fruit. In this doctrine, therefore, which contains in itself both the corruption and the guilt of human nature, I more

willingly insist. Just as it is not only more conducive to piety, but seems to me more Theological."

Nor from the fact that Calvin says somewhere that the impious were created for Destruction, is it proven that he was a Supralapsarian. For by that phrase (an inconvenient one, however) he indicates not the End, but the Extreme and the event, and teaches that the impious were created by God, who by their own fault rush to Destruction, and are at last damned. Which he himself testifies in his *Response to the Calumnies of Nebulo*, Art. I: "Although God decreed from the beginning what would be for the whole human race, yet this manner of speaking will never occur in my writings: that the End of Creation is eternal perdition."

Johannes Piscator was at first addicted to this opinion, but he, the matter having been maturely weighed, publicly retracted it in *Amica Duplicatio*, p. 44: "I acknowledge that I have erred here in indicating the Order of the divine Decrees concerning the Means, by which men are led either to Salvation or to Destruction. For right reason demands that of those Decrees the first was concerning creating men to the image of God, the second concerning permitting that they should fall into sin, etc. etc." Twissus also reports this Change and judges concerning it in *Vindiciae Gratiae, Potestatis ac Providentiae Dei* L. I, Part. 1, Digress. II, C. VI, p. 64, 65, also Digress. HH, C. XXI, XXIV, p. 67, 68, 69. Thomas Aylesbury, *Diatribae de Aeterno Divini Beneplaciti circa Creaturas Intellectuales Decreto* Cap. V, p. 180, 181, 182. Also Sam. Maresius, *Fasciculus Myrrhae* p. 664 f. *Xeniis Academicis* p. 67, & D. Thom. Pierce, *Pacificator Theologiae Corpusculum* cap. V, §. 3, p. 47. And so no German Theologian has approved that opinion.

§.IV. But whosever that opinion may be, we judge it to be false on account of the following reasons:

I. If God, before the Decree concerning creating man & permitting his Fall, had made the Decree of Predestination, i.e., of Election & Reprobation, it follows that God entered into a Counsel concerning saving or destroying man, before He had decreed anything concerning his futurity or future Existence: But the Consequent is absurd: Therefore also the Antecedent. For a non-entity cannot be the Object of Predestination, since of a Non-Entity there are no Affections: nor can the Act of Predestination be posited without a predestinable subject, i.e., one who is electable & reprobable or able to be tormented. Predestination certainly does not make its own Object, as Creation does, but rather presupposes it. But man as creatable is a Non-Entity, because only through Creation is he brought from non-being to being. So far is it, therefore, that he cannot even be predestinable, and in no way can he be an Object for declaring Mercy or Justice. Rightly does Peter Molinaeus, in *Anatomia Arminianismi* c. XIII, num. 21, say: "They are most far from the truth who will that God, in electing and reprobating, considered man as not yet created; for they act as if they were saying that God

considered man as Nothing, and therefore as Not Man. Certainly by the very fact that they say man, they say Something; But to consider Something as Nothing, is a thing closer to a Dream. He who wills to save or punish man, necessarily first willed him to exist. For if God had first destined man to punishment, before He had resolved to create him, he would act as if someone resolved to beat his children with rods, before he had resolved to beget them."

II. Nor can man created, but not yet fallen, be the Object of Predestination. For men created whole are all partakers of life and immortality, whence they can neither be elected to life nor reprobated to Death. Man created and not yet fallen is also innocent, who can be neither an Object of Mercy (for Mercy presupposes a miserable one) and therefore not of Election; Nor even an Object of vindictive Justice (for this presupposes sin) and therefore not of Reprobation. It is absurd to say, according to the common opinion of Theologians, that God can commit an innocent Creature to eternal Torments; for the Justice of God requires that He absolve the innocent, not commit him to death, much less eternal death, Gen. XVIII. 25; Ez. XVIII. 19; Ps. XVIII. 26; Ps. XXV. 10. And because in an innocent man there is not, nor can be, a conscience of crime, for that reason no just Judgment could have place concerning him; and therefore no glory could arise for God from such a judgment, but rather the ignominy of a Tyrannical Empire, as Franc. Turretinus truly teaches in his *Compendium of Didactic-Elenctic Theology*, contracted by Leonh. Riissen, Loc. IX, §. 18, p. 74.

III. If you say that God, in order to have an Occasion for declaring the Glory of His Mercy & the Glory of His Justice, at the same time decreed that man should fall, you make the Fall a necessary Medium of Predestination, and therefore of Reprobation, and you teach that sins are on account of Reprobation & Damnation, and that God did not will to damn men because they were sinners, but therefore decreed to permit sin, so that they could be justly punished, and decreed to create, so that He could eternally damn. How contrary this is to Christian Piety, all sincerely pious people easily understand. When on the contrary Reprobation & Damnation is on account of sin. Vid. Pet. Molin. *Anat. Armin.* c. XIII, §. 13, 14, 17, p. 73-74, 75. Nor ought it to be said that the Fall of men was a necessary medium for declaring Mercy towards the Elect; but from the Foreknowledge of Sin God intends to declare Mercy. Augustine, in Ps. CXXV, calls this a cruel Mercy, if someone should wish for or make miserable ones, so that from that he might obtain an occasion for exercising Mercy & Justice: "He who, in order to show Mercy, wishes for miserable ones to exist, has a cruel mercy: in what way a Physician, that he might exercise his art, would wish for many to be sick, it would be a cruel medicine. Yet as long as there are those upon whom Mercy may be bestowed, let us not fail to send seeds into that field." Much less ought it to be admitted that the fall was necessary for exercising the glorious justice of God. For God does not need a sinful Man for His Glory, as Ecclesiasticus teaches, c. XV, vs.

11, 12: "Say not thou, It is through the Lord that I fell away: for thou oughtest not to do the things that he hateth. Say not thou, He hath caused me to err: for he hath no need of the sinful man." Nor were other Media for declaring His Justice lacking to Him. For He could have declared the glory of His remunerative Justice by bestowing a reward upon men obedient to Him; but He would have abundantly declared His vindictive Justice in the Reprobation of the evil Angels and could have further declared it in the Damnation of the same, who were then already supposed to be fallen. Besides, the Glory of His inexhaustible Wisdom, of his omnimodal Goodness, & of his invincible Power would have shone forth far more without the fall & would have been acknowledged & celebrated by innocent men.

IV. Election was made in Christ, Eph. I. vs. 4. Therefore it is certain that those to be elected were fallen and miserable. Where there is need of a Redeemer, there sin and misery from sin is supposed. As a Physician is for the sick; so a Savior is ordained for sinners, who are lost in themselves. As the healthy have no need of a Physician; so the unfallen and whole have no need of a Savior.

V. Those for whom efficacious Vocation, gratuitous Justification, unmerited Adoption, most clement Regeneration are prepared, must be fallen: But in the Decree of Predestination these benefits are prepared for the Elect. It is not to be doubted therefore, that men in the Decree of Predestination were considered as fallen & sinners. For God does not resolve through Christ to call the just, but sinners, to repentance; not to justify the innocent & whole, but sinners on account of Christ; nor to restore & regenerate the healthy & unfallen, but the sick & corrupt.

VI. We are elected that we might be holy, Eph. I. 4. Therefore we are elected as impure; for Sanctification can have place only in the impure, & Sanctification cannot be intended, unless a sanctifiable Subject, i.e. an impure one, is presupposed in the Foreknowledge of God.

VII. That men not creatable, nor created and liable to fall, but, created and fallen, indeed called and relapsed, are the Object of Predestination, is most evidently proven by chapter IX of Romans. For there **(1)** Paul teaches that a mass is to be understood, in which lying men can be had in hatred by God, by the example of Esau vs. 13, whom God hated not as a man, but as a sinner, for He loves all things that are, & abhors nothing of those things which He has made; for He would not have made anything, that He might have it in hatred, Wisd. II. 25, but He hates sin & on account of sin, sinners, Ps. V. 7; XI. 5; Zach. VIII. 17; Prov. VI. 16 ff; Lev. XVIII. 22 ff; XXVI. 30; Deut. XII. 31; XVI. 21, 22; Wisd. IV. 9. **(2)** Paul teaches that that mass is to be understood, from which are made vessels of wrath, vs. 21, 22, 23. Which can be polluted by no other thing than sin, not only original, but also actual; Just as therefore in those He decreed to exercise unmerited Mercy; So in these, merited and often provoked wrath.

VIII. This opinion of the Supralapsarians is also not only contrary to the unanimous consent of the Doctors of the Primitive Church, but also most contrary to the Harmony of the Confessions of the Reformed Church. Whence it is so far from the case that the Reformed Church has publicly approved this private opinion of certain Doctors of the Pontifical & Reformed Church, that it has rather reclaimed against it in the Public Confessions, & its greatest theologians have noted the Authors & Defenders of this opinion with a sharper censure.

Indeed the Swiss Theologians in a public Convention, held in the Year 1586, concerning the Accusations of Samuel Huber, established the opinion contrary to Theod. Beza. Concerning which matter see Joh. Hen. Hottinger, *Historia Ecclesiastica* Tom. VIII, Sect. XVI, Part. IV, §. 30, 31, p. 908, 909, 910, 911, 912. Indeed, we have observed that the whole Colloquy of Montbéliard held between Theod. Beza & Jac. Andreae ought not to be drawn to the prejudice of any Reformed Church, both from the Preface of the Genevans & Bernese, and from the Testimony of the Wittenbergers, which is read on page 20 of the Colloquy. There can also be consulted what Melchior Adam has in the *Lives of the German Theologians*, in the Life of Jac. Andreae p. 653, 654 & 655.

Nor was William Whitaker able to persuade the Anglican Church of his private opinion, which is not only clear from his Disputation with Peter Baro, the Margaret Professor at Cambridge, but also from the Judgment of the Most Serene Queen Elizabeth & the Most Potent King James, by which they took care, lest the nine Assertions of D. Whitaker, although posited circumspectly enough, be inserted into the Anglican Confession. *Lambeth Articles*, History, p. 5, 6, 8.

William Perkins was freely reprehended on that account by Robert Abbot, first Regius Professor at the University of Oxford & at length Bishop of Salisbury, in a brief Animadversion on Richard Thomson's *Diatribes on the Loss and Intercision of Justification*, Chap. I: "Perkins, a man otherwise learned & pious, in the description of divine Predestination, which he, against our faith, against the faith of the ancient Church, constituted as an absolute decree without reference to the fall of Adam, erred an error not light: the defense of which, undertaken and entered into long ago by certain learned Men, has given unnecessary troubles to the Churches: which we see to linger not without Scandal & danger: while each man judges that the way he has entered upon is to be held more tightly for himself, than he makes the line of truth, drawn by the authority of the sacred letters, a guide for himself like the thread of Ariadne."

The Most Illustrious Orders of Holland & West-Frisia in the Year 1614 by a Public Decree commanded that it should be taught: "That no men are created by almighty God for Damnation, that a necessity of sinning is imposed on none by

GOD, nor is anyone invited to salvation by God, to whom He has not decreed to give salvation."

Nor was the Opinion of Franciscus Gomarus approved in the Synod of Dort, but rather disapproved. For the Most Reverend George, Bishop of Llandaff, gravely admonished: "Since all the foreign Theologians, with no one excepted, and with them also all the Belgic Professors, with Gomarus excepted, had already contributed their judgments for man as fallen, and since he had no doubt that the Provincials would also so determine, it was fitting that the Synod should so decide: nor was there any cause, why on account of the singular opinion of one Professor, who in this part dissented from the judgment of all the Reformed Churches, the Synod should abstain from a decision of this question." Which Gualtherus Balcanquallus reports, in a Letter to Dudl. Carleton, Legate of the King of Great Britain, in the *Epistolae Praestantium Virorum*, Ep. 340, p. 557. Whence the Synod of Dort in the Conclusion of the Canons defined: "That God by the bare and pure choice of His Will, without any respect or view of any sin, has predestined & created the greatest part of the world to eternal damnation; And in the same way that Election is the fount & Cause of Faith and of good works, Reprobation is the cause of infidelity & improbity; the Reformed Churches not only do not acknowledge, but even detest with their whole heart."

Indeed, in the Academy of Groningen, it was publicly ordered that a Disputation on the Object of Predestination be taken down, which, against the mind & definition of the National Synod of Dort, ascended above the fall in assigning it; & on that Occasion it was enjoined upon All Professors of the Academy & Ministers of the Churches, that they should subscribe anew to the Canons of the Synod, also by consequence in that respect, in which fallen man is constituted the Object of Predestination in them, as Samuel Maresius reports in *Dispp. Select.* Vol. I, Disp. de Syner. & Reconcil. Part. in Relig. Diffid. Th. LXXXIV, p. 562; also *Xeniorum Acad.* Praefat. fol. 6, fac. 1 & 2, ib. p. 34, 35, 66, 147, 148.

It was likewise held as a fault in Johannes Maccovius, that he denied that the fallen human race was the Object of Predestination; as indicated by Gualterus Balcanquallus in *Epist. Praestant. Viror.* p. 574.

The most consummate Theologian Robertus Sanderson, initially Regius Professor of Theology at Oxford, and thence Bishop of Lincoln, censured William Twisse in England, in a Letter inserted into the Life of this man & prefixed with his life to his Sermons, pag. 48, 49, where among other things he marvels that Twisse built up the whole mass of his Supralapsarian opinion upon this Axiom: *What is last in Execution, is first in intention*; when however such an Axiom does not exist in the nature of things; But the true & genuine Axiom has it thus: *The End which is first in intention, is last in Execution*. See also Sam. Mares. *Xenia Academ. Apol. pro Synodo Dordrac. de Objecto Praedest.* part. 2, p. 67, 68, 109.

How Samuel Maresius contradicted Gisbertus Voetius, and refuted him, can be read in *Fascic. Myrrhae* or *Xen. Acad.* p. 33 ff, 65 ff, 97 ff.

Nor in Germany were there lacking solid Theologians who disapproved this opinion. Johannes Crocius, formerly the primary Theologian of Marburg, writes that he grieves from his soul "That great & most erudite Men, after so many public complaints of various men, so many warnings of the pious, establish not men definitely foreknown, created and fallen, but men indefinitely foreknown, or creatable, as the object of election," in *Commentar. in Epist. ad Ephes.* Cap. I, p. 250, num. 4. Among these Daniel Sachsus, Superintendent of Cöthen, also professes his name, in *der Zugabe bey der Reformirten Glaubens-Bekänntnifs* pag. 87: "If there are still here and there a few Supralapsarians, the combined churches do not make themselves partakers of such a doctrine, but must leave them commended to GOD and their Rulers, who can suffer it, that peace and quiet among their subjects must be troubled by such divisions."

From which things we think it is liquidly established, that the most outstanding of the Reformed Theologians were not only alienated from the Opinion of the Supralapsarians, but also impugned and publicly rejected and refuted the same.

To that common Axiom: What is last in Execution, ought to be first in Intention; besides what the Most Reverend Rob. Sanderson observed, with Maresius & Turretinus and others we respond,

I. This Axiom is valid with respect to the Ultimate End, but not indeed of the subordinate ones. But the Illustration of Mercy & Justice in the Salvation or Damnation of men is not the absolutely & simply ultimate End, as regards the Government of man in general; but in a certain respect & relatively, as regards the Government of fallen & sinful man. Whence also the Decree of Predestination is not absolutely first, even before the Decree of Creation & Permission of the Fall; but in a certain respect & in the genus of Decrees concerning the salvation of Fallen Man & of the Means subordinated to it. If this Axiom were valid with respect to Subordinate Ends; it would follow: That which is penultimate in Execution, is second in Intention, & what is antepenultimate, is third & so on. Thus because God in Execution 1. creates, 2. permits the Fall, 3. redeems, 4. calls, 5. justifies, sanctifies & 6. glorifies; it would follow: That God 1. intended the Glorification of man, 2. his Sanctification & Justification, 3. his Vocation from the State of sin, 4. the Mission of the Mediator for the Redemption of man, 5. the Permission of the Fall or of Sin, 6. his Creation: which anyone sees to be absurd. He certainly arranges the matter better, who establishes that God intended the Glorification & salvation of Fallen Men through Christ; and for that reason intended their Justification & Sanctification through Faith in Christ & Good works; and thence intended their Vocation to Faith in Jesus Christ, since without it they could not believe in Christ & live according to His Prescription: hence He

intended to send a most Sufficient Redeemer, to whom Men would be called with the command of Faith & Repentance. For to this Analysis of Intention (of which the first is the Decree of salvation not in idea or indefinitely, but of the salvation which is in Christ & through Christ) the Synthesis of the Means in Execution accurately corresponds. For according to the first intention Christ is sent to fallen men, fallen Men are called to the Mediator with the command of Faith & Repentance. The Called faithful & repenting are justified, sanctified, finally the justified & sanctified are glorified.

II. What is last in Execution, that is first in Intention, unless it is repugnant to the Nature of the one Decreeing, or of the Decree, or of the Means. But it is repugnant (**α**) to the Nature of the Decreeing God, to will to declare Justice, for instance, in certain men without consideration of fault. (**β**) It is repugnant to the Nature of the Decree of Election & Reprobation, to Decree the Election or Reprobation of men, their salvation or Damnation before the Decree concerning the Creation & Existence of Men. (**γ**) It is adverse to the Means itself, for instance, Creation, to be intended of itself for the Execution of the Decree of Reprobation. For the creation of man is the production of man to the image of God, that he may rightly acknowledge his Creator God, love him from the soul, live blessedly with him in eternity, to praise & celebrate God. Which Order Sin disturbed, which is against Nature, nor is it a Medium with respect to Damnation but the Cause of the same, much less can it be a Medium with respect to salvation and to the End, except by Accident.

(III.) Nor are the ways or economies in Nature & Grace, Providence & Predestination to be confounded, because since the End is other, the Means also ought to be other. Although therefore this Axiom may have a place, if one remains in the same Order, it will not however be valid, if a transition is made from one Dispensation to another. Compare, if you please, Petr. Molinaeus's *Anatomes Armianismi* Cap. XIII, p. 69 ff, & the *Additamentum* to Cap. XIII, p. 366 ff. Sam. Mares. *Fascic. Myrrhh. Apolog. pro Decisione Synodi Dordr. de Objecto Praedestinationis* p. 632 ff. Franc. Turrett. *Instit. Theol. Elencht.* Part. I, Loc. IV, Qu. IX, p. 376 ff.

§.V. The second Position, which is the first of the Reformed Church itself, makes fallen man, and so the Mass corrupted by original sin, the Object of Predestination, and briefly orders the Series of divine decrees thus:

God decreed

1. To create the World & man in it.
2. To permit the foreseen fall of man.

3. To elect certain of the fallen, out of the benevolent Affection of His Will, to be saved in Christ, to reprobate the rest out of Justice on account of their sins.
4. To destine a Mediator for the elect, who would satisfy divine Justice for their sins.
5. To call men indeed promiscuously, the Reprobate & Elect, externally, and to some extent also internally; yet to call only the Elect internally & efficaciously to Faith & Salvation.
6. To justify, glorify the Elect; but to eternally damn the Reprobate on account of their sins, not only original, but also actual.

This Position, milder than the former, is wont to be called Sublapsarian or Infralapsarian, and they who defend it, Sublapsarians or Infralapsarians. And it is the acknowledged Position not only of many Reformed Theologians, Henricus Altingius, Fridericus Spanhemius, Joh. Wollebius, Marcus Frid. Wendelinus, Sam. Maresius, Franciscus Turretinus & others, but also of certain Reformed Churches.

§. VI. Because, however, it seemed harsh to other Reformed Churches, and their Learned & Pious Theologians, to assert that a great part of men, equally as the Devil, without any hope of pardon—and he indeed on account of a personal sin, easily avoidable, but men on account of the sin of Adam, imputed to them & inherent—were reprobated, i.e., simply excluded from all saving Grace both Objective and Subjective, & addicted to Damnation. Thence they preferred to this the Third Position, which is the Second of the Reformed Church itself; because they judged this to be more agreeable both to the perpetual tenor of Sacred Scripture & to the Consent of the ancient primitive Church, even of Augustine himself & his followers.

§. VII. This Position establishes: That God the Thrice Best & Greatest decreed to create the human Race most sufficiently instructed with Original Justice & with the gifts necessary for persevering in the State of Innocence, and to obligate it to the Obedience due to God the Creator under the promise of all-encompassing felicity and Life, if it should obey, & under the commination of Death and other most grave penalties, if it should violate the given Law & be disobedient to the Creator in so easy a matter:

But God foresaw in the infinite light of His Intellect that the First-formed ones, tempted by the Serpent, would listen to the Serpent, and would voluntarily obey the same & would freely transgress the Law given by God, so easy to observe, and thus would violate the Covenant of Works, which event He, being about to produce light from darkness, resolved to permit.

Although therefore God could have eternally cast off the entire human race, so foully fallen in Adam, out of His Justice; Nevertheless, out of His inexhaustible Mercy He spared the fallen human Race, and did not avenge the sin of the seduced humans with the same Severity as that of the Seducer, the Devil; On the contrary, God the friend of man (φιλόανθρωπον, philanthropon), moved by His ineffable Grace for the whole of the fallen human race, decreed to enter into a Covenant of Grace with the fallen Race, and to that end to send His only-begotten Son into the world, who, having paid a most sufficient Ransom for the sins of all, and having rendered Satisfaction for the sins of all, would acquire for all the Remission of sins, Grace, Justice & eternal Life on this law, that if they, through the powers of Grace joined to this Covenant by an indivisible nexus, should believe in this Mediator with a true & living Faith, they would be rendered partakers of the Remission of sins, of Divine Adoption & of eternal Salvation; But if not, they would be punished by a more grave judgment, with eternal death.

And lest anyone could plead his ignorance or impotence, God resolved to call every rational creature (Mark XVI. 15), all men everywhere (πάντας πανταχοῦ, pantas pantachou, Acts XVII. 30), not hypocritically, nor under an impossible condition, but seriously & sufficiently to embrace this salvation through His Ministers, the Prophets, Apostles, & their Successors, with the command of Repentance & Faith, and to pathetically invite them;

But God foresaw that men would promiscuously repudiate this Mediator & the Salvation offered to them in Him. Lest, therefore, the human Race should fall away from the benefit of Redemption, equally as from the Benefit of Creation, God, moved by a singular Love & Mercy, decreed to elect certain men from the human Race, neither better nor more worthy than the rest, through & on account of Christ, to give them a special, more efficacious Grace & Faith, through Faith to justify, sanctify & glorify them; To cast off & damn the rest out of His Justice on account of their avoidable sins, committed against the Law of Nature & the Gospel, especially on account of Unbelief & final Impenitence, so that the Reprobate have nothing of which to complain, the Elect have nothing from which to glory, the Reprobate, instructed with a common and Sufficient Aid, are able to come, but by their own avoidable malice & fault neglect to come, but the Elect by no merit of their own, but by the largess & abundance of a more Abundant & efficacious Grace certainly & infallibly come, and thus the Perdition of men is from themselves, but the Salvation of Men is from God. Hos. XIII. 9.

To gather the matter into a few words, according to this position God, being about to illustrate His Glory, decreed:

1. To create the World & man in it with Original Justice & with the gifts necessary for persevering in the State of Innocence.
2. To permit the fall of man.

3. To send a Mediator, who for the universal fault, would pay a universal & most sufficient ransom.
4. To call all seriously & sufficiently to embrace this Mediator.
5. Of the called & Relapsed to elect some, through & on account of Christ, to give them a living & rooted Faith, through this Faith to justify, sanctify & glorify them; The rest, by their own Fault, on account of their sins, original & actual, and therefore avoidable, especially on account of contempt of the Mediator, to reprobate & damn.

§. VIII. This position the Divine John Sigismund, Elector of Brandenburg, professed in his Confession of Faith, Heroically-Christianly; This the Divine George William, Elector of Brandenburg, by sending the same Confession of Faith to the Synod of Dort, made his own, and testified to be his own, and at the Colloquy of Leipzig in the Year 1631, he took care to have it expounded by the theologians, of Brandenburg, D. Joh. Bergius, and of Hesse, D. Joh. Crocius & Theophilus Neuberger; This the Divine Frederick William the Great, not only took care to have it more broadly explained & defended by his theologians in the Year 1645 in the Declaration of Thorn at the Charitable Colloquy; but also gloriously asserted it in the Electoral Edicts of the Year 1662 & the Year 1664, and augmented them. This the August and Most Potent Lord Frederick, King of Prussia & Elector of Brandenburg, for his Piety towards God, today asserts and defends.

§. IX. To this we also subscribe on account of the following Reasons:

I. Because by this position a clear distinction is placed between the Devil the Seducer & man the seduced; For just as the Devil was able not only to easily avoid his own fall, but also to abstain from seducing man, and so out of mere malice both rebelled himself & was the Persuader & Author of the Fall of our First-formed ones: So by God as a just Judge he was cast off & addicted to the Infernal fire by his own merit. But the Seduced First-formed ones not only obtained pardon for the sin committed, but also were admitted to the new Covenant of Grace with their posterity & were most clemently called, Gen. III. 15, from which Covenant no one, without his own Demerit, by the Will of God, but by his Demerit & avoidable fault is excluded, which the History of all Ages teaches with Holy Scripture. If therefore God, who is Love itself, did not reprobate even Adam & Eve on account of a personal & avoidable sin, nor addict them to eternal flames; how much less is He to be considered to have cast off a great part of men on account of the sin of Adam, imputed to them & inherent, without hope of pardon, to have utterly excluded them from all saving Grace both Objective and Subjective, & to have addicted them to eternal Death? Surely the most just Judge of all the World will not so judge. Gen. XVIII. 25. Therefore this our position serves to refute that most bitter accusation, as if by the Position of the Reformed God had dealt more inclemently with seduced reprobate men than with the

Seducer Devil; since the Devil on account of an avoidable sin, but Reprobate men on account of the sin of Adam, inevitably imputed to them, were cast off, for whom it would therefore have been better, never to have been born. God therefore had mercy on the fallen human Race.

And that **II.** is proven by the Philanthropy of God so often & so emphatically praised in Holy Scripture. Not only in Exod. XXXIV. 6, 7; Ps. LXXXVI. 5, 15; CII. 8 ff; 2 Cor. I. 13; 1 John IV. 8, 16 is the most principal account taken of Mercy in the description of God, and it is preferred to all the other Glorious Divine Attributes; but also the Mercy of God towards the human Race is preached in a wondrous manner in the Sacred Writings. Thence it is that God is called not a friend of angels (φιλάγγελος, philangelos), nor a friend of the good or a friend of the elect (φιλάγαθος or φιλέλεκτος, philagathos or philelektos), but, to our incredible and ineffable Solace, a friend of man (φιλόανθρωπος, philanthropos), i.e., not an Amatory of Angels, nor of Good men, nor of the Elect, but of men, Tit. III. 4, with singular emphasis, because he intimately loves men as men and his creatures, and bears a fatherly mind towards them and provides for them the necessities not only for Animal Life (for in that way he also loves beasts) but also for Spiritual Life. Hence it is that he swears that he does not will the Death of the sinner, but that he be converted and live, Ezech. XVIII. 23, 32 & XXXIII. 11. To which words Tertullian exclaims: "O Blessed are they for whose cause God swears! but, miserable are they! if we do not believe him even when he swears." Hence it is that the Son of God himself, marveling, bursts forth into these words: "God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting Life. For God sent not his Son into the World to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved," John III. 16, 17. Hence it is that God, from which He concluded all under sin, also had mercy upon all (whom he concluded under sin), Rom. XI. 32. Hence God wills all to be saved & to come to the knowledge of the Truth, 1 Tim. II. 4. Nor does he will any to perish, but all to return to Repentance, 2 Pet. III. 9. Which places, for the sake of avoiding prolixity, we will not explain at present, nor will we vindicate them from exceptions. Joh. Dallaeus has performed this excellently in *Apology for the Synods of Alençon & Charenton* from p. 10 to 66, & *Vindication of the Apology* Cap. V, VI, VII, VIII, from p. 56 to 225, who can be seen. Cf. also Chamier, *Panstratia Catholica*, Tom. III, L. VII, Cap. VI, §. 9, p. 105, & Lud. Crocius, *Syntagma Theologiae*, Lib. IV, C. I, §. 5, p. 962 to 966, also Aretius & Joh. Crocius on 1 Tim. II. 4. To John III. 16, however, we note that by the word World only the Elect cannot be understood, is clear from the circumstances of the Text itself.

(1) For the World here, vs. 16, 18, is distributed into those who will believe & those who will not believe. Either therefore certain of the Elect are not to believe and are to perish, or the World here extends more broadly than the Universality of the Elect.

(2) The universal Sign, *Whosoever*, implies this: For God is said to have so loved the World, that whosoever, from this World, believes, may have eternal Life, but whosoever, from this world, does not believe, may perish.

(3) This is clear, because God in vs. 17 is said to have sent his Son into the World, not to condemn the World. That only the Elect cannot be understood here is obvious to anyone. For could He have come to condemn the Elect? He came therefore to save, not to condemn, the human Race.

(4) It is clear from vs. 18, 19, where those who are damned, are said to be damned on that account, because they had not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God; and because, the Light sent to them having been repudiated, they loved darkness rather than the Light. He who is damned on account of a spurned Son, to him He must have been sent & destined. For how could he be bound to believe in him, who was not sent to him, that he might believe in him.

Whence not only the Doctors of the Primitive Church, and among them Augustine, but also the most outstanding Doctors of the Reformed Church, Bullinger, Musculus, Gualtherus, Calvinus, Zanchius, Pezelius, the Palatines, Johan. Bergius, Conrad. Bergius, Steinius, Joh. & Lud. Crocius, Hildebrandus, Davenantius, Wardus, Camero, Amyraldus, Dallaeus, Hammondus, Bartholomaeus Stoschius, Antonius Brunsenius, Joh. Claude, & our own, of pious memory, Teachers & Predecessors D. Elias Grebenitz, D. Joh. Simonis, D. Phil. Buchius, & he who today, with the highest praise, teaches in this our Academy & Church, Dn. D. Sam. Strimesius, and others have accepted this word for the human Race. Nor do the circumstances of the alleged texts allow that the word All be taken for the Kinds of individuals, but they require that it be taken for the Individuals of the Kinds; It will also scarcely be proven from the Scriptures that the little word, All, when applied to the Lowest and most special species, as they call it, does not denote the single Individuals of that Species, but only its Political or Rhetorical Kinds, i.e. from the diverse Orders of that species only some Individuals. And although Augustine has so taken it somewhere, he also takes it otherwise, and to the Articles falsely imposed on him, Art. II (either He himself or Prosper) says: "This discretion, which divine knowledge contains within the Secret of its justice, being removed, it is most sincerely to be believed and professed, that God wills that all men be saved, I Tim. II. Since indeed the Apostle, whose position that is, solicitously precepts, what is most piously guarded in all the Churches, that supplication be made to God for all men. From which that many perish, is the merit of those perishing, that many are saved, is the gift of the one Saving."

III. Our Position is proven by the Universal Redemption of Christ, or the Sufficiency of the ransom (λύτρον, lytron) of Christ, not potential, but Actual from the Will of God the Father, delivering the Son to death, & of the Son, undergoing death. Which the Sacred Writings of the Old & New Testament invincibly

demonstrate, & all the Catholic Doctors of all the first Centuries without exception asserted & defended from them. Is. LIII. 6: "All we like sheep have gone astray; and God hath laid on him (Christ) the iniquity of us all." Christ himself in Matth. IX. 13 professes: "That he came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." also I Tim. I. 15. Matth. XX. 28: That he gave his Soul a ransom for many. Matth. XXVI. 28: That his Blood was shed for many. Luke XIX. 10: "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." John I. 29: The Lamb of God took away the sins of the world. John III. 16: "God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" etc. John VI. 33: That he gave Life to the World. vs. 51: That he gave his flesh for the life of the World. Paul in Rom. V. 18, 19 teaches: "as by the offence of one (the first Adam) judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Rom. VIII. 32: That God "spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all." 2 Cor. V. 14, 15: "if one died for all, then were all dead: And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again." And vs. 19: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." I Tim. II. 5, 6: That there is "one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; Who gave himself a ransom for all." I Tim. IV. 10: That he is "the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe." Hebr. II. 9: That Christ by the Grace of God tasted death for every man. Galat. IV. 4, 5: "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption." John in 1 John II. 2 affirms that Christ "is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." Indeed, the Apostle also says that Christ died for those who can perish, Rom. XIV. 15: "Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." 1 Cor. VIII. 11: "And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died." Hebr. VI. 6, he writes: That those who, having been enlightened, have tasted the heavenly gift, "crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh." Hebr. X. 29, he considers worthy of the most bitter punishment those who "have trodden under foot the Son of God, and have counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith they were sanctified, an unholy thing, and have done despite unto the Spirit of grace." Peter in 2 Pet. II. 1 writes that the false prophets & lying teachers, who introduce damnable heresies, and who bring upon themselves swift Destruction, were bought by the Lord, whom they deny. Which places Joh. Dallaeus has vindicated in *Apology for the Synods* Part. I, p. 67 to 98, & Part. III, p. 388 to 429, and also *Vindication of the Apology* Part. II, Cap. I, II, III, IV, p. 226 to 347; also Joh. Crocius, *Commentary* on 1 Tim. II. 6, p. 46, 47, 59 to 64, & Lud. Crocius, *Twelve Dissertations*, Disp. XI, p. 611, 612 to 672. Cf. also Calvin's Commentaries on the places cited here.

IV. This series of divine decrees is required by the general and promiscuous serious vocation not only of the Elect, but also of the Non-Elect. Indeed, many here dispute many things about the Universal (actual) or Particular Vocation of Men. But for now we can dispense with those Disputations. It is sufficient that the Vocation to the heavenly Kingdom is **I.** General and promiscuous. **II.** That it is directed to Salvation, under the Condition of Faith & Repentance. **III.** That (if not all are actually called, at least) all are Callable. **IV.** That the Vocation is Serious. **V.** That the Vocation is Benevolent, proceeding from Love, not hatred.

I. The Divine Vocation is General, & Promiscuous of the Elect & Non-Elect. In the Old Testament the Prophets ordinarily indeed called only the Jews, yet not only the Elect but the Elect & Non-Elect, they did not call feignedly, to which the words of David in Ps. CXLVII. 19, 20 look: "He sheweth his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation." But extraordinarily they also called the Gentiles & admitted Proselytes, a not obscure indication that no one is absolutely excluded from the Covenant of God & the Hope of pardon. But under the Auspices of the New Testament, just as Christ commanded the Apostles to preach the Gospel to every rational Creature, Mark XVI, to all peoples, Matth. XXVIII. 19, to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem, Luke XXIV. 47. Whence the Vocation by reason of the intention & command of God (although not always with respect to the event, and of all & single men) is rightly established as universal; So also the Apostles allowed nothing to be wanting in themselves, but faithfully did what was commanded & went over the whole orb of the earth, and offered the salvation obtained & procured by Christ to all promiscuously with the command of Repentance & Faith. "Their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world." Rom. X. 18. They preached to every creature which is under heaven, Col. I. 23, & vs. 28, they announced Christ, "warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus."

II. This vocation was directed to the Salvation of the Called Men, under the Condition of Faith & Repentance. For just as in the preaching of the Gospel, the Narration or Promulgation of the History concerning Christ, & the Command to believe, and also the interdiction of unbelief, pertains to all (called or callable); So also the Promise of eternal Salvation, made to believers, & the commination of eternal Death, made to unbelievers, pertains to all. Christ himself leads the Apostles: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark XVI. 16. Luke XXIV. 47. John III. 16, 17, 18, 19. "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Matth. XI. 28. "him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day." "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." John VI. 37, 40, 47. The

Disciples follow their Master; Hence Peter: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Acts X. 43. "Be it known unto you therefore... that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins." Acts XIII. 38, 39. "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent." Acts XVII. 30. "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith." Acts XXVI. 18. "This is the word of faith, which we preach; That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. For there is no distinction between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Rom. X. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to GOD!" 2 Cor. V. 20. "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, Teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour JESUS Christ." Tit. II. 11, 12, 13. Whence it is invincibly demonstrated, that no one, except on account of infidelity, disobedience & impenitence, is excluded from Salvation. For what is ordained to be conferred on all under the condition of Repentance, Faith & Obedience, that is decreed to be denied to no one, unless Impenitence, Unbelief & disobedience intervene. Therefore the very Nature of Vocation & the Nature of Election & Reprobation require this Order of Decrees: For Vocation is a Legislative Act or an Act of God the Legislator, the Evangelical Doctrine is promulgated, in which to all who will believe in Christ the Remission of sins & eternal Salvation is offered in good faith; but to unbelievers the Wrath of God is denounced. But Election & Reprobation are Judicial Acts, the Sentence of God the Judge, by which Peter, Paul, John, who by the stipulated Powers would certainly and infallibly believe, are destined for eternal Life, but Cain, Pharaoh, Judas etc., on account of the spurned Doctrine of the Gospel, and therefore on account of Unbelief, & impenitence, are destined for eternal death. Unless therefore you wish to subvert this Order (which is hexagonal in Execution), it must be said that the Decree of Vocation precedes the Decree of Election & Reprobation.

Nor is it permitted to object to our Position that not all & single men at all times, and in all places have been called. For I. Even if immediately & directly all & single men, at all times & moments, and in all Places have not been called; which therefore also no one would easily assert: Nevertheless all have been called mediately,

1. In the time of Adam, when God called the entire world, when He called the First-formed from the fall, Gen. III. 15.
2. In the time of Noah, with whom all his posterity were called to the participation of Grace & Salvation, which Grace they ought to have conserved & propagated, which they, not by the fault of God, but by their own, lost.
3. All have been & are called indirectly through the book of Nature, and through the Works of Creation & divine Providence, to that end, that they might seek God, Acts XIV. 17; Acts XVII. 26, 27, 28, & that having sought & found God, they might glorify Him. Which because they neglected to do, they were made inexcusable, Rom. I. 19, 20.
4. All have been called, by the intention & command of God, in the time of the Apostles, Matth. XXVIII, Mark XVI. Which command the Apostles & Apostolic Men also obeyed & went over the orb of the earth, for the cause of calling men, nor only by voice & proclamation, but also by writings they invited men to embrace the Salvation procured by Christ, so that where the Foot of the Apostles did not reach, there nevertheless their Voice might arrive. But if the successors of these were or today are more negligent, & those who heard this Word did not propagate it to their posterity, God is neither bound to answer for their fault, nor to restore the justly taken away Word.
5. From the Negation of execution to the negation of intention & command, the Consequence is not valid.

III. And even if it were certainly established that all men are not called, this nevertheless would not overturn our position: Nor would it be proven from this, that God immediately after the Fall excluded certain men from the Covenant of Grace & from all saving Grace both Objective and Subjective; but it would have to be proven that all men were not or are not Callable. For we confess, that if certain ones immediately after the Fall had been simply cast off by the will of God, those could not be called with the intention of Salvation or would not be callable; As the fallen Angels, who by the hypothesis, received on both sides, because they were simply & absolutely rejected & excluded from the Merit of Christ & the hope of pardon, are not Callable. Whence if any Preacher of the Gospel were to call any fallen Angel, impersonated, acting among men, to the Grace of God in Jesus Christ, i.e. to the Remission of sins & eternal Life, such a Vocation would be, on the part of the Caller, erroneous, but on the part of the Called, in vain, because that Called one, being simply rejected, excluded from all saving Grace, and therefore would not be Callable, and that the more so; because also no prepared Object would be at hand, for which his Faith could be demanded. But all men promiscuously, who only preserve the human Species, whether they be Jews, or Turks, or Gentiles, are Callable, i.e., can be called; Why, I ask? Because a Savior

has been sent to them, and so a prepared Object is at hand, in which they can believe, and because they have been commanded to be called, nor have they been excluded & rejected from Divine Grace & the hope of Pardon, without a new avoidable Fault. But that not All are actually called or have been called, it does not follow from this that they were simply rejected immediately after the Fall & on account of the Fall of Adam, but it follows from this, that that Defect of Vocation happens by the Fault of Someone: Surely not of God; for He commanded all to be called; Therefore by the Fault either of the Preachers or of the Called: Of the former, if, intent on less necessary things, they were deficient in the commanded office, and neglected to call those men; Of the latter, if by their sins they rendered themselves unworthy of the Vocation, or if, having been called, they did not propagate the Vocation to posterity, or if they merited the removal of the Gospel by their sins.

IV. Because the Divine Vocation is Serious. But just as he could not be lovingly & seriously invited to enter upon an inheritance, to whom the inheritance plainly did not pertain, & for whom it was not destined: Likewise a thief condemned to the noose could not be seriously invited to this Life, which had been utterly denied to him by the sentence of death already passed; So also those absolutely rejected could scarcely be seriously called to eternal Life with the intention of Salvation. Since however, according to Sacred Scripture & the common position of our Theologians, as many as are called, are seriously called; But the Non-Elect could scarcely be seriously called, if the Decree of Election & Reprobation were conceived as already made before the Decree of Vocation; from this it is liquidly clear, that according to Holy Scripture & the Confession of Theologians, the Decree of common Vocation must altogether be put before the Decree of Election & Reprobation.

V. Nor is it to be doubted, that as many as are called by God through the Ministers of the Gospel, are called out of Love, not indeed Divine Hatred. But if this is true, it is prompt to collect, that no one of the Called can be supposed to have been already reprobated, a priori; for Reprobation is an act of the highest divine hatred. Since therefore men are called promiscuously & indiscriminately to Life under the condition of Repentance & Faith, it appears that all the called are the object of Divine Love, & by consequence cannot nor ought to be supposed as reprobated, until, the Vocation having been contemned, they become Reprobate, as Augustine speaks of Esau. Finally, neither Philanthropy, nor the Veracity & Sincerity of God permit that God should call the Non-Elect only to inexcusability (*ἀναπολογησίαν*, *anapologesian*) or that they might be inexcusable; not however to eternal Life. For GOD intends not the abuse of his goods, but the use, He wills that the called come, i.e., that they believe in Christ with a true & living faith, and so to those who come He promises Rest for their Souls & eternal salvation. The end therefore of Vocation is the Salvation of the Called; the Event, by reason of

many called, is inexcusability. The Synod of Dort, C. III, IV, Can. VIII, excellently says: "As many as are called by the Gospel, are seriously called. For God shows seriously and most truly in His Word, what is pleasing to Him; namely, that those called should come to him. He also seriously promises rest for their souls & eternal Life to all who come to him & believe."

For that reason **V.** we seek an Argument for our Position from the guilt & inexcusability of the Reprobate. That the Reprobate perish by their own fault, and that they are inexcusable, Sacred Scripture teaches from beginning to end, and by Us, God willing, it will be proven, when we treat of Reprobation, nor is there any Theologian who denies it. But if this is so, it is from this most evident that those who perish by their own fault, & who perishing are inexcusable, could have been saved, and so on account of original sin alone no one, at least of adults, is reprobated. For in all the languages of all peoples, to be at fault signifies: to do or admit something, which you could easily omit, or on the contrary, to omit something which you could have done not with difficulty; likewise they are called inexcusable, who cannot plead for their offenses their impotence or defect of powers, and the impossibility of performing their duty, but had sufficient faculties & powers for performing that which was commanded, for which neglect & omission, they are for that cause justly punished, because they omitted that which was possible for them, and which they ought to have and could have performed. If therefore Reprobate men perish by their own fault & perishing are inexcusable, it is manifest that they could have believed & been saved, and therefore immediately after the Fall of Adam, the Decree of Election & Reprobation is not to be conceived, but the Decree concerning sending a Sufficient Mediator & a general Vocation is to be placed before this Decree.

VI. This order is required by the Execution, which takes place in time, & which is delineated for us in the two Parables of Matth. XX & Matth. XXII, Luke XIV, of those Called into the Vineyard & invited to the Wedding feast, also to the Supper: to both of which these emphatic words are subjoined: "Many are called, but Few are chosen." By which parables it is taught: That as God in time calls idle men, busy with evil things, & unworthy, out of his mere grace into his vineyard & to the wedding of his Son, & from the one offers a Denarius, and from the other his love, and the heavenly Gifts procured by Christ, and illuminates the invited, that they may acknowledge what is their duty, nor omits any of those things by which they can be led to eternal Felicity, converts some, and so actually elects, justifies by faith & endows with eternal Salvation; On the contrary, He disapproves, passes by, deserts, reprobates, and devotes to eternal punishments those who murmur, who repudiate the Love of God in Christ, & the Heavenly Goods; So God in his eternal Counsel out of immense love ordained that the immaculate Lamb be slain for the good & in the place of all, that all things necessary for the salvation of men, requisites, means & goods, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit be prepared &

procured; and lest anyone could plead his ignorance or doubt about the gratuitous & sincere Benevolence of God & his incredible Love, resolved that to embrace so great a Salvation, and the means of Salvation, men be called & invited by repeated turns, with pathetic words: "Behold, I have prepared my dinner: my oxen and my fatlings are killed, and all things are ready: come unto the marriage." But after He foresaw that men, by the study of fleeting things, would spurn & repudiate so great a felicity, with mere and avoidable malice & contumacy, God decreed, out of Justice to desert some of these ungrateful and obstinate Contemners of the Benefits of God, to subtract His Grace from them, to reprobate them, & to devote them to eternal Damnation, but some out of special & abundant Grace so efficaciously to call & draw, that they certainly & infallibly come, so that what is subjoined to these parables may be fulfilled: "Many are called, but few are chosen." Matth. XX. 16 & Chap. XXII. 14. To which also pertains the admonition of Peter, 2 Pet. I. 10: "give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall." Thus Christ in John XV. 16, 19 elected His disciples, having called them out of the World.

VII. This is also not obscurely gathered from the words of the Apostle in Rom. VIII. 28, 29: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified."

That these Words may be rightly understood, it must be observed: That God not only by a general Counsel resolved to call all men promiscuously & sufficiently to salvation with the command of Faith & Repentance; (For this General & Common Vocation is not to be thought to happen without any Counsel of God at all: Burmann. *Synops. Theol.* Tom. II. L. VI. C. II. §. 10. p. 175.) But also according to a special Purpose He decreed to call certain Men, who by a singular benefit of God embrace this Gratuitous Vocation of God, obey the one calling, and sincerely love him, having put all earthly things behind. To these, all adverse things are an aid, says the Apostle, not only for the increase of Christian Virtues, but also for eternal Salvation itself; this Reason being added: For whom God, according to His Foreknowledge, having first of all foreknown them through the Gospel concerning Christ (1 Pet. I. 20), as called, also foreknew and foreloved, them He also predestinated, to be conformed to the image of His Son, first in the Cross, then in Glory, Luke XXIV. 26; 1 Pet. II. 21, that he himself might be the Firstborn among many Brethren. But whom He so predestinated, them He also in time calls not only sufficiently but also efficaciously, and not only to Faith, but also to the Cross, & through these things to Salvation, and He justifies those who embrace

the Benefits of Christ by Faith, and glorifies the justified. While on the contrary He deserts and casts off those who stubbornly spurn the Divine Vocation.

VIII. We seek an argument from the places of Holy Scripture, where men are said to be elected in Christ, e.g., Rom. VIII. 29: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren; Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called" etc.

(1.) If the Foreknown & Predestinated were conceived, in the divine Decree, as to be conformed to the image of the Son of God, it certainly follows that the Decree concerning sending the Son of God preceded the Predestination of men: for the exemplar must be prior to the thing exemplified (so to speak), i.e., to that which is to be assimilated to the Exemplar, and the thing exemplified must be posterior to the Exemplar, because the thing exemplified ought to be made to the likeness of the Exemplar, & have a congruence with it. But Paul here teaches that the Foreknown & Predestinated were conceived, in the Divine Decree, as to be conformed to the image of the Son of God. It ought not to be denied, therefore, that the Decree concerning sending the Son of God is prior to the Decree of the Predestination of Men.

(2.) Paul here teaches that the Son of God, in the Decree of Predestination, is to be viewed or considered as the Firstborn of the many Predestinated Brethren, namely men: whence it is no less manifest, that Christ the Firstborn & natural son of God, was prior in the Decree of God to the predestinated men, the second-born & adoptive. D. Antonius Walæus saw this in *Loci Communes de Electione*, Tom. I. Operum p. 330, where he notably writes thus: "That we were elected before our Head was elected, does not seem agreeable to the nature of the Head, which as it is first in dignity, so also it is first in order. 2. Paul says, that we were predestinated to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he himself might be the firstborn among many brethren, Rom. VIII. 29. But to be predestinated, that we might be conformed to the image, already presupposes that image; and how is he who is the firstborn among brethren constituted the last-born on account of the brethren? 3. and those who think otherwise, will experience a difficulty very difficult to solve, which the adversaries weave here; namely, that God thus destined salvation for us with his justice being saved, the Satisfaction for the sins of those to be elected not yet having been destined, which is sharply urged by them."

(3.) Thus in Is. XXVIII. 16, God speaks: "Behold, I lay in Zion a cornerstone, precious, a most sure foundation"; or as others render it: founded in the foundation. From which place it will be permitted to collect thus: If Christ in the business of Salvation, and indeed both in the Decree and in the Execution, is the Foundation & the Cornerstone, upon which men have been ordained to be built

up like stones & in time are built up, it follows that the Decree concerning sending Christ is prior to the Decree concerning the Predestination of men in the sign of our reason: For it is proper that the foundation be prior to the thing founded on it (so to speak), i.e., to that which is to be built upon the Foundation; Now from the place of Isaiah it is manifest that Christ (both in the Decree and in the Execution) has the nature of a Foundation; It cannot be doubted therefore, that the Decree concerning sending Christ, or of laying the foundation of salvation, precedes the Decree of the Predestination of men.

(4.) In Eph. I. 4, God is said to have elected men in Christ. Which words, however they may be understood, infer that the Decree concerning sending Christ preceded the Decree of Election & Reprobation. For whether you establish that God elected us through Christ & on account of Christ the Mediator; or you opine that God elected us, whom He would insert as Members into Christ as the head, it is for that reason all the same: For either sense supposes that Christ the Mediator existed (at least in the Divine Decree) when God elected us. If you say that God elected men in Christ & on account of Christ; the sense is: God, being placated in the Divine mind through Christ, elected certain men; but if you make the sense: God elected us to be saved through Christ, or those whom He would insert into Christ as the Head, you at least confess that God, when He elected men, had respect to Christ, & intended to give members to Christ, the Head, which again supposes that Christ already existed in the divine Decree, when God decreed to elect men. But in reality it is far more glorious to Christ, to establish that we were elected on account of Christ, than that Christ was elected on account of us.

(5.) The same is evinced by the words of Paul saying in Eph. I. 5, that God predestinated us unto the adoption of sons by Jesus Christ to himself (πρὸς εἰς υἰοθεσίαν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς αὐτὸν): For if God predestinated us unto Adoption through Jesus Christ, his natural only-begotten son, and indeed unto him (εἰς αὐτὸν, Jesus Christ), it is clear that the Decree concerning sending the Natural son, the Mediator, through & on account of whom, indeed, in whom or unto whom we were ordained to be adopted, in the Decree of Predestination, preceded our Predestination.

(6.) If our Predestination (with the same Paul teaching in Eph. I. 5) was made according to the good pleasure of the will of God (Κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος Θεοῦ), it follows that the same, in view of Christ the Mediator, since in him alone the Father was well pleased (ἐνδόκησε, endokese), & on account of whom He was acquiescent (ἐνδόκησεν, endokesen) in us, we were not predestinated before Christ, much less without a view of Christ, and so the Decree of our Predestination presupposes the Decree of the Ordination of Christ the Mediator.

(7.) If God in the Decree of Election made us accepted in that Beloved; which the Apostle teaches in Eph. I. 6, it is clearer than the midday light that Christ was first beloved, and then We were made beloved & accepted in Christ.

(8.) To which also those words of 1 Pet. I. 2 can be referred, that Christ was first foreknown (προεγνωσμένον, proegnosmenon), and then We in Him. And Rom. I. 4, Christ was first declared/ordained (ὁρισθέντα, horisthenta), then We through Him; so that thus Christ may hold the first place among all & in all things. Col. I. 17, 18: "And he is before all things, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence" (Καὶ αὐτός ἐστι πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν, καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος ἐκκλησίας, ὃς ἐστιν ἀρχὴ πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων).

IX. This Order of the Divine Decrees is required by Chap. IX of Romans, in which the Apostle treats of the Rejection of the called Jews, stubbornly ungrateful, on account of their obstinate Unbelief & avoidable Malice, & of the Gratuitous Assumption through Faith of the called or to-be-called Gentiles in their place, and thus he treats of a Mass corrupted not only by the Sin of Origin, but also by Actual sins, and those not of any kind, but by the contempt of Vocation. Which is most evidently clear to anyone paying attention from the beginning & end of the Chapter. To which it is no obstacle that the Apostle there in verses 11, 12, 13 adduces Jacob & Esau: For although this Scripture seems to speak thus, as if a Sentence of salvation had been passed by God on the one, and of death on the other, before either the one had loved God, or the other had hated God. Nevertheless those Comminations of God against Esau, unless he had excluded himself from the Promise of Grace out of obstinate malice, would no more have impeded his Salvation, than similar threats of God against Nineveh impeded its Salvation, which, when God had said that it would be destroyed within forty days, nevertheless stood & remained long after, because, forsooth, it repented. Esau, equally as Jacob, was circumcised, and by his Father, as pertains to all external rites, was consecrated to the Church. But that in his life & actions he did not cultivate Justice and equity, just as Jacob did, the cause was not the Oracle of God to Rebecca, but his own malice. Nor is anything said of him in that place, that Esau was deprived of the inheritance of eternal Life; but only that it would be, that he would be inferior to his Brother in this World. Which prophecy also was not fulfilled in their persons, but in their posterity. Of such a reprobation of one, and acceptance of another (namely, which looks to the promised Land) the Prophet Malachi speaks, as is apparent from the beginning of the Book; where he begins in this manner: "Was not Esau Jacob's brother? (saith the LORD:) yet I loved Jacob, And I hated Esau." In what did God hate Esau? The Prophet shows: "and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness." In what He loved Jacob, the Text there declares. Namely, God transferred the

right of inheritance, which pertained to Esau, as the firstborn Brother, to Jacob the younger by birth. Likewise the Land, promised to Abraham & Isaac, was given by Testament to Jacob and his posterity. For the rest, St. Paul used this Example of Jacob & Esau with no other Counsel, than that he might snatch away from the Jews that in which they most trusted, that is, both their Vain hope, which they had conceived in their mind from the fact that they were descended from Abraham according to the flesh; and also their inane confidence, which they had placed in the Observation of the Mosaic Law; these are the words of Joh. Hooper, an English Bishop, & a Martyr for the Reformed Religion, in his Preface to the Explication of the Decalogue. The similar example of the Potter, applied there, looks rather to liberty, than to the actual exercise & execution.

X. The examples also of the Elect & Reprobate confirm this Order of the divine decrees. For as many as have been Elected in time, of which number are Abraham, the Father of believers, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, David, the Prophets, the Apostles, Nathanael, Lydia the seller of purple, others, with no preceding merits but out of the mere & free Mercy & Grace of God, yet having been called, were Elected, a not obscure indication that to this Execution made in time, the Intention, i.e. the Decree of Election, made before the foundations of the world were laid, entirely corresponded. And as many as have been reprobated in time, of whose number were Cain, at least many who perished in the Deluge, at least many of the Sodomites & Gomorrahites, Korah, Dathan & Abiram, the seven accursed Nations, Haman, Herod, the Rich Man at the feast, Judas, the Pharisees & unbelieving Jews & as many as belong to this ignoble crowd, having been called, indeed on account of the divine Vocation stubbornly & contumaciously spurned & repudiated, were rejected & reprobated, indeed in the future judgment the reprobate adults will be justly damned on account of unbelief & final impenitence, and other avoidable sins; From which Execution of Reprobation we can not with difficulty judge concerning the Decree of Reprobation, namely that this was made after the Decree of Vocation.

XI. This Scale of the Divine Decrees is demanded by the Sacraments of the N. Test., Baptism & the Holy Supper, in which, equally as in the Word of the Gospel, Christ with all his Benefits is seriously & sincerely offered to All who use the Sacraments, not placing an obstacle, and is conferred on Believers. For according to Calvin, *Institutes*, Lib. IV, C. XIV, §. 17: "God truly performs, whatever he promises & figures by the sacramental signs: nor are the signs wanting of their effect; that their Author may be proved true & faithful. Only this is sought here, whether God operates by his own proper & intrinsic (as they say) virtue, or whether he resigns his offices to external symbols." Id. *Commentary on Ezech.* C. XX: "We see that the Sacraments are never destitute of the virtue of the Spirit, except insofar as men render themselves unworthy of the grace offered to them." Id. on Tit. C. III, v. 5, p. 663: "That principle ought to be valid among the pious:

God does not play with us with empty figures, But by his own virtue performs within, what he demonstrates by the external sign." Which being granted, it cannot be doubted, that the Decree of common Vocation, of which the Sacraments are an appendix, is to be placed before the Decree of Election & Reprobation.

XII. The Certainty of Faith & Salvation is better deduced from this hypothesis, especially of weak men, who either doubt or are timidly solicitous about their Election. For the Scholastics rightly teach that Subjective Certainty of the Mind is not given without Objective Certainty of the Being; whom D. Frid. Spanhemius praises on that account in his Inaugural Disputation on the five Articles; on Election, Thesis XI. And it is safer to subsume under a Universal Proposition, such as the Decree of Redemption & of common Vocation supplies, than a Particular one, such as the Decree of Election begets. Matthias Martinus, a Theologian of Bremen, has treated this Argument prolixly in his Ecclesiastical & Scholastic Commentary on the second Psalm, p. 267 to 293, & Lud. Crocius in his *Dozen Exegetical & Apologetical Dissertations of the Syntagma Theologiae*, Dissert. XI, §. 32, 33, 34, p. 658 to 667, 668; also Joh. Dallaeus, *Apology for the Synods of Alençon & Charenton*, Part. II, §. 8, p. 195 to 201. How nevertheless the Certainty of Faith & Salvation can be deduced from the hypothesis of Particular Grace, the Blessed D. Elias Grebenitz has learnedly shown in his *Tractate on the Negation of Universal Grace*, Sect. II, Apologetical.

XIII. The Holy Doctors of the Church, to a man, all approve this Series of divine decrees; not even Augustine, Prosper of Aquitaine & Fulgentius, Remigius of Lyons, etc. are excepted, which has been evinced by Men most versed in the Reading of the Fathers, such as Johannes Dallaeus in his *Apology for the Synods of Alençon and Charenton*, Part. IV, p. 753 to p. 946, and Gerh. Joh. Vossius in *Historia Pelagiana*, Lib. VII, P. I, Thes. II, p. 652 to 733. To whom may be added the Blessed Philippus Buchius, a most celebrated Doctor & Theologian in this our Viadrina, in his *Disputation on Predestination*.

And indeed, concerning the Position of the Doctors of the first four centuries of the Church, there is no Controversy. Concerning St. Augustine, however, some doubt whether he approves this series.

But truly, first, Augustine himself professes that he, in this Controversy with the Pelagians, consents with the Catholic Doctors of the prior centuries: Irenaeus, Cyprian, Basil, Nazianzen, Ambrose, Jerome, and Hilary. "What they believe," he says, "I believe; what they hold, I hold; what they teach, I teach; what they preach, I preach. Yield to them, and you will not strike me; acquiesce to them, and you will be quiet from me."

Then, it is to be observed that Augustine posits certain dogmas which necessarily require this series of ours, such as are:

1. That God has embraced the entire world, i.e., all men, with philanthropy (φιλανθρωπία, philanthrōpia).
2. That Christ died most sufficiently for all Men.
3. That it was in the free Power of the Called Men to come.
4. That the Predestination or Election of men was made after the exemplar of Christ.
5. That Esau & Judas could have been saved.
6. That all the baptized are regenerated.

All of which, even taken separately, sufficiently evince this Order of Divine Decrees.

And all these things today—all the Thomists, Augustinians, Dominicans, and other Doctors & Monks of the Pontificals who are followers of Augustine—confess, approve & defend.

Lest, however, we seem only to have said this, and not indeed to have proven it, we will bring forth certain passages from the Blessed Augustine, from which the Truth of what we have said will shine forth.

1. He teaches that God has embraced the entire world, i.e., all men with philanthropy (φιλανθρωπία, philanthrōpia). For thus in his Book *On the Spirit and the Letter to Marcellinus*, C. XXXIII, he speaks: "God wills all men to be saved, and to come into the knowledge of the truth, yet not so that he takes away from them free will, by the good or bad use of which they may be most justly judged. Since this is so, the unfaithful indeed act against the will of God, when they do not believe his Gospel; yet they do not therefore overcome it, but they defraud themselves of a great and supreme good, and implicate themselves in penal evils, being about to experience in their punishments the power of him whose mercy they contemned in his goods. Thus the Will of God is always invincible... He who has contemned believing his mercy will be guilty unto damnation under his power. But whoever has believed him... will have from his grace good works, from which also according to the body he may be redeemed from the corruption of death, be crowned, and be satisfied with goods, not temporal but eternal, above what we ask & understand."

Tom. IV, *Book on Catechizing the Uninstructed*: "And yet God is most merciful, and is patient over impious men, and provides them a place for penitence and correction... God does this even for those whom he knows will persevere in malice, giving a space for repenting, that he may exercise our patience, & inform it by his own example."

Tom. II, Epistle LXXXVII: "How many gifts and gratuitous presents the impious have in this life from God, whom they condemn, who can enumerate? Among which is that great one, that by the examples of imposed tribulations... he admonishes them, if they would be willing to attend, to flee from the wrath to come... What therefore is not mercifully bestowed upon Men by the Lord God, from whom even tribulation is a benefit? For a prosperous thing is the gift of one consoling; but an adverse thing is the gift of God admonishing."

Tom. VII, L. V, C. IV, against Julian: "But how innumerable are the things God permits to be done before his eyes, which certainly if he had not willed, he would in no way permit: and yet he is just & good, & by providing patience gives place for Repentance, willing no one to perish."

Id. serm. XXXVIII, on the Saints: "This is the evil hearing, which the impious are to hear: Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire. For the Sentence will be inevitable, which is foretold long before by the most pious God, that it might be avoided by us with all our strength. For if our God willed to punish us, he would not admonish us so many Ages before. He vindicates unwillingly, in a way, who demonstrates long before how we may be able to escape. For He does not will to strike You, who cries out to You, Observe."

Tom. VII, to the Articles falsely imposed on him (by Prosper his genuine Disciple) he is introduced speaking thus, Art. II: "This discretion, therefore, being removed, which divine knowledge contains within the Secret of Its Justice, it is most sincerely to be believed and professed, that God wills that all men be saved, 1 Tim. II. Since indeed the Apostle, whose position that is, solicitously precepts, what is most piously guarded in all the Churches, that supplication be made for all men." And Art. IX: "This is the difference between evil men & demons, that for men even very evil there remains, if God have mercy, Reconciliation: for the Demons no conversion has been reserved."

Id. Prosper, *Response to the VIII Objections of the Gauls*: "The whirlwind of obscure Questions being removed, let us betake ourselves to the latitude of the revealed Grace, and let us say with the Apostle: Who is the Savior of all, especially of the faithful... Therefore God has a care for all men & there is no one whom either the Evangelical preaching, or the testimony of the Law, or Nature itself does not convene... He who says that God does not will all men to be saved, but a certain number of the Predestinated, speaks more harshly than ought to be spoken concerning the height of the inscrutable Grace of God."

The Author of the Books *on the Vocation of the Gentiles*, who is thought to be Prosper, L. II, C. XXV: "Whether therefore we contemplate the most recent Ages, or the first, or the middle, it is rationally & piously believed that God wills and always has willed all men to be saved; and this is demonstrated from no other

source than from those Benefits, and that Providence of God, which he bestows commonly & indifferently on all generations... But it pleased God, both to bestow this [special Grace] on many, and to remove that [general benignity] from none, so that from both it might appear, that what was conferred on a portion was not denied to the universality."

The Church of Lyons, *on the Three Epistles*, in Gilb. Mauguin, Cap. IV, p. 75, teaches: "That Almighty God by the same foreknowledge & his Predestination so foreknew that certain evil men would persevere in their iniquity, and on this account justly predestined that they would perish, that from that very charter of His Foreknowledge and Predestination, he imposed on no one a necessity that he should be evil... Therefore by their own fault the impious & iniquitous pertinaciously persevere in their evils, not by any Prejudice of God, who daily calls all to penitence, & invites them to Salvation."

The same, *ibid.*, Cap. XII, p. 89: "Thus it happens, even if according to the pious sense of certain pious Fathers God wills all men to be saved by the goodness of the Creator... that same thing again He does not will by the equity of the Judge, by which he does not permit that same creature... wickedly stained... to be unpunished."

The Synod of Valence, held in the year 855, defines: "We faithfully hold, that the evil themselves do not perish because they could not be good, but because they did not want to be."

2. It is also manifest that Augustine establishes that Christ died sufficiently for all men (not only potentially, but also actually).

Tom. VIII, in Ps. XCV: "The Redeemer came, and gave the price. He shed his blood, he bought the orb of the earth. You ask, what did he buy? See what he gave, & find what he bought. The blood of Christ is the price. What is worth so much? What if not the whole world? What if not all nations?"

In Ps. XLIX: "He who called the earth from the rising of the sun to its setting, has redeemed the whole."

In Ps. XCV: "he shall judge the world with righteousness. He did not buy a part. He has to judge the whole, because he gave the price for the whole."

Tom. V, L. XX, *of the City of God*: "All therefore have died in sins, with no one at all excepted... and for all the dead the one living has died, i.e., having no sin at all."

Concerning which place, book VI against Julian, Cap. IV, Tom. VII, he also addresses Julian in this manner: "Whom in this place do you understand to be the dead?... We understand the dead, for all of whom the one Christ died... From this

he proved all to be dead, because one died for all. I push, I inculcate, I insert it for the one refusing: Accept, it is salutary: I do not wish that you should die; One died for all, therefore all are dead, if he died for all... Wherefore if little children draw no sin, they are not dead, he did not die for them, who did not die, unless for the dead."

The same on John III. 17: "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. Therefore AS FAR AS IT IS IN THE PHYSICIAN, he came to heal the sick man. He kills himself, who does not wish to observe the Precepts of the Physician."

Tom. VII, to the Articles falsely imposed on him, Art. I, Prosper presents him speaking thus: "Against the wound of original sin... the true & potent & singular remedy is the death of the Son of God our Lord Jesus Christ... Therefore as to the magnitude & potency of the price, and as pertains to the one cause of the human race, the blood of Christ is the Redemption of the whole world. But those who pass through this Age without the faith of Christ, & without the Sacrament of Regeneration, are alien to the Redemption."

Prosper, *Response to the Objections of the Gauls*, 9: "As if the Savior were not crucified for the Redemption of the whole world... Since therefore it is most rightly said that the Savior was crucified for the sins of the whole World, on account of the true undertaking of human nature... it can nevertheless be said that he was crucified only for these, for whom his death was profitable."

The writer of the *Books on the Vocation of the Gentiles*, Lib. II, cap. XVI, thus writes: "There is no reason for doubting that Jesus Christ, our Lord, died for the impious & sinners... Now did Christ die for all? But he certainly died for all."

Nor did the Church of Lyons in the IX Century, and its Archbishop Remigius, contradict these things. For although he urges that Christ died for the Many, for his sheep, etc., yet by these he does not deny the actual Sufficiency of the Death of Christ for all men; but he only censures the Excess of those, who would dare to affirm that Christ also died efficaciously for those impious who were to remain in their impiety... But Remigius himself asserts that Christ died for these who would be willing to believe and for all the called & baptized.

The Church of Lyons, *on the three Epistles*, in Gilbertus Mauguinus, cap. III, p. 73, where it approves our mind concerning the Order of the Divine Decrees: "He foreknew man to be created, & predestined that he would create him: He foreknew the human race, fallen through the first man, to be redeemed by the Blood of his only-begotten Son, & predestined that he would redeem it."

Ibidem Cap. XXIV, p. 108: "Now that concerning the price of the Lord's Blood, that it was given only for these who would be willing to believe; It is the Manifest Position... of the same blessed Fathers."

Ib. C. XXVIII, p. 114: "Thus even if Christ died for all, even for those who will perish in their impiety, he so exhibited the goodness of his passion to them, that nevertheless he condemned such impious ones... by his just judgment."

The Book on *retaining the Truth of Scripture*, C. XIV, p. 218, 219, denies that the Lord suffered for the Anti-Christ... "For if he is believed to have suffered for them, why is he not believed to have suffered similarly for the Devil & his Angels?" And p. 225, he continues: "But concerning the rest, who are to perish persevering in their very infidelity and impiety, if... the good men who have defined such things could demonstrate to us with most certain & most clear Testimonies, that the Lord also suffered for such, it is entirely worthy that we also should believe. But if they could not, let them cease to contend for that which they do not read. Let them be ashamed to define what they do not know." He complains of the excessive rigor against Gottschalk, in *on the three Epistles*, C. XXIV, XXV, p. 107, 109, 110.

The Synod of Valence, agreeing with these things, says in Chap. **IV**: "Likewise concerning the Redemption of the Blood of Christ, on account of the excessive error which has arisen from this cause, so that some, as their Writings indicate, define it as having been shed even for those impious ones who from the beginning of the world even to the passion of the Lord died in their impiety and were punished with eternal Damnation; it pleases us to hold this: that we hold this price to have been given for those of whom our Lord himself says: As Moses lifted up the Serpent in the Desert, so must the Son of man be lifted up, that everyone who believes in him should not perish, but have eternal Life."

Ibid. Chap. **V**: "Likewise we believe it is most firmly to be held, that the whole multitude of the faithful, regenerated from water & the Spirit, and through this veraciously incorporated into the Church, & according to the Apostolic Doctrine baptized into the death of Christ, has been washed from its sins in his Blood. Because there could not be regeneration, unless there were also a true Redemption; since in the Sacraments of the Church there is nothing void, nothing illusory, but positively the whole is true, and supported by its own truth and sincerity. Yet from that very multitude of the faithful & Redeemed, some are saved with eternal salvation, because through the Grace of God they faithfully remain in their Redemption, bearing the voice of their Lord himself in their heart: He who has persevered to the end, he shall be saved: others, because they were unwilling to remain in the Salvation of the Faith, which they received at the beginning, and chose rather to make the grace of Redemption void by perverse

Doctrine or Life, than to preserve it, do not in any way arrive at the fullness of Salvation, & at the perception of eternal Beatitude."

That all these things confirm our hypothesis, no one fails to see.

With the doctrine of the Sufficient Redemption of the whole world can also stand the words of Augustine, Tract. LXXXVII on John: "The whole World therefore is the Church, & the whole World hates the Church; The World therefore hates the World, the reconciled hates the enemy, the saved hates the damned, the cleansed hates the stained: but that World, which God in Christ reconciles to himself & which is saved through Christ & to which every sin is forgiven through Christ, has been elected out of the world that is inimical, damned, contaminated."

In few words: Just as Remigius, Archbishop of the Church of Lyons, did not deny that God wills all men to be saved by His Ordained, sufficient, and Wise Will, but denied it of His Absolute, Efficacious, and Omnipotent Will, which is clear from the things adduced here in N. 1, p. 91, 92, 93: So, when he denies that Christ died for those who were actually damned (at the time of the Passion & Death of Christ), he denies indeed the Efficacy & Salutory Fruit of the Death of Christ, and their actual redemption from hell; But in no way does he deny the Actual Sufficiency & the Impetration of Redemption, by which they could have been saved through Faith & Penitence, and have been Otherwise than what they were. For Remigius himself, President of the Synod of Valence, with his Co-Bishops, abundantly declared his mind thus, Synod. Chap. II: "The evil do not perish because they could not be Good, but because they were unwilling to be."

3. Augustine asserts that it is in the free Power of the Called men that they may come.

Tom. IV, Lib. LXXXIII, Quæst. Qu. LXVIII: "To that Supper, which the Lord said in the Gospel was prepared, not all who were called, willed to come, nor could those who came, have come, unless they were called. And so neither ought they who came attribute it to themselves, because they came having been called, nor ought they who were unwilling to come, attribute it to another, but only to themselves, since that they should come having been called, was in their free power. Vocation therefore works the Will before merit. For that reason, even if anyone attributes it to himself, that he came having been called, he cannot however attribute it to himself that he was called: but because having been called he did not come, just as he had no merit of reward that he should be called, so he begins the merit of punishment, when having been called he has neglected to come."

In Lib. I, C. III of *de Gen. contr. Manich.* he had written: "But that Light feeds not the eyes of irrational men, but the pure hearts of those who believe in God, & from the love of visible & temporal things, convert themselves to fulfilling his

precepts, which all men can do, if they will." Which he, in *Retractationes*, L. **I**, C. **IX**, does not simply disapprove, but corrects in this manner: "But what I said, let not the new Pelagian Heretics think was said according to them. For it is altogether true, that all men can do this, if they will; but the Will is prepared by the Lord, & is so much augmented by the gift of Charity that they are able."

Tom. **III**, *de Spir. & Lit.* C. XXXIV: "The Mercy of God indeed precedes us in all things, but to consent to the Vocation of God or to dissent from it, belongs to our own Will."

And Tom. **VI**, *de Fide contr. Manich.* C. **IX** & **X**: "Sin is from the rational soul, to which belongs the free Choice of the Will. And the penalty is inflicted by the justice of God, which does nothing unjustly. Against these things the Manichaeans, with their usual Blindness, bark, and when they are convinced that nature is not evil, but that it is in the power of man to do well or badly, they say that the Soul does not have a free Will, & they do not see their blindness. For who would not cry out that it is foolish to give precepts to him for whom it is not free to do what is preceptive: and that it is iniquitous to condemn him who did not have the power to complete what was commanded? and these injustices & iniquities the miserable ones do not understand they are ascribing to God."

Tom. eod., in *Act. cum Felic. Manich.* L. **II**, C. **VIII**: "It is not therefore unworthy, that God should say, Go into eternal fire, to those who have spurned his Mercy through free Choice."

Tom. **VII**, L. **II**, *de Peccat. Merit. & Remiff.*: "Divine Grace helps the Wills of men, and that they are not helped, the cause is in themselves likewise, not in God."

Tract. LIII on John: "Why could they not believe (the Jews), if it is asked of me, I would quickly respond, Because they were unwilling; For GOD foresaw their evil Will, & he, from whom future things cannot be hidden, foreannounced it through the Prophet."

To the *Artic. falso sibi impos.*, Artic. XVI: "Those who have spurned the inviting will of GOD, will feel the Vindicating will of GOD."

Prosper, Epistle to Demetrias: "Most manifestly, both Prophetic, & Evangelical & Apostolic Doctrine, wills us to be neither proud, nor idle; we ought to be cooperators of the Grace of God, that we may vigilantly & Soberly follow it as it excites, helps, enriches & daily promotes us." And soon: "For in all the warnings of God, and commands, there is one and the same account, both of divine grace, and of human Obedience. Nor is a Precept ever given for any other reason, than that the aid of the one preceptive may be sought. For the voices of teachers, & the Letters of pages, which serve God for the Erudition of those hearing or reading, are not without the virtue of him whom they serve, and when that which is

commanded is performed by the obedient one, then the effect of the Divine Work is declared."

The same Prosper of Aquitaine, in his *Response to the Objections of the Gauls*, concerning the End of Divine Vocation, with respect to the Non-Elect, has these things: to Object. **IV**: "That not all are called to grace, to all of whom the Gospel is preached, is not rightly said, even if there are those who do not obey the Gospel."

Ibid. to Obj. **V**: "If vocation in the Gospel is understood only by Preaching, it is not veraciously said that it is preached otherwise to some than to others, since there is one God, one faith, one Regeneration, one Promise. But if respect is had to the effect of the planting & watering, one thing was done with those whose exterior ears were struck by a corporeal voice, another with those whose interior sense God opened, & in whose heart he placed the foundation of faith, and the fervor of love. But to say that some were therefore called so that they would not believe, is too absurd; as if the vocation were for them a cause of infelicity, & the preaching of faith made them unfaithful."

To Obj. **XIV**: "The infidelity of those not believing the Gospel is by no means generated from the Predestination of God." A little after: "Therefore the infidelity of unbelievers is to be referred not to the constitution of God, but to his foreknowledge. Which did not infer a necessity of not believing, because it could not be deceived about the infidelity which was to be." Likewise: "Therefore he is as much in error who refers the infidelity of the impious to the constitution of God, as he who does not profess God to be the Author of the faith and justice of the Saints."

Ibid. to Object. **XV**, Sentent. to C. **V**: "Good things are to be referred to God their Bestower and Cooperator; but evil things to the Voluntary nequity of the rational Creature." Likewise: "He who says that those who were called were not equally called, but some that they might believe, as if the Vocation were the cause of not believing for anyone, does not speak rightly. For although faith is not, except from the gift of God, and the will of man; yet infidelity is not, except from the sole Will of man."

Sentent. to C. **XIV**: "He who says that those who do not believe the Evangelical Preaching, do not believe from the Predestination of God, & that God has so defined, that whoever does not believe, does not believe from his own constitution, is not a Catholic."

The Author of the *Books on the Vocation of the Gentiles*, L. **II**, C. **IV**: "The eternal goodness of the Creator did not so avert itself from those men (the gentiles), that it did not admonish them by any significations to know and fear him." After some things: "Just as that largess of the Grace of God, which in the last times has

flowed out on all, does not evacuate that which rained upon the one Israel under the Law... So neither from that care of God, which properly presided over the sons of the Patriarchs, is it to be conjectured that the Rudders of Divine mercy were withdrawn from the rest of men. Who indeed in comparison with the elect seem rejected, but have never been abdicated from manifest and occult Benefits."

And C. **X**: "For the many authorities of the Divine Utterances have manifested, & the continuous Experiments of all the Ages have taught; that the just Mercy of God, and merciful Justice, has never been wanting either for nourishing the bodies of men, or for teaching and helping their minds."

Cap. **XV**: "For there has always been applied to all men a certain measure of supernal Doctrine, which although it was of a more spare and more occult Grace, was nevertheless sufficient for some as a remedy, for all as a Testimony."

Cap. **XVII**: "Even now in the extreme parts of the World there are some Nations, upon which the Grace of the Savior has not yet shone. We do not doubt that also concerning those, by the occult Judgment of God, a Time of Vocation has been disposed, in which they may hear and receive the Gospel, which they have not yet seen; To whom nevertheless that general measure of Aid, which from above has always been provided to all men, is not denied: although human Nature has been so wounded by a bitter Wound, that spontaneous contemplation is not fully able to erudite anyone to the knowledge of God, unless the true Light has discussed the overshadowing of the Heart, which, by an inscrutable Judgment, God, just & good, did not pour out in past Ages in the same way as in the last days."

Cap. **XXXII**: "It has been labored, as much as the Lord has helped, that not only in the Last days, but also in all Ages past it might be proven, that the Grace of God has been present to all men, by a Providence indeed equal & a general goodness, but by a multiform Work, and a diverse measure, since whether occultly, or manifestly, he himself is the Savior of all men, especially of the faithful. Which position of most subtle brevity & most valid strength, if it be considered with a tranquil view, settles this whole controversy of which we have treated: For by saying, who is the Savior of all men, he has confirmed that the goodness of God is general over all men: But by adding: especially of the faithful; he has shown that there is a part of the human race, which by the merit of a divinely inspired faith is advanced to the Highest and eternal Salvation by special Benefits; which is certainly done with no iniquity of the most just & most merciful God, whose Judgment in these disputations is not to be discussed with arrogance, but to be praised with trembling."

4. Augustine establishes that the election of men was made after the Exemplar of Christ, and of his Predestination. Which in Tom. **VII**, L. **I**, *de Prædest. Sanct.*, C. **XV**, these Words show: "There is also a most clear Light of Predestination &

Grace, the Savior himself, the Mediator himself of God & men, the man Jesus Christ."

5. Augustine also wrote that Esau & Judas could have been saved; although he nevertheless proposes Esau as an Example of Reprobation more than once.

Tom. **IV**, *ad Simplician.*, Qu. **II**: "Esau was unwilling & did not run: but even if he had been willing, & had run, he would have arrived by the help of God: who would also grant the willing & the running by calling, unless, the Vocation having been contemned, he became Reprobate." Where it is to be observed, that Augustine says Esau became reprobate, the Vocation having been contemned.

He says that Christ also shed his Blood for Judas the Betrayer: "He threw down the price of silver, for which the Lord was sold by him, nor did he recognize the price, by which he himself was redeemed by the Lord." Vid. eund. in Psal. CVIII.

Fulgentius, L. **II**, *de Remiff. Peccat.*, C. **XVI**, concerning Judas: "He bound himself with a worse Chain of iniquity when he killed himself as a guilty man, than then, when he betrayed the innocent Christ. For the sin of betraying Christ could have been dismissed for Judas, if living he had converted; but his own killing is in no way relaxed for one who is extinct. After the Betrayal of Christ therefore the betrayer had time, in which through that Blood, which was shed for the Remission of sins, the sin of Judas himself could also be remitted: since Christ, who died for the impious, would not have denied the Benefit of remission to his Betrayer, if he had not by despairing taken away from himself the time granted for remission." Soon concerning the same: "He is for that reason condemned to eternal death, because despairing of benevolence, although he did not kill Christ (by this his Desperation), he nevertheless sinned worse in it, than if he had killed Christ, in that he neglected the fitting time, which was granted for the remission of sins by Divine Longanimity." Thus also elsewhere concerning the same: "He therefore denied himself the fruit of penitence, because he did not hope for the sin of his Betrayal to be washed away by the very Blood of him whom he betrayed."

The Author of the Book *de Vocat. Gent.* adds Cain to these, L. **II**, C. **IV**: "When therefore God spoke such things to Cain, is it at all ambiguous that he willed him, & as much as was sufficient for the mode of healing, acted, so that Cain might repent from that fury of impiety? But the pertinacious malice was thence made more inexcusable, whence it ought to have been more corrected. And certainly God foreknew to what end the conception of the raging one was to progress. Nor from the fact that Divine Knowledge could not be deceived, was the crime of the will urged by a necessity of sinning."

The Church of Lyons, *de Trib. Epist.*, C. **XLIII**, p. 139, concerning Judas the Betrayer, alleges these words of the Blessed Augustine from his Commentary on Ps. CVIII: "If Judas had held to that to which he was called, in no way would either his own past sins, or the iniquity of his parents have pertained to him. Because therefore he did not hold to the adoption in the family of God, but rather chose the iniquity of the old lineage, the iniquity of his Fathers has returned in the sight of the Lord, so that in it he himself also might be punished, & the sin of his mother has not been deleted in him etc." And to these it subjoins: "Behold, the Blessed Doctor most openly, according to the sense of the Prophecy, which is contained in this Psalm concerning that lost man, most openly teaches, that neither his own nor his parents' sins could now have pertained to him, if he had been willing to remain in that Grace & Adoption of the Sons of God, to which he had been called. But because he did not remain & by apostatizing returned to the iniquity of the old generation from Adam, even after the Grace of Baptism, which he made void in himself, there returned to him not only his own, but also the iniquity of his Fathers & the sin of his mother has not been deleted in him, so that in them he himself also might be punished, by the judgment and condemnation of him who renders the iniquity of the Fathers upon the sons to the third & fourth generation."

6. Augustine and those who felt with him believed that all the baptized are regenerated.

L. **II**, *de Peccat. Mer. & Remiff.*, C. **XXVII**: "The Sons from the remaining oldness of the Parents, wholly old, propagated in the flesh of sin, escape the damnation due to the old man, by the Sacrament of Spiritual Regeneration & Renovation. For that we ought principally to attend to and remember, that only a full and perfect Remission of all sins is made by Baptism, but the quality of the man himself is not continuously changed, but the spiritual firstfruits in those progressing well from day to day with growing newness change in themselves what is carnally old, until the whole is renewed."

Idem C. **XXVIII**: "If a migration from this Life immediately follows, there will be nothing at all which may hold the man liable, all things which held him having been loosed."

The same, C. **XV** of *de Trinitate*, he hands down that Baptismal Renovation happens in one moment; namely, by the Remission of all sins. Ibid. C. **XVII**, he compares Baptismal Regeneration to the pulling out of a fixed weapon from the body; but the Regeneration which afterwards happens in adults, to the curation of the wound itself.

Epistle XXIII: "This Sacrament (namely of Baptism) is of such great value, that if he emigrates from this Life before the use of reason, through the Sacrament itself,

with the Charity of the Church commending, he is liberated by Christian Aid from that condemnation which through one man entered into the World." "He who does not believe this," he says, "and thinks it cannot be done, is certainly an infidel, even if he has the Sacrament of faith."

The Council of Carthage, Epistle XC, in Augustine: "Whoever denies that little ones are liberated from perdition through the Baptism of Christ, & perceive Sempiternal Salvation, let him be Anathema."

Epistle CLVIII: "The Remission of sins is not false even in the Baptism of little ones, nor is it said in word only, but is veraciously done."

Prosper, to the Chapters of the Gauls, to Obj. II: "Every man who, believing in the Father & the Son & the Holy Spirit, is regenerated in Baptism, is absolved both from his own sins, which he contracted by evil Will & action, and from the Original, which he drew from his Parents. But he who denies that one who Relapsed after Baptism to infidelity & impious morals was purged from Original sin, opines as falsely as he who asserts the same is not to be damned with eternal death."

Fulgentius, *de Verit. Prædest.*, L. I, C. XII, says that a little one violently taken from infidel parents, or stolen by theft, if he be brought to Holy Baptism by the pious charity of any of the faithful, & soon as he has been baptized, departs from this Life, has been made an heir of God & a co-heir of Christ.

The Church of Lyons, book *de Trib. Epist.*, Cap. XLIII, p. 139, inquires: whether to one Baptized, who thenceforth recedes from Christ, & makes his Grace void in himself, and so ends this life, are imputed the original & actual sins, which had been truly remitted to him in Baptism, or indeed those only which he committed after Baptism, by losing the Grace of God. This Question, *ib.* pag. 140 ff, certain words of Augustine concerning Judas the Betrayer having been alleged, it decides in this way: "But that sin having been originally drawn, from which all who come to the faith are absolved through the laver of Regeneration, they now die not in that ancient iniquity of the Fathers, but each one of them will die in his own iniquity. Whether therefore to those sinning after Baptism those sins which they afterwards committed are imputed; or whether also those which they committed before Baptism are superadded on account of the transgression of so great a Grace, certainly each one dies in his own iniquity, which he had committed either before or after... if therefore original guilt is in no way deputed to them after Baptism, manifestly each one dies only in his own sin & in his own iniquity; but if among the other sins that guilt also is imputed, even so each one dies in his own sin; since now Original sin is not imputed to him because he drew it from his Origin, but because by the merit of his own proper iniquity he merited it to be imputed to himself again."

Cap. **XLIV**, pag. 141, 142, it affirms that these Baptized ones, washed by the blood of Christ, who nevertheless will recede from Christ & eternally perish, were separated from the mass of perdition, to which Mass however they are revolved. But that the Fathers sometimes deny that such were separated from the Mass of Perdition, pertains to the Foreknowledge of God. See the words of the Council of Valence adduced back here n. 2, p. 100.

The things cited up to this point lucidly show that Augustine, and those addicted to him, were not alien from our Hypothesis. Certainly Augustine or Prosper in the Preface to the *Articles falsely imposed on him*, not only does not acknowledge the heads of the Pelagian & Semipelagian Accusations, which also contained the Accusation that our Lord Jesus Christ did not suffer for the redemption of all men, & that God does not will to save all, even if all should wish to be saved; but he professes himself ready to condemn them with an Anathema, which he would not do, if he had established either this or at least something akin to it. "They weave," he says, "prodigious lies of certain most inept blasphemies, and these they circulate publicly and privately to be shown & foisted upon many, asserting that such things are in our sense, as are contained in the diabolical little index. That these things are falsely cast upon us to excite envy, we could easily & sufficiently prove by the subscription of a single Anathema."

Remigius and with him the Church of Lyons proves our Order of the divine decrees with express words, to be repeated here, from Lib. *de Trib. Ep.*, C. **III**, p. 73: "He (God) foreknew that the world would be, & predestined that he would make it: he foreknew man to be created & predestined that he would create him: He foreknew the human race, fallen through the first man, to be redeemed by the Blood of his only-begotten Son, & predestined that he would redeem it."

Which the Synod of Valence also confirms, C. **II**, establishing: "That no one is condemned from a Prejudice of God but from the merit of his own iniquity, nor do the evil themselves perish because they could not be good, but because they were unwilling to be, and by their own fault remained in the mass of damnation either by Original or also by actual merit."

XIV. We derive an argument from the Consent of many of the Reformed: For it is so far from the case that the Reformed Church has disapproved this Series of divine decrees, that rather certain of its public Confessions & its most outstanding Doctors have approved the same; indeed, the Reformed were the first of the Protestants who used this Method.

(a) The WALDENSES

Certainly (a) the WALDENSES in a notable Epistle to Johannes Oecolampadius (in which at the time of the Reformation they profess that they, for four hundred years before, if not from the time of the Apostles, had followed that form of Doctrine) did not approve the more rigid & harder position of the Blessed Luther against Erasmus; but declared their own more benign Position in these words, in Abrah. Scultetus's *Decade II. Annal. Evangelii passim per Europam renovati*, p. 295, 304, 305:

"Furthermore, there is nothing that more disturbs us who are weak, yet by our own Ignorance, as I recognize, than what I have heard and read in Luther concerning Free Will & the Predestination of God. For we believed that some natural Virtue was implanted in all men by God, yet to one more & to another less: as Experience makes plain that man differs from man: And as the Parable of the Talents seems to insinuate: And as we also see by Experience, that in Herbs, Plants, Stones, and all other things there is naturally inherent a proper virtue implanted by God, by which they can do many things. So we believed that Men, by the aforesaid implanted Virtue, can do something, yet with God especially stimulating & exciting it: as he himself says: I stand at the door & knock; that he who is unwilling to open, by that implanted & stimulated virtue, will at length receive according to his Works. Otherwise, if it is not so, I do not see why so many affirmative & negative Precepts, as Erasmus disputes, ought to be understood."

"Concerning Predestination, however, we believed that the Almighty, infinitely before the Creation of Heaven & Earth, foreknew how many ought to become Saved & Reprobate: Yet that He made every Man for eternal life: that the reprobate indeed become so by their own fault, that is, because they were unwilling to obey & keep the Commandments. But if all things happen by Necessity, as Luther says: & those who are predestinated to life, cannot become Reprobate; nor the contrary: because Divine Predestination is not frustrated: to what purpose so many Scriptures & Preachers & corporeal Physicians? For nothing less or more will happen on account of these things: because all things happen by necessity."

(β) The BOHEMIAN BRETHREN

(β) The BOHEMIAN BRETHREN approve this Series of Divine Decrees in their Confession of Faith, sent to King Vladislaus in Hungary, which Balthasar Lydius exhibits in his *Waldensibus*, pag. 149, 150. Concerning the Gratuitous mercy of God towards Man so miserably deluded and concerning the promised Liberator, his Son, they profess:

"The minds & Consciences (of the First-formed), so terrified & by so great a Terror of God dismayed or contrite, seriously and almost made lifeless, were exhilarated by the gratuitous favor of God the Father towards the human race, which of his own accord he decreed to bestow on so great a Sinner & wretched man. Indeed after that most merciful Father God had looked upon that lamentable & much most miserable Lot and Condition of man, He, pitying so great a misery of him lying there, and almost submerged, whence he could by no means swim out, resolved and certainly decreed that His Son was to be sent down to the Earth for recovering him. But before He sent him down, by many, and that often, promises He had testified, that He certainly would have mercy, & that a Savior was to be sent down, not with respect to or estimation of any human merits or dignity, but for the sake of himself and his own name, inasmuch as that Mercy may be glorified and magnified in eternity."

After a few things they continue: "And all and single of these things he took care to have been prophesied & predicted in many ways and by many modes through the Prophets. But afterwards when the Time distinguished by him for so great a Business was fulfilled, then that fount of mercies, God the Father, poured out this most lavish shower of all Graces upon all sinners, His son having been sent down to Earth: Which the Son himself, sent down there, also expressly testifies, thus saying: God so loved the World, that he gave his son, that everyone who should believe in him, should not perish, but have eternal Life."

pag. 151: "And hence it appears, of what great estimation that highest and all-surpassing love of God towards the human race ought to be to us; Since God has Assumed our nature, so degenerated, and in all ways most corrupt, and now made liable to eternal death, to pay the penalties for our Crimes in it, and so has honored it, that with his own Divinity he has conjoined it into one Hypostasis of his Person."

Id. ib. p. 221, 222, says: "That God strives in all ways lest anyone perish." pag. 227, 228, 229, 230: "that promises, pacts & covenants were entered into with the whole human race."

Agreeably to which Confession the same Bohemian Brethren in a certain manuscript Confession preserved in the Archive of the Unity of Brethren, speak

thus: "Concerning Predestination we believe from the Word of God, that since we all were lying in an equal mass of natural corruption, from that there shines forth a most evident Testimony of Divine Commiseration and of the external and merely gratuitous Love of God in Christ, that God, for the abolition of natural Corruption, and of actual sins, and so for gathering to himself a Church, now in the new Testament everywhere in places throughout the whole Orb of the Earth, without any Distinction of Peoples, of Jews and of Gentiles, according to his eternal and firm Purpose & Will, takes care to have offered the Word of repentance and of Life, with the Holy Sacraments, and through these very things the Prince of Life Jesus Christ, 1 John II, and his most precious Passion & death, as a most sufficient propitiation for the sins of all men, and of the whole World. Concerning all of which it is moreover true, that wherever God by his paternal Will offers his Word to any nation, region or place throughout the whole World, there also He himself most seriously & out of sincerity, and with a zeal altogether divine, wills any men whatsoever to come to the knowledge of the truth, lest any perish, but that all should tend to Repentance; indeed that no one there is excluded from the means of Grace and eternal Salvation, except him whom his own Corruption, malice and impenitence excludes from them. For God now declares to all men everywhere, that they should repent, because he has established a day, in which he is to justly judge the Orb of the Earth by that Man, whom he defines, providing faith or making it plain to all, Acts XVII. From which it follows: 1. That no one is saved by the absolute Decree of God without the Preordination of faith & repentance; much less is anyone damned by the absolute Decree of God without the intervention of any sin; But whoever are damned, are damned on account of perseverance in evil, and so principally on account of Unbelief and Ingratitude against the means of Grace, and that moreover that malice and Ingratitude is not from God, but from the evil themselves and from their own corruption & pravity; but in no way from this, as if they were efficaciously & inevitably predestinated, incited and impelled to sinning, just as this was deservedly rejected in the Council of Orange, Can. XXV."

The Order of the Divine Decrees is proposed most clearly of all here in the Little Book, to which the Title is, JOHANNES LASITIUS, a Polish Noble, containing Memorable things of the Ecclesiastical Discipline, morals and Institutes of the Bohemian Brethren; with Admonitions to the Remnants of that Church & others, by JOH. A. COMENIUS, Amsterdam, An. 1660, pag. 202, 203, num. 4:

"Concerning Predestination, it was less fitting for men to dispute, the more an inscrutable abyss the Judgments of God are (Ps. XXXVI. 6). For his thoughts concerning us are wonderful (Ps. XXXX. 7). Since, however, that Abyss also has been detected in Christ, rightly here also and unanimously on both sides they confess what they believe according to the Scriptures: Namely,

(1.) That we all have fallen in Adam, Rom. V. 16.

- (2.) That God has had mercy on all, Rom. XI. 32.
- (3.) That He sent the Son through whom He might reconcile the World to himself, 2 Cor. V. 19.
- (4.) That whosoever believes in him, should not perish, but have eternal Life, Joh. III. 16.
- (5.) And therefore that only believers, yet all believers, are saved.
- (6.) But that Faith is the gift of God, Eph. II. 8.
- (7.) And since His own Works are known to God from eternity, Acts XV. 8, God has foreseen from eternity who would be believers.
- (8.) Whom therefore he foreknew, them he predestinated, to be conformed to the Image of his Son, Rom. VIII. 29.
- (9.) And He gave them to Christ as sheep to a Shepherd, that no one of them should perish, Joh. VI. 39 & 10, 15 etc.
- (10.) And that the names of these are written in the Heavens (Luke X. 20), in the Book of Life. Phil. IV. 3, Apoc. III. 5 & XXI. 27."

(γ) The GERMANS

(γ) As far as our Germany is concerned, the Reformed German Theologians implicitly acknowledge this Series of Divine Decrees, while they receive & venerate the *Corpus Doctrinae* of the BLESSED PHILIP MELANCHTHON as a Symbolic Book, & in public Promotions they solemnly swear on the principal part of this *Corpus Doctrinae*, the Augsburg Confession.

Which not only the Palatines and with them all the Reformed do in the *Neustadt Admonition*, Cap. **V**, p. (Edit. in quarto) 188 to 193; Cap. **VI**, p. 205, 207; Cap. **IX**, pag. 324, 325; Cap. **X**, p. 336 to 362; And Cap. **XI**, p. 393, 396 to 400, 404 to 407. Especially in Cap. **XII**, p. 444, where they conclude in this manner: "Let the ancient Body of Doctrine remain in the same place in which it has been until now, in the Churches & Schools; let the Consensus constituted according to the Body of Doctrine remain, condemned by the Adversaries, but never refuted. But let no one be forced to the novelties of Bergen; And the whole matter will be in the clear."

But also separately the Most Serene Elector of Brandenburg, Lord Joh. Sigismund, of Most Glorious Memory, bound the Doctors of the Reformed Churches & Schools to the *Corpus Doctrinae* of Philip Melanchthon: "Let it suffice for our Schools & Churches, according to the Holy Bible & the Symbols, and the Augsburg Confession, the Body of Doctrine handed down by Philip, to the norm of which the Professors & Ministers of the Churches & Schools may compose themselves not without public fruit."

The Churches of Anhalt likewise have embraced the Philippic *Corpus Doctrinae*, and not only in the year 1581 did they edit a brief Repetition, or a Simple & perspicuous Confession conformed to the *Corpus Doctrinae* of Melanchthon; but also Wolffgangus Amlingus, a Theologian of Anhalt, in the funeral Sermon for the Most Serene Lord Joachim Ernest, Prince of Anhalt, gravely exhorted all the people of Anhalt to persevere in the Doctrine consonant with the Philippic *Corpus Doctrinae*, thus, pag. 45, 46:

"(Since it is also not hidden what kind of Loyalty, Love and Friendship, in right, constant unity, existed until their blessed graves (notwithstanding the different gifts, light and knowledge) between these highly enlightened teachers, Prince George of Anhalt, Dr. Luther and Philip, and since Prince George, as well as Luther himself, always recognized and praised the magnificent book *Loci Theologici* of Philip, in which the main sum of the whole Christian doctrine is truly comprehended quite clearly and correctly, as the highest treasure of the Churches of God next to the holy Bible, and over which this laudable Prince, after Dr. Luther's (blessed) death, alongside the holy

Philip, endured the calumnies of some restless, ambitious and quarrelsome spirits with great princely patience, in silence and hope, etc. So the faithful people of Anhalt still do no wrong in this, that they steadfastly (all novelty being excluded and set aside) persist and rest in that same core of the pure doctrine, which is firmly built on the proven ground of the Prophetic and Apostolic Scripture, and therefore not on human quicksand, but on the true cornerstone of irrefutable truth, and can never be overthrown in eternity. Which is then precisely the same doctrine that the highly laudable Prince and Lord of Anhalt, Prince Wolfgang etc., also of Christ-mild blessed memory, helped to deliver and confess before his Imperial Majesty, alongside at that time few other Prince-Electors and Estates of the Empire, at the most dangerous time in Germany. And no Christian should make himself partaker of the grave sin which is called, Alteration or Obscuring of the recognized and known truth. For thereupon the most severe worldly punishments are wont to follow, as indeed our God-blessed dear sovereign Prince, according to his indwelling highly enlightened understanding, well understood, that it was not spoken in vain: *On account of a changed kind of Doctrine, fatal punishments threaten the whole of Germany.* Inasmuch as it is also impossible that any constant unity or Concord in religion can be reached and established, unless one comes again to the Principium from which one has deviated, namely the true irrefutable doctrine comprehended in the writings of the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippici*; for there one has the Truth and the Peace, that is, the unity of all the orthodox together; according to the command of the LORD: Only love Truth and Peace etc.)"

The Reformed of Bremen, both Ecclesiastical and Political, most solemnly profess that they know no other Symbolic Books, besides the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum*, in the following words: "(As far as the accusation of Calvinist doctrine is concerned, we and our forefathers have always declared ourselves, and hereby declare ourselves again, that as we were called and accepted by the government of this city for Church service, upon the Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures, the general Christian Symbols, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Frankfurt Recess, and upon the whole *Corpus Doctrinae* of Melanchthon: So we have hitherto, with the granting of divine grace, taught according to and in conformity with the same, and have not been convicted of another by anyone with foundation and substance, in which with God's help we also intend to remain further.)" That the pious men of Bremen religiously adhered to which sanction, the Writings of Christoph. Pezelius, Pierius, Martinus, Crocius, give faith.

This is so manifest, that the Wittenberg Theologians themselves in *Gründlichen Beweisß* etc., Part. **II**, C. **II**, Quæst. **XIX**, p. 233, confess it, where these writings are found: "(which we approve thus far only, inasmuch as they serve our purpose) Philip Melanchthon demands so diligently and before all Things, that the promises of the grace of God must be left universal, as they sound, so that each one can for himself subsume, and appropriate them to himself, and he sets such a general promise as the ground of faith in the *Corpus Doctrinae*, which not only the churches of Bremen, but also of Anhalt have accepted as a Symbolic book, and therefore when they teach otherwise, they teach against their own Church-books and thereby partly deviate from their own Oath and duty." Ib. quæst. **XIV**, p. 376: "how clearly and properly the *Corpus Doctrinae*, which is accepted in Bremen and Anhalt, witnesses of this, has been introduced before, according to which at least those churches should align themselves. Although by different teachers it has been taught contrary to the same."

Rudolphus Hospinianus reports in *Concordia Discors*, Cap. **XII**, fol. 66, 68 b, 69, 76, 77, that the Theologians of Hesse also, formerly, when the Formula of Concord came forth, had warned; that the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum*, which they had hitherto used for fostering Christian Consensus, as being consonant with the Prophetic & Apostolic Writings, was not to be abolished by the substitution of a New one. Where especially in Cap. **XVIII**, fol. 99, the words of the Most Serene Landgrave William, to the Most Serene Elector of Saxony, Augustus, deserve to be noted:

"It is to be accurately weighed, both by you and by others, that for many years now in your Electoral Duchy, there has been a certain & religiously used Body of Christian Doctrine; which also our Lord Father, of Holy memory, willed to be and to be used in all the churches of our dominion, and we are not ignorant that it has been received in many other neighboring regions, and has been used with decent constancy until now. Then also in Synods & public Constitutions of the Princes it has heretofore been provided, that we should all acknowledge the same Body as the norm of doctrine, to which also, as an unshaken rule of truth drawn from the Scriptures, many thousands of the Pastors of the Church of Christ have been admitted to the office of teaching and administering the Sacraments & have been confirmed in their ministry. And although in the proposed book of Concord, no mention is made of this Body of Doctrine, neither in a good part, nor in a bad part; yet the same Body of Doctrine is for that reason tacitly rejected and abrogated, because in the book of Concord other Writings, which are not had in the Body of Doctrine, are posited as the norm of doctrine: from which thing these inconveniences follow. First, that both you, & our Lord Father, & the other estates of the Empire,

and so many Churches & Schools from every part have hitherto acted not only imprudently, but even badly, while we have approved the oft-mentioned Body of Doctrine, & acknowledged it for the form of truth, & thus we argue ourselves of great levity, and inconsiderately reprehend and enervate all our past actions, etc."

See besides Hospinianus, Ludovicus Crocius's Preface to the *Twelve Dissertations*, D. Christoph. Pelargus's *Antithesis Apologetica contra Balduinum*, p. 18, 20, D. Conr. Bergius's *Praxis Catholica*, Diff. **VI**, p. 807, 809.

We with D. Conradus Bergius, *Praxis Catholica*, Diff. **VI**, §. 140, p. 108, say: "Since therefore it is better known to almost all Theologians what is taught concerning the proposed questions in the *Corpus Doctrinae* of Philip, than that it is needful to recite many things from it here: and since both the people of Anhalt, and others elsewhere among the Reformed are wont commonly to praise and approve the same Writer & Writing; the negation of the Philippic Position cannot be commonly imputed to the Reformed, unless it can be liquidly shown that it has been negated by a public & common Writing of all others or at least of the majority."

But explicitly, certain of the Greatest German Theologians approve the Order of Decrees in most significant words:

(δ) The MARCHIC (Brandenburg)

(δ) In the MARCHIC (Brandenburg) Reformed Churches, that this form of Doctrine began immediately with the Reformed Religion is lucidly testified not only by the Public Brandenburg Confessions, but also by the Doctors of this Church.

For thus D. CHRISTOPH. PELARGUS, Senior Professor of Theology in this Viadrina, & General Superintendent of the whole of Marchia, taught in his revised *Compend. Theol. Loc. XIII*, p. 225, 226, 227, 228 & *Antithes. Apol. contr. D. Balduin. §. XX, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII*.

Doctor JOH. BERGIUS, in *der Wille Gottes von aller Menschen Seeligkeit* (The Will of God for all Men's Salvation), Chap. **XV**, Sect. **II**, N. 11, p. 136:

"(We act most safely when we consider and explain the entire Counsel of GOD concerning the salvation and damnation of Men in the very Order in which He has revealed it in his Word, and has fulfilled it in works one after another. For then it will clearly appear that not only the Creation and the Fall into sin of the first parents, but also the ordinance and promise of the Mediator and Savior, and therefore also the calling of fallen Men to repentance and faith in Christ, and thus also the General Will of Grace of GOD towards all who are Called, have, in the order which GOD has established through his eternal Providence and Counsel in Christ, preceded the particular election and reprobation of certain Men, and are therefore not at all contrary to the same.)"

With whom D. CONRADUS BERGIUS agrees in *Praxi Catholica Divini Canonis*, Diff. VI, §. CCXVII, n. 5, p. 925:

"Therefore God understood, certainly from eternity:

(1.) that man could be created & ruled in such a way, that there would be liberty either to Glory and Life from Obedience; or to ignominy and death from disobedience.

(2.) that if he were created and ruled in this way, he would fall.

(3.) that to the fallen & captive a Mediator could be sent, to whom being united by Faith they might be saved.

(4.) that the same could be called, & causes could be so ordered, that they both could & ought to believe, perform Penitence & be united to the Mediator.

He knew also without doubt, if such an Ordination of Causes were posited: whether all, or some, or none would believe. He understood certainly also, that for some the Causes could be so ordered & prepared, that they would most certainly believe, be liberated, be saved. That Salvation—which, with causes ordered in this or that way, would come not to all men but to some, the rest being most justly damned on account of unbelief—is perfectly and in every way glorious to God. This last thing, namely the Glory of God & the Salvation of certain men, as it is the greatest & principal good in these matters, so also it is understood to be intended and decreed first, most, and principally: and yet by that very fact also all the other things at the same time, which in this Decree are presupposed & included in a certain order & connection."

He repeats the same things in *Themat. Theol. Difp.* VI, p. 35, 36.

The most celebrated Professors of our University of Viadrina, D. GREGORIUS FRANCUS, D. TOBIAS MAGIRUS, D. GOTTLIEB PELARGUS, D. FRIDERICUS REICHELIUS, comprehended the matter succinctly & forcefully in their Judgment to Herm. Hildebrand, Pastor of Bremen, sent to Bremen in the year 1640, which sounds thus:

"Following the thread of Prosper's *de Vocat. Gentium*, lib. **II**, C. **XXXI**, we establish:

I. That it was the Serious Will & intention of God the Heavenly Father, sending his Son into the World, & of the Son of God, as the lamb of God bearing the sins of the World, & offering himself as a Sacrifice on the Altar of the Cross, that through it All & Single Men in the whole World should have a most perfect propitiatory Sacrifice for all their sins, both Original and actual, and thus no Man should be destitute of a sufficient Means by which he might obtain Reconciliation with God, Remission of sins, Justice & eternal Life.

II. And no less also was it the serious Will & Intention of the Heavenly Father, as also of the uniquely Beloved Son, that those only, for their part, who were to hear this Mediator, to desist from their sins & Impenitence, & to adhere to him with a faith not feigned, but true and efficacious through Charity, should actually obtain & possess actual Reconciliation, Remission of Sins, Justice & Salvation.

III. Whence also it is further the Serious Will & Intention of God that this gracious Will of God concerning the expiatory Sacrifice of his Son be announced in the whole World to all men through the Ministry (yet

so that nothing be taken away from the most wise & most just Administration of God, who retains for himself the free Place, Time & mode in such a proclamation of grace), & that the requisite Condition of Penitence & Faith, by which they may be rendered actual partakers of the Benefits flowing from this propitiatory Sacrifice, be proposed, taught & urged.

IV. That to this external preaching of the Gospel is Ordinarily Conjoined a certain Measure of the Supernatural & Efficacious Grace of the Holy Spirit (although the Spirit breathes variously & in manifold ways according to his liberty, when, where, & in what mode he wills), which operates so efficaciously in the Hearers, and so convicts the impenitent & unfaithful of their Impenitence & incredulity, that they are forced to acknowledge that they perish by their own proper & most free Fault & contempt of the Gospel, & are deprived of the offered Benefits: and that it is to be imputed only to Negligence, evil lusts & Hypocrisy that the Virtue & humor of the heard Sermon on Divine Grace is not felt, or is suffocated & withers away without Fruit.

V. Just as also on account of this very negligence, Contempt & Abuse of the given Grace & offered Benefits, they have been deprived by a just Judgment of a more Efficacious Grace—through which they could have obtained true & Saving faith, & retained it even to the end, and through it have obtained the full Operation of the precious Sacrifice of Christ & of all the Benefits flowing from it—which God was also not obligated to give; just as also for this among other causes the external sound of the Gospel is not communicated to many men, because it is not unknown to the Divine Omniscience that they, equally as the former, will hold the truth in Unrighteousness, & will repudiate this offered Grace with Unbelief & Impenitence.

VI. Nevertheless, that God the Heavenly Father, according to the Riches of His Grace, has elected for himself a peculiar flock out of the whole human race, & has given it to his Son, who also specifically purchased it for a peculiar people with his blood; whom, just as by a peculiar, unmerited grace—not at all given for this cause, that he would use the Universal grace better than the former—so he would call by so efficacious a Grace to the Kingdom of his son, that he infallibly repents, believes in him, & is constantly preserved in such faith in him to the end, and so through the same faith in him is justified & at length glorified.

So that the Universal philanthropy (φιλανθρωπία, philanthropia) of God & of our Lord Jesus Christ towards the whole World universally fallen

into sin may be preached, as is right: as also besides the just Judgment against the ingratitude of its greater part, which compensates such a Dilection with hatred, and so not unmeritedly earns hatred in return: but especially the immense Mercy of them towards the Elect Church: so that for all who perish, excuse, and for those who are saved, Gloriation in their own merits & discretion, may be utterly taken away in the Judgment of God, and thus the Salvation of Israel may be ascribed only to unmerited Divine Mercy, but Perdition only to the proper fault of the man himself."

Thus far the Professors of Frankfurt of that time.

This dogma also our piously Deceased Teachers, D. ELIAS GREBENITZ, D. JOHANNES SIMONIS, D. PHILIPPUS BUCHIUS, asserted in Writings partly edited, partly not edited, and today among others the Most Reverend Lord D. SAM. STRIMESIUS asserts it in his *Critica Concionatoria* §. **XX**, n. 4, p. 88, but especially in a most solid manuscript Tractate *on the Conciliation of Universal & Special Divine Grace*. Those Pious and Learned Men, who, either here or elsewhere, have explained or today explain the Ways of God a little differently, have nevertheless held and declared this position to be Orthodox.

From our Brandenburg Theologians compare also, if you please, D. Joh. Bergius, *Unterfcheid und Vergleich der Euangel.* Quæst. **LIV**, **LXXI**, p. 73, 74, 105, 106; also *Antwort auff die Misdeutungen D. Joh. Micrælii*, Cap. **VI**, p. 126 ff, 144, 145; D. Gregor. Franci, *Meditationem Theol. de Genuino Senfu Abfoluti Decreti*; D. Eliæ Grebeniz, *Unterricht*, Cap. **VI**; D. Phil. Buchii, *Disput. Inaug. de Prædestinatione*.

And that this Position was not, or is not, private or precarious, but Public, is testified, besides the confession & the Electoral Edicts, by a Brief Writing, edited by Electoral Authority in the year 1666: *Summarischer Bericht von der Märckischen Reformirten Kirchen Einträchtigkeit mit andern Reformirten Gemeinen*, or, *A Succinct Exposition of the Consensus of the Reformed Church of the Mark with other Reformed Churches in Germany & outside Germany*:

(ε) The ANHALTINES

(ε) The ANHALTINES in their *brief, simple & Perspicuous Repetition of the Orthodox Confession, which the churches of the Principality of Anhalt embrace*, printed at Neustadt an der Haardt in the year 1581, say: "We are most certain, however great a mass of Disputations may be accumulated, that it is nevertheless necessary in true struggles, lest men be precipitated either into profane Security & Hypocrisy or into horrible Desperation, that refuge must at last be taken to this citadel, as it were: namely, that judgment concerning the will of GOD is to be made from the express Word, that both Sermons, of Penitence & of Grace, are Universal: that in God there is neither Respect of persons, nor contradiction of Will, that finally the command of God is eternal & immutable, to hear the Son & assent to the promise."

"This is therefore the most simple Position, in which, the Labyrinths of all Disputations having been cut through, we piously & firmly acquiesce: Since God could have either utterly reduced the first Parents after the Fall to nothing, or cast them off with the Devils into eternity by the highest and most just right, & by his infinite power could have excited new worshippers for himself; yet out of the abundance of mercy He spared the fallen human race, created to his own image, & according to the Good Pleasure, and counsel of his most clement Will, through and on account of Christ as Mediator: and in Christ as the head, in whom He loved us already before the foundations of the World were laid, He destined for eternal Life by an immutable Decree all who flee to Christ the Redeemer with true faith."

Which Confession not only the Reformed praise, among whom are: Rud. Hospinianus... D. Conr. Bergius... Herm. Hildebrandus... but also the Lutherans acknowledge it as Reformed, Joh. Himmel... D. Abr. Calovius... the Wittenbergers... D. Quenstedt... And the doctrine of this Confession was followed by DANIEL SACHSIUS, Superintendent of Cöthen, in *der Einhelligkeit der vier Evangelisten* (The Unanimity of the Four Evangelists)... and in *der Zugabe bey der Reformirten Kirchen Glaubens-Bekäntnifs* (The Supplement to the Reformed Churches' Confession of Faith).

(ζ) The PALATINATES

(ζ) In the PALATINATE, ZACHARIAS URSINUS & DAVID PAREUS in their *Explications of the Catechism* to Question LIV, concerning the eternal Predestination of GOD, Quest. II, in the Definition of Predestination, not obscurely indicate this Series of Divine Decrees, when they say: "Predestination is the eternal, most just & immutable Counsel of God,

1. of creating men,
2. of permitting their Fall into sin & eternal death,
3. of sending the Son in the flesh, to become a victim,
4. and of saving some through the Holy Spirit & the Word on account of the Mediator in true Faith & Conversion, of justifying them through & on account of him, of raising them to Glory, & of giving them eternal Life; but of leaving some in sin & death, of raising them to Judgment & of casting them into eternal punishments."

Which words Ludovicus Crocius also cites & approves... See Heidelberg Catechism, Quæst. VI & XXXVII.

The Palatines in *Ausführlichen Bericht*, was die Reformirten Kirchen in Teutschland glauben oder nicht glauben (Detailed Report on what the Reformed Churches in Germany believe or do not believe), Cap. II, n. II, p. 13, 14: "(We believe further, that God has condemned the fallen angels without any grace and mercy to the eternal fire, to our terror, so that we do not trifle with the wrath of God against sin. We believe further, that God indeed had the right and power to cast the fallen humans also without any grace and mercy into the eternal hellish fire. But He did not do it: but has promised Grace to man again. And so that he could show them Grace without prejudice to his Justice, he ordained his only-begotten Son for this, that he should become our Surety and Mediator, take upon himself the Punishment that we had deserved, and through his innocent death should redeem us from the eternal, well-deserved death.)"

See also BARTH. PITISCUS's *Explication* of John III. 16.

(η) The HASSIANS.

(η) In HASSIA, a great many Doctors from the very beginning of the Reformation have handed down & defended this Order; ANDREAS GERH. HYPERIUS, who died in the year 1564... D. GEORGIUS SOHNIUS, Professor at Marburg & Heidelberg, deceased in the year 1589, in *Operum* Tom. I, *Methodo Theologiae* p. 256, diffusely thus:

"Just as from eternity He decreed concerning the creation of men and the permission of their Fall, so also He decreed concerning the sending of the Son to become a Victim, concerning the calling of men who were fallen and corrupt to embrace Grace in Christ the Mediator, concerning the converting of some through the Word and Holy Spirit on account of Christ the Mediator, and concerning the leaving of the rest in sin and death. And although He decreed all these things from eternity, yet He decreed them distinctly, so that those Decrees follow each other in a certain order and are considered distinctly in the Divine mind.

And as He decreed, so also He now acts in time. For there is a Distinction and order of Divine Decrees just as there is of His works. Therefore, what God decreed from eternity, that He now does in time, and as He decreed, so He acts. And what He now does in Time, that He decreed from eternity, and just as He acts, so He decreed. And again, what He did not decree, that He does not do; and what He does not do, that He did not decree.

Thus He decreed distinctly in this way: first, to create Men; then, to permit that, once created, they should fall by using their free will, and not to impede their Fall; thirdly, to call the fallen and corrupt men to embrace Grace in Christ; and indeed to call some efficaciously, that is, to give them faith, according to His mercy, but according to His Justice to leave others in their sins and death, and not to give them Faith or convert them to Christ; furthermore, to judge, that is, to justify the faithful and to damn the unfaithful; finally, to make the justified blessed for eternity and to afflict the damned with eternal death.

So also He executes all these things distinctly in time; that is, first He creates men, then He permits the created to fall into Sin, thirdly He establishes a Mediator, and so on for the rest."

The same, Tom. II, *Exegef. in Augustan. Conf.* p. 1001:

"Predestination, he says, was made according to the Foreknowledge of God, that is, God predestined men whom He had foreknown, and thus as corrupt by sin and as called by the Gospel of Christ. For in predestining them from eternity, He considered them not simply as men to be created by Him, but as men who would fall into sin and who would be called again by the Gospel through Christ.

For these Decrees of God follow each other in Order: namely, that God from eternity decreed to create men, and on the other hand, to permit that, once created, they should fall; to call all the fallen through the Gospel of Christ the Mediator; to gift some of the Called with faith, and not to gift others; finally, to ordain from the called these ones to Life, and those ones to eternal death, that is, to justify the former and to damn the latter.

This eternal Decree of God concerning the ordaining of men—who are corrupt by sin and called again to Christ through the Gospel—now to Life or death, is called Predestination. For He could neither from eternity elect through Mercy any but the miserable and corrupt by sin, nor could He reprobate through justice any but those likewise corrupt by sin and liable to damnation through sin, just as now in Time He neither justifies nor damns any but the miserable and those liable to damnation."

Around the year 1597, by order and public authority of the most illustrious Prince MAURICE, Landgrave of Hesse, the following was published at Kassel: **A SYNOPSIS OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION**, compiled in two books for the Illustrious Court School of the most illustrious Prince Maurice of Hesse.

In this work, in chapter III, concerning the Actions of God, letter A, section 6, and letter A, section 7, to the Question: "*Concerning what matters has God held counsel from eternity?*" The decrees of God are reviewed, plainly according to our understanding, in these words:

Sacred letters show us three principal things brought into action.

1. FIRST, concerning the creation of the World: For from eternity all his works are known to God, Acts 15:18.

2. SECOND, concerning the sending of the Son: For Christ was foreordained before the foundations of the World were laid, but was made manifest in the last times, 1 Peter 1:20. Likewise, by the definite counsel and foreknowledge of God, he was delivered up and crucified, Acts 2:23.

3. THIRD, concerning the election of men to eternal Salvation: For he chose us in Christ before the foundations of the world were laid, that we should

be holy and blameless in his sight in love, who predestined us to the adoption of sons through Jesus Christ, set forth for the common purpose through the external Call, is expressly held in Luke 7:30, when it is said: *But the Pharisees and the interpreters of the Law rejected the counsel of God, or rendered it void, against themselves, not being baptized by John.* Where the counsel of God, placed and set forth, as far as it pertained to the Christ who was offered, they are said to have made void. (Th. XLVIII)

Thus in Acts 13:46, *Then Paul and Barnabas, using their liberty, said, as Luke reports, It was necessary for the word of God to be first explained to you, but since you reject it and judge yourselves unworthy of that eternal Life, behold, we turn to the Gentiles.* It was necessary, he says, namely from the counsel of God who ordains, who willed that Christ be preached to all in common, first to the Jews, and then also to the Gentiles.

Thus Christ in John 17 says that power was given to him over all flesh, that is, generally, because he is the common Savior of the whole world: but he adds a restriction, *that as many as you have given him, he may give them eternal Life*, that is, instilling faith in them: where a distinction is made between the general Counsel of the Covenant of Grace towards the human race, by which name he received power over all flesh, that he might be a sufficient ransom for the whole world, if only all would embrace the Gospel: and the particular Grace of Election, through the gratuitous drawing of God, so that he gives eternal Life only to those who have been given to him by the Father before Secular times. (Th. XLIX)

It is no wonder that those who do not pay attention to this proposed distinction in the Scriptures, while avoiding Charybdis, thereupon run into Scylla; some of whom falsely extend the Grace of Election as widely as the general counsel of God of the preached Gospel itself, while others draw in their sails too narrowly, as if Christ were sent into the World only for the cause of the Elect, because he is graciously applied to the Elect alone. The former of these argue viciously from the Undistributed to the Distributed: but the latter from the Distributed to the Undistributed.”

D. JOH. MOLTHERUS, Professor at Marburg, was also addicted to this hypothesis.

PAULUS STEINIUS, one-time Superintendent of Kassel, a not insignificant member of the Synod of Dort, in his *Disputation on the eternal Predestination of God*, held at Kassel in the year 1622, follows the same method, in Theses XVI & XVII.

A distinction among men is not seen in the Mission of the Messiah, nor in his being handed over to death, and the Redemption that was made through it. For God promised immediately in Paradise after the Fall to Adam, and in him to the whole human race, which had been made guilty of eternal death, the Seed of the woman, who would crush the head of the Serpent (Genesis 3:15). And so to the common perdition of the whole human race, induced by Satan, he opposed a common remedy, to be prepared through the Messiah and his Passion and Death, by the power of which all, provided they would apply it to themselves by true faith, could recover from the bite of the serpent and be eternally saved. This promise God fulfilled in the fullness of time, by sending his son into this world, born of a woman, and made subject to the law, so that he might redeem those who were subject to the law (and subject to it were all and every one, with no one excepted), Galatians 4:4-5, etc.

The same **Paul Steinus**, in the third part of *The Evangelical Brotherhood*, published in the year 1623, in the dedication to the most esteemed Senate of Bremen, declares his mind accurately thus:

“Some approach this doctrine rather deeply, and begin it from on high, in that they propose that this is the very first decree of God the Lord, which He made with Himself from eternity, that he willed to make some men eternally blessed, but to eternally cast off and damn the rest, and indeed the greatest part: Upon which decree of God, the decrees and counsels of man's creation, of the permission and allowance of the lamentable Fall in Paradise, of man's redemption through the Messiah and Savior of the world, of the announcement and preaching of this Messiah, etc., are then supposed to follow.

Others teach that the decree of the creation of man, and of the allowance of the Fall, comes first, and the decree of election and reprobation immediately follows upon it; which then is to be followed in order by the decree of the redemption of the Human Race through Christ, and what further follows from it.

Others present this doctrine in such a way that the election of grace follows upon the decree of God concerning Redemption, and its announcement in the preaching of the Holy Gospel, and is nothing other than the decree of God concerning the sanctification of man, whereby He has resolved from eternity, according to the good pleasure of his will, to give to some from the fallen Human Race, in Christ Jesus, through the preaching of the holy Gospel, true, saving faith, and thereby to make them righteous and eternally blessed: So

that the decree of God concerning Creation is the First: The decree of God concerning Redemption, the Second: And the decree of God concerning Sanctification (which is nothing other than the election of grace), the Third: Inasmuch as the *Synopsis Religionis Christianae pro Schola Aulica*, printed here in Kassel some twenty-odd years ago, set forth such an order, and it is still constantly taught by us.”

In the treatise itself, from *The Evangelical Brotherhood*, Part III, chapter II, p. 36:

“For my own humble part, I am of the opinion that one cannot better order the Decrees of God than according to their execution itself (*in ipsa Executione*), as they are effected one after another in their very fulfillment and brought to pass, and as the works of God are set upon one another in the Apostolic Creed, so and in such a way, that, just as in the fulfillment the work of Creation is the first: upon which the Fall of man occurred: The work of Redemption is the second: upon which the preaching of the Gospel and the general invitation and call to the community of the crucified Christ is founded: and finally the work of Sanctification (which includes the gift of true faith, through which a distinction is made among men, and the elect are actually separated and set apart from the others,) is the third: So likewise this same order should be made and taught in the Decrees of God, in God's counsels: Namely, that the decree of God concerning Creation is the first: Upon which follows the decree to permit and allow the Fall of man: The decree of Redemption the second: And finally the decree of Sanctification (which is nothing other than the election of grace) the third; in which form these three Decrees, the *Decretum Creationis*, *Decretum Redemptionis* & *Decretum Electionis*, are set forth in the *Synopsis Religionis Christianae*, which was published for the Mauritian Court School some twenty-odd years ago, in this very same order, as can be seen in the 1st Part, Ch. III. Which opinion I, for my part, hold to be the best and safest. (See also *ibid*, p. 140-41.)”

Ibid. p. 47:

“Although, for my part, I willingly concede this to Mentzer in this matter, and am of the opinion that the appointment of Christ to the mediatorial office, and thus also his satisfaction and merit (in God's decree), should rightly be placed before the election of grace: So that Christ is the foundation and the ground not only of our Salvation, but also of our election to eternal Salvation. With which opinion various distinguished teachers on our side agree, such as Zanchius, Sohnius, Dr. Moltherus, Dr. Ludovicus Crocius, Dr. Johannes Crocius, and many others, etc.”

Ibid. p. 51:

“We, for our part, which Mentzer should well mark and take note of, place the election of grace not before, but after, the decree of God concerning the sending of the Messiah, and its announcement through the preaching of the Gospel.”

id. ibid. p. 59:

“The distinction among men cannot be perceived in the first creation; nor in the fall of Adam; nor in the punishment; nor also in the first promise of the woman's Seed, and his suffering and death; nor finally in the announcement of the Gospel: since in all these things together men are either entirely equal to one another, or at least no distinction can be found therein between those who are saved and those who are not saved; as we willingly concede to Dr. Mentzer: However, the special love of God towards his elect can nevertheless be perceived after the announcement of the Gospel; in that no person, by nature, can believe the Gospel and accept the grace offered in it, even if it is preached to him externally clearly and distinctly enough and he also hears it with his physical ears; [but] God the Lord, through the preaching of his word, opens the hearts of his elect, so that they pay attention to what is taught and preached, of which a remarkable example is presented to us in Lydia the seller of purple, Acts 16:14. &c.”

The same, in a certain Epistle to Lud. Crocius, a Theologian of Bremen, professes this Position in Crocius's *Dyod.* p. 98, in these words:

"From the hypothesis, which Lord Sibrandus has in common with us, concerning the death of Christ, which he sustained for all and single men by the counsel of God the father, it is concluded by necessary consequence, that the Decree of Redemption, as that which concerns the entire human race, precedes the Decree of Election, which is concerning only some from the human race. Which I have evidently shown in my previous letters to him: so that I hope he will easily assent to us in this matter."

Nor was this the private opinion of D. Steinius alone, but the public & common Position of all the Ministers of the Divine Word of his place & time, with the same Steinius testifying:

"In our Ministry there is no one (whom I indeed know) who thinks differently from me in this matter, so that I deservedly give thanks to God for our consensus & congratulate our Church... M. Baumannus, Con-Rector of the Urban School, with whom your P. Caesar is wont to

communicate his counsels, in the act of the Disputation, at the beginning of the Collation, did not obscurely profess his dissent. At length however, convicted by the evidence of the matter & the weight of the arguments, he yielded to the truth not unwillingly."

That this was the constant & commonly received Position in lower Hesse, the *Amicable Writings* of the Most Serene Princes of Hesse, published in the year 1632, testify, pag. 211 & 382:

"Our churches have hitherto so taught & still teach and profess, that namely God wills the Salvation of all Men commonly: & although the actual & efficacious Application of the Evangelical Promises does not befall all, but truly only the elect, nevertheless Christ was sent by God the heavenly Father as a Savior to the whole World, and thus to all and single Men, he himself also has acquired & merited Salvation & eternal Beatitude for All and single, & he takes care that such acquired Grace & goods be offered indiscriminately through the Holy Gospel to all and single Men, to whom it is preached, together with this certain promise, that they, if they perform Penitence, & believe the Gospel, will be actual partakers of his merit... and so that Election was not made before the Decree of Creation & of the Permission of the Fall, nor before the Decree of sending the Mediator, and of delivering him to death, and finally not before the Decree of announcing the Gospel to every Creature, But this Decree immediately follows. And that the Decree of Reprobation is not absolute, but that God has found in the Reprobate the cause of Reprobation & Condemnation, namely sin; the Decree of Election also is not opposed as absolute to what is Ordained, as if God willed to lead those whom he has predestinated to eternal life to Salvation absolutely without any acceding Means, but that in the elect he finds no cause at all, on account of which he has preordained them before others to eternal Life."

The same man, in a certain letter to Ludovicus Crocius, the theologian of Bremen, professes this opinion in Crocius's *Dyodis*, p. 98, in these words:

"From the hypothesis, which is common to us and Mr. Sibrandus, concerning the death of Christ, which he endured for all and every person by the counsel of God the Father, it is concluded by necessary consequence that the Decree of Redemption, as that which concerns the entire human race, precedes the Decree of Election, which is about only certain ones from the human race. This I have shown him evidently in my previous letters, so that I hope he will easily agree with us in this matter."

And this was not the private opinion of Dr. Steinius alone, but the public and common Opinion of all the Ministers of the Divine Word of that place and time, with the same Steinius as witness:

“In our Ministry there is no one (whom I indeed know) who thinks differently from me in this matter, so that I rightly give thanks to God for our consensus and congratulate our Church. Mr. M. Baumannus, Co-Rector of the City School, with whom your ruler (P. Caesar) is accustomed to share his counsels, in the act of the Disputation, at the beginning of the Colloquy, professed his dissent not obscurely. Finally, however, having been convicted by the evidence of the matter and the weight of the arguments, he yielded to the truth without reluctance.”

That this was the constant and commonly received Opinion in Lower Hesse, the *Amicable Writings* of the Most Serene Princes of Hesse, published in the year 1632, testify on pages 211 and 382:

“Our churches have hitherto so taught and still teach and profess, that God namely wills the Salvation of all Men in common: and although the actual and efficacious Application of the Evangelical Promises befalls not all, but truly the elect alone, nevertheless Christ was sent by God the heavenly Father as a Savior for the whole World, and thus for all and every Person, He also himself acquired and merited Salvation and eternal Blessedness for All and every one, and he ensures that such acquired Grace and goods be offered through the Holy Gospel indiscriminately to all and every Person to whom it is preached, together with this certain promise, that they, if they repent and believe the Gospel, will actually become partakers of his merit.

And so that Election was not made before the Decree of Creation and of the Permission of the Fall, nor before the Decree of sending the Mediator, and of delivering him to death, and finally before the Decree of announcing the Gospel to every Creature, But that it immediately follows this Decree.

And that the Decree of Reprobation is not absolute, but that God found in the Reprobate the cause of Reprobation and Condemnation, namely sin; Also that the Decree of Election is not opposed to the Ordained means as 'absolute,' as if God willed to lead to Salvation those whom he predestined to eternal life, absolutely without any accompanying Means, but that in the elect he found no cause at all on account of which he preordained them to eternal Life before others.”

Dr. **JOHANNES CROCIUS**, in his *Commentary on Ephesians*, Ch. I, p. 256, no. 4, also proves this Series in these Words:

“The decree, therefore, concerning sending Christ the Savior is prior in order to the Decree of Election.”

With Johannes Crocius, **THEOPHILUS NEUBERGER** subscribed to the Colloquy of Leipzig in the year 1631, and by this his subscription, he approved this dogma.

(θ) Those of BREMEN

(θ) In the Church & School of BREMEN, that this Form of Doctrine has been publicly handed down in an uninterrupted series has not only been clear from the above, but will also be clear from what is just about to be said. To wit, this Order of the Divine Decrees was publicly professed not only implicitly by ALBERTUS HARDENBERGIUS, CHRISTOPHORUS PEZELIUS, JOH. MOLANUS, URBANUS PIERIUS, MARCUS MENINGIUS, TOB. PEZELIUS, JOH. LAMPADIUS, and other Older men, but also explicitly by the Doctors sent to the Synod of Dort: MATTHIAS MARTINIUS, HENRICUS ISSELBURGIUS & LUDOVICUS CROCIUS. See *Act. Synod. Dordr.* p. 639 to 658.

D. LUD. CROCIUS, in his *Apologetico pro Augustana Confessione*, Disput. **IX**, §. **LXIII**, **LXIV**, **LXV** to **LXXII**, p. 194, 195, treats prolixly of this Order of the Divine Decrees, and weaves it thus:

"As pertains to the Decree of Creation, by it God from eternity resolved to create the human race in his own image in perfect Justice & Sanctity, & to obligate it to a certain Obedience, in which if it persevered, it would be saved by the benefit of its Creation: but if it fell away from it, it would both fall from the co-created image of God, & be subjected to temporal and eternal punishments. This Decree God executed on the sixth day of Creation, when he created the first-formed humans, the first progenitors of the human race, in his own image, and bound them by the command concerning not eating the forbidden fruit, Genesis I. 26 & Chap. II. 16, 17."

"But the event of this Creation in man did not correspond to the law of God, as he deflected from the end of his Creation. For when the first parents heard the voice of the Serpent, and obeyed it, by that Obedience of theirs they both lost the image of God and together with calamities of every kind also incurred death itself, just as all these things are known from Moses, Genesis III, the whole chapter. God foresaw this event and also by a certain counsel for most just causes willed to permit it."

"In the meantime, lest the human race be created in vain & perish in its ruin, God in his eternal counsel made the Decree of Redemption, by which he destined his only-begotten Son as the Savior of the World, who would satisfy for all the sins of the human race, and reconcile it to himself, so that everyone who should believe in him would be saved: he who would not believe, being damned in his own perdition, would perish by a more grave judgment. Col. I. 19, 20; Joh. III. 16."

"This Decree God commanded to be executed in the fullness of time, sending his son into this world, born of a woman, who satisfied for the sins of the whole human race by his obedience & death, so that everyone who believes in him may be saved, he who does not believe may be damned by his own fault."

"And although our Lord Jesus Christ came into this world to save sinners, having been made a propitiation for the sins of the whole world: yet God from eternity foresaw that no man could enjoy that benefit of his Redemption by his own natural powers and through it be saved unto life, for the reason that no man by his own natural powers can believe in Christ & come to him. Lest therefore the human race should fall away from the Benefit of his Redemption along with the Benefit of Creation, God from eternity made the Decree of Election, which is properly called Predestination, by which in his eternal Counsel he elected some from the entire fallen human race according to the Good Pleasure of His Will in Christ, to whom through the Ministry of the Word & Sacraments as means of Faith, He would give Faith & Perseverance, so that by their Faith in Christ they might be justified in this Age, and glorified in the other, not even the gates of hell withstanding, the rest being passed by & left to themselves in their misery, to whom in the meantime he did not envy their salvation, since indeed through the Ministry of the Word & Sacraments they are able to attain to Faith in Christ & be preserved in it."

The same D. Lud. Crocius follows the same form of Doctrine in his *Syntagm. Theol. L. IV, C. I ff, p. 957 ff, & Dyodecade Dissert. Exegeticar. & Apolegetic. Syntag. Sac. Theol.*

GERHARDUS NEUFVILLE, Doctor & Professor of the Gymnasium of Bremen, in two Disputations on Predestination & the Mystery of Election & Reprobation, held there, in the prior Disputation, Thes. **XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII**, learnedly proves our Position & among other things writes:

"The Decree, by which Christ was constituted Mediator of the human race, is prior to the Decree of Election: thence it follows, that Christ was given as Mediator and Redeemer not only to certain men, who are Elected in Christ, but to the whole human race. Since Christ in the Gospel generally promises Remission of Sins to all, if they believe: it is certainly manifest that that remission was impetrated for all, so that an access is open to single individuals for the perception of this benefit through faith in Christ. See Joh. I. 17 & Chap. III. 16 & VI. 47; Act. X. 43 & c. XIII. 38, 39. And so it is also rightly said, that the Intention of God the Father giving Christ to death & of Christ himself dying was,

that satisfaction be rendered for the sins of all men, and thus the Right of obtaining the Remission of sins be acquired for them. So, however, that no one be rendered an actual partaker of that Benefit, except believers."

Likewise D. CONRADUS BERGIUS, already cited above under lit. d, p. 123: having been called from Frankfurt to Bremen, professed this Truth also in Bremen in Writings composed & edited there. Among which are the *Themata Theologica*, where in Disput. **VI**, p. 35, 36, he repeats in the same number of words what We have produced here under Lit. d. Likewise two Disputations on the Sufficiency & Efficacy of the Death of Christ, held in the year 1641, in the latter of which, §. **VIII** ff, he confirms with reasons what was asserted before.

The same Position was professed in the same Church by HERMANNUS HILDEBRANDUS in his *Orthodox Declaration of the three Articles*. To which not only the Professors there, Lud. Crocius, Conradus Bergius, & BALTHASAR WILLIUS, but also the Ministers of the divine word in the Old and New City, JOHANNES ALMERUS, PETRUS VARENHOLDIUS, JOHAN. SCHILDIUS, JOH. CONRADUS LÆLIUS, applauded.

That this was the Constant Doctrine of the Doctors of Bremen, the Most Celebrated Man, Dietericus Sagittarius affirms in his Oration **III**, on the Birth, Progress & Increment of the School of Bremen, pag. 154:

"By the common suffrage of the Fathers in the Year of the Century XVIII, these Triumvirs of Bremen (so to speak) (Matth. Martinus, D. Hen. Isselburgius & D. Lud. Crocius) were sent to that most famed national Synod of the federated Belgium celebrated at Dort, with that counsel and with that caution, lest the moderate doctrine, to which our Church had been accustomed from the very beginning of the Reformation, be rendered more difficult by the rigid opinions or locutions of some, & weaker Consciences be turned from our assemblies to others. For the most wise Men of that age, both Political and Ecclesiastical, who for the most part had come out of the School of Melancthon, knew that the Symbolic Writings received in Bremen (to which they themselves, equally as their ancestors, appealed when a Theological question was moved) were, besides Holy Scripture, the one norm of Faith, none other than the Augsburg Confession, its Apology with the *Corpus Doctrinae* of Philip: For the rest they so abhorred novelties, that they admitted neither the Formula of Concord, nor any other Little books as Symbolic. Hence that Orthodox Consensus of the most Learned Men among us, who, having used modesty & moderation in teaching & Writing, served God with one Heart & shoulder, as it were, and studied to erect the same Beacon (as

it is said): so that our Church could have congratulated itself on its Halcyon days, if that restless Spirit, to whom this pious Concord was a thorn in the eye, as it were, had not, lest the same should last or endure, sought its Dissension by various arts."

In the Reformed Church of Danzig, D. GEORGIUS PAULI approved & defended this Position in his *Reformato Augustano*, or, *Apologia pro Dictatis suis Scholasticis*, Cap. **XIII**, p. 179, 180 ff. Which book was printed in Bremen in the year 1637.

(i) The SWISS

(i) In Switzerland, not only did the first Reformers **HULDERICUS ZWINGLIUS**, **THEODORUS BIBLIANDER** (concerning whom see Hottinger, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Sec. XVI, Part IV, Chap. VI, §. XX, p. 688 ff.), **CONRADUS PELLICANUS**, **HENRICUS BULLINGERUS**, **WOLFGANGUS MUSCULUS**, **RUDOLPHUS GUALTHERUS**, and **BENEDICTUS ARETIUS** carry this torch before others; But also the **HELVETIC CONFESSION** itself, the first in the Collection of Confessions, establishes this Order, when it teaches, in Chap. X, that God did not elect us *without a Means, but in Christ, and on account of Christ*, etc.; in Chap. XI, that *Jesus Christ, our one and eternal Lord, is the Savior of the human Race, and therefore of the whole world*; in Chap. XIV, that *access to God is always open to all sinners*.

No one who is skilled in theological controversies will easily doubt **Zwingli**. For thus he writes on Romans 5:15:

“If Adam by his sin could do so much as to constitute us all sinners, why could not the Gift of GOD rather be so powerful that through it all sins might be remitted? In his Declaration on Original Sin to Urbanus Rhegius: Whatever evil Adam gave by sinning, this has been cured by the Grace of CHRIST. Likewise: The righteousness of CHRIST restored the [human] Generation in such a way that the corruption does not harm, unless where, when we have grown up, by acting against the law, we again perish through our own perfidious fault. Likewise: We could have responded in a few words, that Christ was altogether as beneficial in healing as Adam was harmful in sinning. Further, Adam infected the entire mass with original sin; Therefore CHRIST restored the entire mass, etc. Whence Bellarmine in Vol. IV of his Controversies, on the Loss of Grace and the State of Sin, Book IV, Ch. II, p. 235-236, reprimands Zwingli because he wrote that it was probable that through Christ the entire nature was restored, so that absolutely no infants perish, whether they be children of gentiles or of the faithful, nor even any adults, though they be gentiles, if they show the work of the law written on their hearts.”

The Wittenbergers also, in their *Thorough Proof*, p. 385, 416, judge that he said almost too much concerning the universal Merit of Christ.

Bullinger's mind is evident from his Oration held in the year 1536, *On the Moderation to be observed in the business of Providence, Predestination, Grace, and Free Will*, found in Johannes Henricus Hottinger's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Sec. XVI, Part IV, Chap. VI, §. XXIII, p. 763, 813, 814 to 819, where he emphatically proposes this Order thus:

“If therefore, to return and take up the main point of the matter; in the Business of Predestination, we judge according to the custom of the Saints, namely according to that order which God has followed, and which the Canonical Scripture describes for us, the method of explaining the manner of Justice and Mercy, of Predestination and piety, will be easy. For God, being good and just, from his innate Clemency and equity does not will the death of the sinner, but rather that he should convert and live. Therefore, restoring that first man, our Progenitor, cast down by the art of the Devil and by his own wicked desire, and immersed in death and perdition, he did not want all his posterity, that is, the entire race of mortals, his own work, to perish. Moreover, he found a means through which man might be saved; yet lest Justice be in any way sinned against, Christ the Lord is he, through whom it pleased the Father to reconcile and recapitulate to himself all things, which are in Heaven and which are on Earth (Col. I). For he committed no sin (Is. LIII), yet he took sin upon himself, and he who had not deserved death, by dying destroyed death. For this is that very thing which God announced in the first Preaching of the Gospel both to our Progenitors and to all of us, saying (Gen. III): I will put enmity between you and that woman, between your Seed and her seed. It shall crush your head, and you shall crush its heel. --- Hence it is that the Serpent is read to be cursed, but man is not. --- Now therefore, to men so constituted and restored by God, the good Lord reveals his will. And to some indeed through created things (Ps. XIX), but to others through the Preaching of his Holy Word. --- Truly, at that calling of God who admonishes, many indeed understand what should be sought, what should be avoided; but they are not moved justly and as they ought, so as to seek what they have understood to be true and just. Those who both understand and rightly seek what God reveals, understand and seek through the Grace of the Lord: through which grace the gifts are increased daily for those who are Working and proceeding in the way of justice, so that at last they seem to surpass themselves in the pursuit of Virtues. But those who reject the Truth offered to them, reject it by their own Fault. For, hiding by their own inertia the talent entrusted to them in good faith, they are unwilling to stir up the gift of God. Therefore, Divine Justice cannot not punish them as servants of bad faith. First, therefore, the talent is taken from them: then they are permitted to themselves, which is for God to harden and to blind. At last they rush headlong into Tartarus, to pay for this in eternal ruin.”

In his five Decades of Sermons on the Chief Chapters of the Christian Religion, Decade IV, Sermon I, fol. 184, face II, he pathetically teaches that Christ and the Grace of Christ pertain to all:

*“For by no means, (he says) should one imagine that there are two books placed in heaven, in one of which are read the names of those to be saved, and indeed to be saved by a certain irrefragable necessity, however much they may struggle against the word of Christ and commit atrocious crimes: while in the other are contained the names of those to be damned, who cannot but be damned, however religiously they may live. Let us rather hold that the Holy Gospel of Christ preaches the Grace of God, the Remission of sins, and eternal life generally to the entire world. Which thesis of his he afterwards confirms with many testimonies of Sacred Scripture, and says that the blame for eternal ruin is the avoidable malice of men. Concerning Bullinger, Breitingger judges truly and forcefully in his *Apology for Bullinger*: He thought, taught, and wrote orthodoxly, sparingly, and prudently.”*

Wolffgangus Musculus proves this dogma in infinite places in his writings. But especially in his *Commentary on Colossians*, Chap. I, v. 20, he has these memorable words, by which he acknowledges this Order of the Divine Decrees:

“In the latter epistle to the Corinthians V, he says: God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself. Therefore this reconciliation was made for the whole human race. But it seems to be established that the human race consists of the reprobate and the elect. Do we therefore say that all in general, both the reprobate and the elect, have been reconciled? I respond: the human race consists of men, not of the reprobate and the elect. To be reprobate and elect does not make men, and therefore does not constitute the human race, and thus not the world. Thus God loved the World (says our Savior in John III) that he gave his only-begotten son, that whoever believes in him should not perish, but have eternal life. And here, when Christ loved the world, the reprobate are not included, but simply the human race, that is, all men. And when the Apostle in the 1st Epistle to Timothy, ch. II, says: Who wills all men to be saved; he is not speaking of the reprobate, but of all men. In a similar manner, what he says, that God was in Christ, and reconciled the world to himself, this is not to be referred to reprobate men, but to all men. You will say: But the reprobate are also men. Therefore they too are reconciled. I respond: because they are not simply men, they cannot be partakers of this reconciliation. Again; But all men are sinners, you will say: and thus there is not among them anyone who is simply a man: Therefore no one at all among mortals is reconciled. I respond; It is one thing to be a sinner, and another to be reprobate. We are all sinners, but not so are we all reprobate. Then, reconciliation properly concerns sinners, and thus it pertains to the whole human race. The reason for the reconciliation is Catholic [i.e., universal], on account of the Catholic sin, which divided

the human race from God: but Reprobation is not Catholic, therefore the catholic reconciliation cannot pertain to it. But you will say: Election is also not catholic, shall we therefore say that the Catholic reconciliation does not pertain to the Elect either? I respond: it is so, reconciliation presupposes alienation, which was on account of sin, not on account of Election. Where God is said to have reconciled the world, one must dispute neither about the Reprobate nor about the Elect. In Sum: this reconciliation is to be referred to that catholic enmity of the human race, which we all contracted from Adam, on account of the corruption of our nature: and in respect of this the whole world is said to be reconciled through Christ, wherefore there is no reason for us to infer anything here about the reprobate. These things have been said about the fact that God, existing in Christ, is said to have reconciled the world to himself; but that not all men become partakers of this reconciliation is because not all embrace it by faith in Christ, but very many are turned away by unbelief: about which matter we also spoke in 2 Cor. V."

The same man, in his *Loci Communes*, the section on the Grace of God, p. 289-290, graphically depicts the Order of our Salvation, both in Intention and in Execution:

"When I inspect those things which are commemorated concerning Grace in the Sacred Scriptures, especially the Apostolic ones, I consider that we must think a little more broadly about the Grace of God than insofar as it operates privately in the Elect. We must inspect in it the very foundation of our common Salvation and Redemption, namely the Counsel, good pleasure and purpose of the will of God, from which that whole dispensation of our Redemption has flowed. Wherefore I judge that this Grace of God must be divided into Proposing and Operating. To the Proposing belongs that which, before the foundation of the world, he willed, decreed and proposed from eternity, that in the fullness of time, by sending his son, he would liberate and save the human race. To this pertains what is read in Eph. I concerning the Mystery, Good Pleasure, Counsel, Purpose, Election, and Predestination of his will, which were in him before the foundation of the world: 2 Tim. I:20. In these places we see that the Grace of God from eternity and before the foundation of the world was Willing, Proposing, Electing and Predestinating those things which concern the salvation of the human race. To the Operating grace must be referred first that he created this man, whom he proposed to save from eternity through Christ, soon after founding the world, in his own image, placed him in Paradise, made him certain of his Will by giving him a law, condemned the transgressor to death and ejected him from Paradise, promised the Seed of salvation, clothed the naked ---

Under the law occurred the Liberation from Egypt, the leading into the promised land, the giving of the Law --- After the law succeeded that singular work of the Grace of God, by which the human race was to be redeemed through the incarnate Christ. To this class belongs the Incarnation of the eternal Word, and what is annexed to it --- the Dispensation of Christ, comprehended by his Preaching, performing of miracles, Institution of the Disciples, Passion and Death, Resurrection, Ascension, and Mission of the Holy Spirit, and what is required for this, that it may attain its end, such as the Ministry of the Gospel, --- And the Calling of all Peoples, by which all Nations are called to the unity of faith, the Knowledge of the Truth and true Salvation in Christ. After the consideration of these things (NOTE BENE), we are led in a right order to the private operations of Divine Grace, by which, through the Holy Spirit in the hearts of the elect, is perfected the Illumination of the blind mind, the Justification and Regeneration of the impious heart, the insinuation of the gifts of God, of Faith, Hope, Charity, Patience, etc., and what else is required for the efficacy of good works, and finally the Glorification of our Bodies and Spirits to the Image of Christ."

Hence in the year 1555, on the 3rd of April, the **Bernese**, on the occasion of Calvin's Book on *Predestination and Providence* (in which, however, he prefers the Infralapsarian hypothesis to the Supralapsarian, as we have shown in §. III. p. 46-47), having made a decree of the Senate, ordered that the matter of Predestination not be proposed so rigidly; which is reported by Hottinger, *Hist. Eccl.*, Sec. XVI, Part IV, p. 615-616, and Jacques Spon, *Histoire de Genève*, p. 254-255:

"This caused Calvin to publish his book on the *Predestination and Providence of God*, which the Magistrates of Bern would neither approve nor disapprove, wisely forbidding their Ministers to preach to the people on such lofty matters."

Cf. Beza's *Apology I*, to Claudius de Sainctes. In the same place, in the year 1587, on the occasion of the Controversies moved by Samuel Huber from the Colloquy of Montbéliard, a moderate type of Doctrine was asserted, Hottinger, *Hist. Eccl.*, Sec. XVI, Part IV, p. 908, 909, 910, 912; Melchior Adam, in his *Life of Jakob Andreae*, p. 653, 654, 655.

(κ) The ANGLICANS

(κ) Nor in **ENGLAND** at the very time of the Reformation were there lacking great Theologians who entered upon this path. Among these was **JOHANNES HOOPERUS**, Bishop of Gloucester, who in his *Preface to the Exposition of the Decalogue* has these words among others:

“After the fall of Adam, the virtue and efficacy of the divine promise extends itself to the salvation of man, to the same extent that the rigor and Justice of the law is valid for condemning men on account of sin. For just as by the offense and sin of one man death passed unto all men to condemnation (as Paul says), so by the Justice of one, life is derived unto all men to Justification. The words of the promise made to Adam and Abraham confirm the same. *I will put enmity between you and the woman, between your seed and the woman's seed, and her seed shall crush your Head.* For just as we were in Adam before his Fall, and therefore, if he had not sinned, we would have been endowed with the same innocence and perfection in which he was created: so we were in his loins when he sinned, and we were made partakers of his sin. But just as we were partakers of evil in him, so we were also in him when God made the promise of grace to him, and we were made partakers of the same grace, not as sons of Adam, but as sons of the promise. Likewise, just as the sin of Adam, without any privilege or exemption, pertained to all and every one of Adam's posterity: so the promise of grace pertained to all and every one of Adam's posterity, just as much as to Adam himself. This is more plainly expressed where God promises that in the seed of Abraham he will bless all the peoples of the earth.”

After a few words, he adds in the same place:

“The promise of grace does indeed pertain to the whole race of men, and embraces all; but within certain bounds and limits, which if men transgress, they exclude themselves from the promise made in Christ. Thus Cain, before he had excluded himself, was no more excluded (by God) than Abel; Saul than David; Judas than Peter; Esau than Jacob.”

After some other things:

“This imperfection, however, or inborn sickness, contracted from Adam, does not exclude a man from the promise of God in Christ, provided that he does not transgress the limits and bounds of original sin through his own foolishness and malice, and fall into sin out of contempt or hatred for the Divine Word, and transform himself into

the image of the Devil. For it is by this means, at last, that we deprive ourselves of the promises and merits of Christ, who indeed took upon himself our infirmities and original fault, but by no means the contempt of himself and his law.”

Another of the English Reformers, **HUGO LATIMERUS**, teaches things similar to these in his *Sermon on Septuagesima Sunday*; likewise in the first *Sermon on the Lord's Prayer*; also in the *Sixth Sermon*.

In subsequent times, not only did **PETRUS BARO** (concerning whom there exist various accounts in Henricus Alting's *Theologia Historica*, Loc. IV, p. 305-306, and the *History of the Lambeth Articles*, p. 1 to 8) dispute with William Whitaker on this matter; But also **LANCELOTUS ANDREWES**, Bishop of Winchester, in his *Judgment on the Lambeth Articles*, p. 23, 25, 26, not only states that the act of predestinating includes Christ and is not absolute, but relational, and that Christ was predestined first, then we through him; But he also adds these things about the series of Decrees:

“Others are accustomed to weave this series otherwise, each according to his own understanding. The Fathers seem to me to have been of the opinion that there would be no election unless it were woven thus: First, that God loves Christ, then us in Christ. Second, that being so graced, he endows with grace and faith. Third, that being so endowed and thus distinguished from the rest, he elects. Fourth, that he predestines the Elect. Certainly the nature of Election demands this, which, where there is no difference at all between him who is elected and him who is rejected, can neither be nor be conceived. Nor did the Scholastics think otherwise. For that series of the more recent theologians plainly does away with all Election; by which it is posited that God, in a first and absolute act, simultaneously and at once, assigns these to Salvation, but those to everlasting perdition, with the men existing neither in any mass nor distinguished in any way by his gifts. After which assignment, I do not understand what place there can be for Election, or how that assignment itself can be called Election.”

JOHANNES OVERALLUS, formerly a Professor of Theology at the University of Cambridge, but afterwards Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, expresses the Opinion of the Anglican Church on Predestination and its related points from Article XVII of the Anglican Confession in his *Judgment* annexed to the Lambeth Articles, p. 43-44, thus:

“The order of our Divine Predestination in Article XVII seems to be intended as this: that God, foreseeing the Lapse of the human race,

decreed out of his mercy to send his Son for its remedy, and in him established the condition of Salvation; then he ordained for all in general, in greater and lesser measure, the necessary and sufficient means and aids to produce it in the souls of men, which means, more especially for these whom he chose in Christ out of the rest of the human race, he would crown by the largesse of a greater and more abundant Grace, according to his Good Pleasure, by which they would most certainly be led to faith, Perseverance, and eternal Salvation, and the rest would have nothing of which to complain, and it might be shown both what the free Will of man, left to itself under the Aids of common and sufficient Grace, could do, and also what the Benefit of special and efficacious Grace, bestowed upon those with whom it pleased God, could do. Thus, not only concerning the first man, but also concerning the rest that followed, the Opinion of Augustine is true: *Thus God, the Lord of all, ordained the Life of angels and men, that in it he might first show what their free Will could do, and then what the Benefit of his Grace and the Judgment of his Justice could do.* Thus God is the Savior of all men, but especially of the Faithful: by which Apostolic Opinion Prosper judged this whole cause should be terminated.”

A fuller *Exposition of the Divine Decrees in the Matter of Predestination* by the same man exists in the *Epistles of Excellent and Erudite Men*, Ep. CCX, p. 353-354-355.

At the **Synod of Dort**, the most Eminent English Theologians, **GEORGIUS CARLETON**, Bishop of Llandaff, **D. JOHANNES DAVENANTIUS**, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, **D. SAMUEL WARDUS**, Professor of Theology at Cambridge, **D. THOMAS GOADUS**, and **GUALTERUS BALCANQUALLUS**, with the approval of the Most Serene **KING JAMES** and the **ARCHBISHOP** of Canterbury, publicly proposed and defended this Opinion, which is evident from their *Judgment on the Second Article* in the *Acts of the Synod of Dort*, Thesis III, p. 602-603:

“God, having pitied the lapsed human race, sent his son, who gave himself as a price of Redemption for the sins of the whole world. In this oblation of Christ we consider two things: The manner of calling men to the actual participation of this sacrifice, and the fruit from this same sacrifice flowing back to men in different ways. As to the manner, there is no mortal who cannot be truly and seriously called by the Ministers of the Gospel to the participation of the remission of sins and eternal life through this death of Christ, Acts 13:38-39; John 3:17. For there is nothing false or simulated underlying the Gospel, but whatever is offered or promised in it to men by the Ministers, is in the same way offered and promised to them by the Author of the Gospel.

As to the fruit, from the death of Christ, in which is contained an infinite treasure of merits and spiritual Blessings, the actual fruit flows back to men in that manner, and in that measure, and by those means, by which it has seemed good to God himself. Moreover, it has seemed good to God, even after this sacrifice was accepted, that the remission of sins and eternal life should not be actually conferred on anyone otherwise than through Faith in the same Redeemer. And here that eternal and secret Decree of Election reveals itself, since that price which was paid for all, and which will certainly profit all who believe unto eternal Life, does not, however, profit all, because it is not given to all to fulfill this condition of the gratuitous Covenant.”

That this was not the private Opinion of those five Deputies to the Synod, but also of the Archbishop of Canterbury of that time, and of the Most Serene and Potent King James himself, is not obscurely gathered from the Epistle of these five British Theologians to the Archbishop of Canterbury (which exists in the *Ecclesiastical and Theological Epistles of Excellent and Erudite Men*, p. 561), in which they address him thus:

“What Your Grace, with the highest care and most exact judgment, wrote down for us to explain certain difficulties concerning the second Article, we have received with the most grateful spirit, as we ought, and where the place shall be opportune, we will most gladly with all reverence observe. In the meantime, we do not doubt that Y. G. will approve of the more circumspect course of action, by which we have hitherto taken care, not only that we should not use those instructions of Y. G. except privately among ourselves; but also that we should not approve by our votes and the subscription of our hands those more rigid theses, which condemn the contrary ones in the doctrine of the price of the Oblation of our Savior Christ, for public release. The Lord Ambassador increased this our caution by his most recent letters, in which he admonished us how seriously and diligently the King willed it to be observed that, before the Synod should establish anything about the death of Christ, which we were to follow, we should strive with all effort, that no other Conclusions should be formed, nor prescribed in other formulas or modes, than those which, as nearly as could be done, agreed with those which the Fathers in the primitive Church used against the Pelagians, and by no means with any new phrase of a more recent age: and that they should recede as little as possible from the Confessions of the Anglican Church, and of the other Reformed Churches; finally, that it be done with the least possible offense to the Lutheran Churches.”

After the Synod, **Joh. Davenantius** in his *Animadversions*, opposed to a certain anonymous *Treatise on the Love of God towards the Human Race*, in the English tongue in the year 1641, praises this Synodical Opinion of the English Theologians and that of Joh. Overall in these words, p. 200:

“Thus our Anglican Theologians describe it in their suffrages (at the Synod of Dort). Thus the Reverend and most judicious Bishop of Norwich explained it, when he determined that both the Remonstrants and the Puritans, as he called them, strayed from the middle way of truth, which the Anglican Church holds against both. In Election, he argued the error of the Remonstrants was that they found the absolute Decree of particular Election in the Foreknowledge of the Faith and Perseverance of the Elect. His own opinion, on the contrary, and that of the Anglican Church, is the same as Augustine's, that Election does not find men Faithful, but makes them so. The errors of the Puritans, however (in this Doctrine at least), he reduced to these heads: that they excluded the Conditional Decree of the Evangelical Promises, and that they inverted the Order of the Decree of Predestination by placing it before the lapse of man and the Decree of the Incarnation of Christ.”

The same **Joh. Davenantius** and **JOSEPHUS HALLUS**, Bishop of Exeter, professed the same Truth in their Judgments sent to Hermannus Hildebrandus in Bremen, which exist in Herm. Hildebrand's *Orthodox Declaration of the Three Articles*, p. 27 ff. and 34 ff. Josephus Hallus also, although he did not remain at Dort until the end of the Synod of Dort, nevertheless subscribes to the Judgment of his British colleagues, here cited. For thus he writes in his *Judgment on Ecclesiastical Peace* to John Durie:

“If anyone should ask what I think about Predestination; I roundly profess that I adhere to the Articles of the Anglican Church and to the Opinion of the Theologians of our Britain who gave their suffrage at the Synod of Dort (at which I was present).”

The Most Reverend Archbishop of Armagh, **JACOBUS USSERIUS**, approves the same, in a special Treatise whose Title is: *The Extent of the Death of Christ*; that **ROBERTUS SANDERSON**, sometime Bishop of Lincoln, approved this opinion, is reported in his *Life*, p. 27, 48. **THOMAS BEDFORDUS** in his most learned Treatise, *Vindiciae Gratiae Sacramentalis*, p. 42:

“That formula of some, "Provided that no Obstacle is placed," does not please me, he says. Lest perhaps someone (as some do) should seek the obstacle in the Decree of God rather than in the act of man. For there are those who fetch the obstacle from the Decree of

Reprobation: As if God in the Sacraments does not offer Grace to all to whom they are communicated, but only to certain ones; And that, not so much from the fault of the man not paying attention, as from the will of God not intending any good for them, not even under a condition. Which seems to me to have been said incautiously and inconsiderately. Without a doubt, Christ is extended and offered no less in the Sacraments than in the word of the Gospel to anyone, to be truly exhibited and applied, provided he does not place an obstacle for himself.”

From that time, most of the Theologians and Bishops in England, among whom are eminent **D. HENRICUS HAMMONDUS, JEREMIAS TAYLOR, JOSEPHUS MEDUS, ISAACUS BARROW, JOHANNES PEARSON, HENRICUS MORUS, JOHANNES TILLOTSON, EDWARDUS STILLINGFLEET, GILBERTUS BURNET, EDWARDUS FOWLER, ROGERIUS BOYLE, BRIANUS TURNERUS, THOMAS PIERCE, GEORGIUS BULLUS**, have approved and defended this Order of the Divine Decrees; with only this distinction, that some approach more nearly to the Greeks, Scotists, Franciscans, Jesuits, Lutherans and Remonstrants (as far as the sum of the matter is concerned), and a Conditional Decree and a Sufficient Grace that is only efficacious in the event; but some, while admitting a Conditional Decree and a Universal Sufficient Grace, nevertheless, with respect to the Elect, also acknowledge an intrinsically Efficacious Grace, or a further degree of Grace. See Henricus Morus, *Theological Works*, Book X, Chap. II, §. VII, & Chap. IV, V, p. 408, 411, 413, 414. And Thomas Pierce, *Pacification of Orthodox Theology*, Corpusculum Chap. VIII, §. II, p. 45, 46 ff.

And that not only Episcopal Theologians, but at least some Presbyterians, think thus is made credible by **RICHARDUS BAXTER** in his book whose title is *The Saints' Everlasting Rest*; in whose Preface, no. 5, of the Dutch edition, he expresses his mind in brief words (omitted in the German Translation) thus:

The Middle Way, which Camero, Ludovicus Crocius, Martinius, Amyraldus, Davenantius and all the theologians of England and Bremen, at the Synod of Dort, hold, I think, comes nearest to the Truth, of all those who have written about these Points of Redemption and universal Grace.

(λ) The FRENCH (Gallicans)

In **FRANCE**, very many Reformed Theologians have given their approval to this opinion. We could indeed count **Joh. Calvin** himself among these. For it is certain that Calvin, among other things pointing to this, teaches:

1. That God, after the Lapse of the First-formed, promised and offered that blessed Seed of the Woman to all men in general, as far as the Human Race shall be propagated.
2. That Christ died most sufficiently for all men.
3. Whence he does not restrict the Words: *World, Many, Sheep*, to the Elect alone, but takes them as for all.
4. He states that the Grace of God is offered to all promiscuously, so that it is Ours to embrace it.
5. That the Promises of Grace are Universal, and that they are offered to all sincerely, and not deceitfully.
6. That it is accidental and Adventitious to the Call that many who are Called perish.
7. That our Election was made with a view to Christ.
8. That those perish twice, who, having been Called, refused to come.
9. That the Grace of God is Universal: *I so confess the Grace of God to be universal, that I add, however, that the distinction lies in this, that not all are called according to the (Special) purpose of God.*

Because, however, he seems to be fixed in the Doctrine of the Decree of God, and here some other things come to be considered, leaving Calvin's Opinion in the middle for now, we will press on with the Consensus of other French Theologians.

JOH. CAMERO, in his Works, p. 529, sets the Series of Decrees thus:

“The first Decree is about restoring the image of God in the creature, yet with God's justice being saved. The second is about sending the son, who is to save all and every one who believes in him, that is, who are his members. The third is about making men fit for believing. The fourth is about saving those who believe. The first two Decrees are general, the latter two are Special.”

Following him is **MOSES AMYRALDUS**, who states:

1. That God decreed to create the World, to testify to his Goodness, and to create man in his own image and for happiness, which, by using his natural powers well, he could have rendered perpetual for himself.
2. That he decreed to leave the First-formed to their own Will, and to permit them to fall.

3. That he decreed to give his Son to all, with the condition of Faith and Repentance annexed.
4. That he decreed to invite all men to Faith and Repentance.
5. That God, foreseeing the natural and moral Hardness and unbelief of all, decreed to elect some of these Called, with the others being left in their own obstinacy and damned on account of their unbelief.

Which things Frid. Spanheim also reports in his *Exercitationes on Universal Grace*, Sect. XVI, p. 683 f. 684. Which hypothesis of his Amyraldus defended in various Writings and vindicated against Dr. Spanheim. See also the same man on the Secession from the Roman Church and on the reason for establishing peace among the Evangelicals, p. 162, 163, 164.

JOH. DALLÆUS, in his *Apology for the Synods of Alençon and Charenton*, Part III, p. 524-525, considers that the whole matter can be settled most briefly and simply with two Decrees.

“By the first of these, God decreed to create man in a state of nature, furnished with that grace, freedom of will, and power, which was sufficient for this, that he, if he willed, might remain in natural happiness and integrity. By the latter, however, from the permitted and foreseen lapse of man into the transgression of the natural covenant and into the misery opposite to natural happiness, he decreed to give to the whole race of men, through his son, the same one as a Savior and Mediator and light, the power to emerge from misery into a state of supernatural blessedness through faith and repentance; but also, with the abuse of this universal common benefit being permitted and foreseen, to elect from the whole race of mortals a certain number of them out of his mere good pleasure, and to mercifully, certainly, and (as they say) infallibly bestow upon them, by a singular grace, all those things in which Salvation is contained—faith, repentance, and a blessed Resurrection to eternal glory; but to most justly pass by, reprobate, and finally eternally damn the rest.”

PAULUS TESTARDUS subscribes to this in his *Synopsis of the Doctrine of Nature and Grace*, no. 278, where he teaches:

“The first Decree of God concerning man is that by which he resolved to create man in a state of integral and mutable nature. This Decree was followed by the foreknowledge of the lapse of Adam, sinning freely, and plunging himself and the whole human race to be propagated from him by the natural law of generation into the deep abyss of misery. To this foreknowledge, however, he subjoins in God an affect of mercy towards the human race. Whence he says the

second Decree arose, which he divides into several parts, namely into the purpose:

1. *Of giving Christ to the world as Mediator, Victim, and treasure of Grace.*
2. *Of justifying and glorifying believers who are made one with Christ by Faith, according to the measure of revelation and testimony; and of condemning by unbelief those who reject grace, and of punishing them with eternal pains.*
3. *Of testifying to the world of the Grace prepared in Christ by means in themselves sufficient to elicit faith to at least some degree.*
4. *Of efficaciously calling certain ones from the world, which does not comprehend the light shining in the darkness, and which miserably abuses the testimony of grace that is sufficient in itself, and who would otherwise perish in unbelief with the rest, who are no better than they, and therefore of justifying and glorifying them; and of leaving the rest to the hardness of their own hearts, of forsaking, hardening, and damning them, and therefore also of punishing them with eternal pains."*

LUDOVICUS LE BLANC, sometime Theologian of Sedan, not only recounts these things, but also assents to them in his *Theological Theses on the Order of the Divine Decrees*, p. 154-155, and *Whether and to what extent the Faithful are bound to keep God's Law*, p. 581, §. VII.

Furthermore, **LUDOVICUS CAPPELLUS** proves this Order of the Divine Decrees in the Collection of the Theological Theses of Saumur, Part II, in the Theological Theses on Election and Reprobation, first Part, Constructive Section, Theses XXXII, XXXIII, XXXIV, p. 107:

"And so if some order of the Decrees of God is to be established, not with respect to God himself, but with respect to us, and according to our mode of conceiving and considering, (for in God himself all his Decrees are one and the same most simple Act of his will), this one seems altogether most convenient to God's Wisdom, as well as his Goodness, and his Justice, namely that first of all he decreed to create the World and in it man, to whom he would communicate himself through Goodness, and by that Communication demonstrate his Power, Goodness and Wisdom; Then, he resolved to permit to himself man, having been created and placed in a Natural and therefore mutable state, and not to prevent him from falling or from declining from that state, by which he might demonstrate his right and dominion, and his most absolute liberty over his Creatures, by which he is bound to no one; Third, he decreed to have mercy on man, who was enticed into sin by the fraud of the Devil, and through sin had prolapsed with all his posterity into eternal misery, that is, to snatch him from that misery (by which he would declare himself not only

good, but also supremely merciful), provided that his Justice, violated by sin, should be satisfied for the sinners in some convenient manner, for his Justice did not suffer that man should be liberated without a sufficient Satisfaction. Fourth, since neither man himself, nor any other, could make satisfaction for them, he decreed to send Christ, who would make satisfaction for all sinners promiscuously, provided they should believe and be led by true repentance. Finally, because no one was going to believe, nor could believe (on account of inborn corruption and naturally inherent perversity), he decreed to give to certain ones, whom he willed, faith, by which, being ingrafted into Christ and applying his Satisfaction, they might enjoy the Benefit of that Satisfaction through the fullest absolution from all sins and the true Sanctification and eternal Glorification consequent to it.”

JOSUÉ PLACÆUS concurs in a special Treatise, whose title is: *A Defense of the Opinion of Josué de la Place on the Order of God's Decrees*. Also devoted to this hypothesis is **CRECUTUS**.

JOH. CLAUDE, *Posthumous Works*, Vol. IV, *Dissertation on Election & Reprobation*, p. 448, makes the first Decree about creating the World. 2. About not preventing the lapse of the first man. 3. The Decree about sending the son into the world. 4. The Decree about calling all men to faith and repentance, and through faith and repentance to Salvation. 5. The Decree of the Election of certain men to faith and Conversion through the Holy Spirit, together with the leaving of the others and the destination of the Reprobate to eternal death on account of their impenitence.

The same man, in his *Posthumous Works*, Vol. III, *Treatise on Jesus Christ*, book IV, Ch. XV, §. II, p. 149-150, declares the other Opinion to be contrary to Scripture in these French words:

According to this hypothesis, rigidly proposed & rigidly maintained, one must place in the Order of the Divine Decrees the sending of Jesus Christ into the World after the Decree of Election. For Jesus Christ is considered, according to this opinion, only as a means to execute the Decree of Election. However, it is certain that Scripture makes us conceive of the sending of Jesus Christ, in the ideas of God, as anterior to the Decree of Election. Saint Paul in Eph. I says that God has elected us in Jesus Christ before the foundation of the World; which cannot be understood, in whatever manner one takes it, without placing Jesus Christ in the Order of the Divine Decrees as anterior to Election. For if one says that God, being himself in Christ, has elected us, Christ is therefore before Election; and likewise if one says that God has elected us in order to put us in Christ, Christ is also before Election, since the

terminus ad quem, as one says, of our Election, is our communion with Jesus Christ.

Above all, he urges this in Vol. I, p. 181-182, Proposition III:

“The first Article states that the sending of Jesus Christ into the World is anterior to Election & to Reprobation. --

1. This Truth appears from the Passage of the 1st Ch. of Ephesians where it is said that God has elected us in Christ; which supposes that Jesus Christ was already in the intention of God, before the Choice which he made of men.

2. The same thing appears from the VIII of Romans where the Apostle says that God has predestined us to be rendered conformed to the image of his Son; which supposes again that Jesus Christ was in the intention of God before our Predestination, since he is the original, to the conformity of which we have been predestined.

3. This same thing is justified by all that we have just said concerning the principle by which Jesus Christ was sent into the World, which according to Scripture is the general Love that God had for men. For this Love cannot but be conceived as before the Decree of Election and of Reprobation, since Reprobation renders the Reprobate Objects of the hatred of God, & consequently deprives them even of that general Love that God had for all men.

4. This Truth is also justified by what we have said concerning the Call, which is general & indifferent to every kind of man. For if Jesus Christ was sent subsequent to the Decree of Election, & if the end of his sending is only to execute the Election, this Restriction of his sending for the Elect alone cannot naturally suffer that he be proposed & offered to others than the Elect, for the reasons that we have already put forward.

5. But this is verified again by what Saint Paul teaches us in Rom. IX concerning Election and Reprobation: For he wills on one side that Election be a free act of the Mercy of God, who decrees to bend the heart of some to the Faith, & who at the same time decrees by another act of his free Justice to harden the others, that is to say, to leave them in their hardening and in their unbelief: He has, he says, mercy on whom he will & he hardens whom he will. ---

p. 184. Finally, this first Article will appear incontestable to those who will consider what the Gospel is & what the Decrees of Election and of

Reprobation are. For as to the Gospel, it is a new Right, or a new Law, that God has established after the violation of the Law of Nature; a new Law which consists in these two clauses: *Whoever believes will be saved, & whoever does not believe will be condemned; both of which are founded on the sending of Jesus Christ. But as to Election and Reprobation, these are Acts of God which regulate the fact, and if I dare say it, the fate of each person in particular, determining those who will believe & who will be saved & those who will not believe & who by their unbelief will perish, etc., etc.*"

Cf. Vol. II, p. 30-31. That **DAVIDEM BLONDELLUM** was devoted to this hypothesis clearly shines forth from his *Authentic Acts*, and his *Preface* affixed to Daillé's *Apology for the two Synods*. Likewise most recently Mister **BEAUSOBRE** in the *French Treatise Defense of the Doctrine of the Reformers, etc.*, proves the same hypothesis, p. 288, 289, 376.

(μ) The DUTCH

(μ) In HOLLANDIA, that not a few favored this hypothesis from the beginning of the Reformation is reported by the Most Illustrious States of Holland and West Friesland themselves in a Letter to the Most Serene and Potent King of England, James, in the year 1618; in which they speak thus:

“The matter stands thus. From the beginning of the purified Religion among us, both among the Pastors and among the faithful people, there has been a variation in Opinions concerning the business of Predestination and what is connected to it. For some approved those dogmas which have acquired for themselves no small dignity from the authority of Calvin, Beza, and others, namely the same which the learned Men Whitakerus and Perkinsius defended in England; Others, dissenting from these, praised for their own opinion Authors not to be scorned: Erasmus, Melanchthon, Bullinger, and others. And although in Gelderland and also in Friesland it is apparent from published Books that there were not lacking Pastors who defended this latter opinion; nevertheless in Holland and West Friesland and in the Province of Utrecht the number of those thinking thus was always greater: and partly still living, and partly departed are Professors and Pastors who thirty and forty years ago publicly followed this manner of teaching, with no one on that account raising a dispute against them.”

—Epistles of Excellent and Erudite Men, Ep. CCCV, p. 499.

Nor is the SYNOD OF DORT itself alien to this doctrine, if its Canons are considered literally and without the bias of parties. For thus Chapter I, on Divine Predestination, the first five Articles, word for word:

1. Since all men have sinned in Adam and have been made liable to the curse and to eternal death, God would have done no injury to anyone if he had willed to leave the entire human race in sin and under the curse, and to condemn it on account of sin, according to those words of the Apostle, *The whole world is liable to the condemnation of God*, Rom. 3:19. *All have sinned and fall short of the glory of God*, v. 23. And, *the wages of sin is death*, Rom. 6:23.
2. But in this the love of God was made manifest, that he sent his only-begotten son into the world, so that *whoever believes in him should not perish, but have eternal life*, 1 John 4:9, John 3:16.
3. But so that men may be brought to faith, God clemently sends heralds of this most joyful news, to whom he wills and when he wills, by whose ministry men are called to repentance and faith in Christ crucified. For

how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? etc., Rom. 10:14-15.

4. Upon those who do not believe this Gospel, the wrath of God remains. But those who receive it and embrace the Savior Jesus with a true and living faith, are through him delivered from the wrath of God and from destruction, and are endowed with eternal life.
5. The cause or guilt of that unbelief, as of all other sins, is in no way in God, but in man. But faith in Jesus Christ, and salvation through Him, is the gratuitous gift of God; as it is written, *By grace you have been saved through faith, and this is not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, Eph. 2:8.* Likewise, *It has been granted to you freely to believe in Christ, Phil. 1:29.*

Chapter II, canons III, IV, V, VI, teaches that the Sufficiency of Christ's Death for all should be proposed promiscuously to all who are called, by which it comes to pass that those who perish, perish not from a defect or insufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ offered on the Cross, but by their own fault. Chapter III & IV, Canons VIII & IX, teach that however many are called, are called seriously, and indeed to faith and salvation, and that the guilt of their destruction is not in the Gospel, nor in Christ, nor in God, but in the called themselves, etc.

Where it should be observed that the Synod in Chapter I teaches:

1. That with the lapsed Adam all men have sinned.
2. That God could indeed have cast off the human race, but did not cast it off, but loved the human race and sent to it his only-begotten son.
3. That God decreed that Men should be called promiscuously to Repentance and Faith in Christ crucified.
4. That finally, in the sixth and seventh Articles, it deals with Election.

Indeed, the most celebrated Ludovicus Crocius, Theologian of Bremen, who was himself present at the Synod, did not receive the mind of the Synod otherwise, in his Assertion of the Augustan Confession, Corollary or Consideration of the Anti-Crocius of Mentzer, §. CLXVIII, p. 500, where he speaks in this manner:

“I can testify with a safe and sound conscience, that it was neither the purpose of the Synod of Dort to deny that Christ is the foundation of Election, nor to define this Order of the divine decrees, by which the Decree of sending Christ is stated to be posterior to the Decree of Election. For which reason also it descends from the permission of the Lapse, the mission of Christ, and the promulgation of the Gospel, as things presupposed in the Counsel of God, to the Decree of Election and Reprobation; as is evident from the first chapter, Canons I, II, III,

IV, V, VI, VII. But that it deals with the Death of Christ only in the second chapter, was done because the order of the Canons does not regard the order of the Decrees of GOD, but the order of the questions agitated in Belgium and comprehended in the Hague Conference.”

That this was and is the mind of the Synod is also taught by Paulus Steinius, who was also himself among the Fathers of the Synod; Part III of *The Evangelical Brotherhood*, Chap. II, p. 51:

“We, for our part, which Mentzer should well mark and take note of, place the election of grace not before, but after, the decree of God concerning the sending of the Messiah and its announcement through the preaching of the Gospel, so and in such a way that the election of grace is nothing other than the decree of God by which he has resolved to give true faith in Christ to some, and to kindle it in their hearts through the preaching of the Gospel, inasmuch as the conclusion made at DORDRECHT also implies this, since in it, immediately upon the Fall is placed the sending of the Messiah into this world, through which God the Lord has revealed his love towards the fallen Human Race, and its announcement in the preaching of the Gospel, namely that all those who will believe in Him shall have eternal life through Him, but upon the unbeliever, the wrath of GOD shall remain. And upon this, now further in the said Synodal conclusion, mention is first made of the Providence of God, whence it comes that some are endowed by God with true faith, as is to be read concerning this in the 1st head of Doctrine, articles I, II, III, IV, V, VI.”

Nor did the Theologians of Great Britain understand and approve the mind of the Synod otherwise. See the Epistle of Georgius, Bishop of Llandaff, to Dudley Carleton, Ambassador of the King of Great Britain; likewise to the Archbishop of Canterbury; likewise the Epistle of Gualterus Balcanquallus to the same Dudley Carleton in the *Ecclesiastical and Theological Epistles of Excellent and Erudite Men*, p. 543, 544, 549, 559, 561, 562, 563.

Joh. Dallæus, who although he himself was not present at this Synod, was nevertheless living at the time the Synod was held, thinks the same, *Apology for the Synods of Alençon & Charenton*, Part IV, p. 619:

“Although the Synod (of Dort) did not clearly and distinctly define what the order of the Divine Decrees is; nevertheless it not obscurely favors that order which the brethren follow, right at the very threshold; since, after it has established that all men sinned in Adam and were made guilty of the curse and of eternal death, it immediately

adds: But in this the love of God was made manifest, that he sent his only-begotten Son into the World, so that whoever believes in him should not perish. For since it sets up these things thus, it seems altogether to state that God, after the foreseen lapse of men, immediately and without mediation resolved to send the Son into the World to all those men whom he had said had lapsed in Adam, that is, to the universal human race, which could justly be left in sin and the curse and be damned on account of sin. But that certain and definite counsel of saving certain ones by name, that is, the Decree of Election, it then only commemorates in the sixth Canon, after it has recounted the rebellion of men and of many against the Gospel, and the faith of certain ones from the grace of God; And here, it says, the profound and equally merciful and just distinction of men, equally lost, especially reveals itself to us; or that Decree of Election and Reprobation revealed in the Word of God. And how agreeable these things are to that order of the Divine decrees which we have explained above from the hypothesis of the brethren, anyone can easily understand for himself.”

The same man, *ibid.* p. 970-971, having cited the Words of the Synod of Dort, also produced by us here, adds these things:

“This the Synod (has); whose opposition, which is instituted between them by the adversative particle "But," altogether requires that in the second part of the Sentence that is denied to have been done which the first said could have been done: and so it is signified that God by no means willed to leave the universal human race in sin and to damn it on account of sin; but manifested his Charity, or love, for it in this, that he sent his Son into the World to liberate that universal human race in such a way that whoever believes in him might be snatched from the destruction owed to all, and have eternal Life. Therefore the Synod states that Will and love of God towards the universal race of men, which man's unbelief alone prohibits from being given salvation. From which this also follows, that the fact that men remain in that Destruction, from which there is liberation, remedy and salvation in the Lord Christ, happens not by the Will of GOD, but by their own unbelief and impenitence alone.”

The Canons of the Synod of Dort are also interpreted in this sense by the Blessed Dr. Joh. Bergius, in *The Will of God for the Salvation of all Men*, Chap. XXI, p. 265-266, and Dr. Conradus Bergius, *Praxis Catholica*, Dissert. VI, §. CLIII to CLXXVI, p. 825 to 856. Confer also on the Synod of Dort, the *Authentic Acts* of David Blondel, p. 11, 12, 13.

That the Synod of Dort establishes our opinion is not denied by Dr. Balthasar Mentzerus in his Triad of Theological Disputations on the Eternal Election of the Sons of GOD to Eternal Life; in the first of which he exhibits the Lutheran Language of the Synod of Dort on Predestination; where in Thesis IV, p. 3, he speaks thus:

“Immediately at the beginning the Synod teaches that Election or Predestination was made from the human race that had prolapsed into sin.”

Thesis XV, p. 7: SECONDLY the Synod teaches:

“In this the Charity of GOD was made manifest, that he sent his only-begotten Son into the world, so that whoever believes in him should not perish, but have eternal life, 1 John 4:9, John 3:16.”

Th. XVI:

“That the universal love of God towards the whole world, or the whole human race, or all men in the world, is commended here is gathered from this, because in Chap. II, Art. III, these express words are placed: This death of the Son of God (in whose mission that charity of God was made manifest) is the one and most perfect victim and satisfaction for our sins, of infinite value and price, abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world.”

And Art. V:

“The Promise of the Gospel ought to be announced and proposed promiscuously and indiscriminately to all peoples and men to whom God in his good pleasure sends the Gospel, with the command of Repentance and Faith.”

Th. XXVII:

“THIRDLY the Synod teaches that GOD elected us to Salvation in Christ, whom he also from eternity constituted as Mediator and Head of all the Elect and foundation of salvation. Which words are had in Chap. I, Art. VII, p. 341.”

Th. XXXIV, p. 8:

“FOURTHLY the Synod teaches that the death of the Son of God is the one and most perfect victim and satisfaction for sins, of infinite value and price, abundantly sufficient to expiate the sin of the whole world,

Chap. II, on the Death of Christ and the redemption of men through it, Art. III.”

Th. XXXXII, p. 10:

“FIFTHLY the Synod teaches, Chap. II, Art. V, that the promise of the Gospel ought to be announced and proposed promiscuously and indiscriminately to all peoples and men to whom God in his good pleasure sends the Gospel, with the command of Repentance and Faith.”

Th. LIV, p. 13:

“SIXTHLY, so that men may be brought to faith, God clemently sends heralds of this most joyful news to whom he wills, and when he wills, by whose Ministry men are called to Repentance and Faith in Christ crucified, Rom. 10:14-15. The words are of the Synod, Chap. I, Art. III, & Chap. III & IV, Art. VI.”

Th. LXII, p. 14:

“SEVENTHLY the Synod teaches: Just as it has pleased God to begin this work of his grace in us through the preaching of the Gospel, so through the hearing, reading, meditation, exhortations, threats, promises of the same, and also through the use of the Sacraments, he preserves, continues and perfects it. The words are of the Synod, on the perseverance of the Saints, Art. XIV, p. 372.”

Th. LXXIII, p. 16:

“EIGHTHLY the Synod teaches, Chap. II, Art. VI: That many called by the Gospel do not repent, nor believe in Christ, but perish in unbelief, does not happen from a defect or insufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ offered on the cross, but from their own fault.”

Th. LXXIV: And Chap. III & IV, Art. IX:

“That many called by the Ministry of the Gospel do not come and are not converted; the Fault of this is not in the Gospel, nor in Christ offered through the Gospel, nor in God calling through the Gospel and also conferring various gifts upon them; But in the Called themselves, etc.”

In respect of this Truth, Dr. Mentzer judges the Synod of Dort worthy of praise and exhorts that the Reformed should constantly and sincerely defend that Truth. Ibid. Th. XIV, 42.

This Judgment of Dr. Mentzer on the Synod of Dort also exists in Joh. Polyander's *Miscellaneous Theological Treatises*, first Treatise. Besides Gerh. Joh. Vossius, *History of Pelagianism*, Book VII, Part I, Theses I, II, III, IV, the *Tuba Pacis Clangens* follows our Method in Belgium, likewise: *A Brief Information to the Church of The Hague, concerning the Livid Libel of an Anonymous author, Spread against the outline of sound words of The Hague in the year 1642*, written in Dutch.

Dr. Antonius Walæus, *Loci Communes*, on Election, Vol. I of his Works, p. 330, writes thus:

“That we were elected before our Head was elected does not seem agreeable to the nature of a Head, which, as it is first in dignity, is also first in order. 2. Paul says that we were predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, so that he himself might be the firstborn among many brethren, Rom. 8:29. But to be predestined so that we may be conformed to an image presupposes that image already; and how is the firstborn who is among brethren constituted as the lastborn on account of the brethren? 3. And those who think otherwise will experience a difficulty very hard to solve, which our adversaries weave here; namely, that God thus destined salvation for us while his justice was safe, without a Satisfaction for the sins of those to be elected yet having been destined, which is sharply urged by them. Let the Wise judge whether these things do not confirm our hypothesis.”

The Synopsis Purioris Theologiae of the Leiden theologians has similar things, Disp. XXIV, §. XXIII, XXIV, XXV, p. 299-300.

The same Walæus, in his Response to the Censure of Corvinus, Vol. II of his Works, p. 241, Col. I:

“We do not properly have a question with you about the Order of the Decrees, but about the cause and foundation of the Decrees.”

Ibid. p. 242, col. II, Paragr. XXIV & XXV:

“Corvinus says that the Order of Decrees which our theologians State, fights with the Wisdom of GOD. But we have already said several times before and here repeat again, that we do not properly dispute about the order of the Decrees, provided the foundation of Grace, which is truly Grace, is preserved in this Order.”

Nor does Andreas Rivetus disapprove of this hypothesis, in his Works, Vol. II, in the Thirteen Disputations on the Just and Gracious Dispensation of GOD concerning the Salvation of the Human Race, Disputation VI, Theses IX, X, XI:

“There are others, he says, who, rejecting that first absolute decree, and rightly so, make the conditional decree so common to all men that they assert that the counsel of God the Father in delivering the Son to death and of the Son in undergoing the same, and their intention and scope, was to acquire, impetrate and merit for all and every sinful man by that most precious death and passion, that, if they repent, when they are capable of doctrine, and believe in Christ, they might be able to be reconciled with God and receive the Remission of sins: They deny, however, that actual Reconciliation with God or the remission of sins or eternal life was actually acquired or impetrated for those who remain in impenitence.

Th. XI: Since these deny that Christ died equally for the impious and the pious, and affirm that only the pious may glory in the satisfaction of Christ, because the principal fruit and efficacy of the satisfaction comes to them, they agree in sense with all other Orthodox on that point, even if they differ in their mode of speaking; especially since they acknowledge a certain special decree, according to which he died specially for the elect alone, by which they are brought not only to the common, but also to the singular benefits, namely the Grace of Regeneration and of efficacious Calling, of Justification and of Glorification; and to the merit of Christ's death they assign the true and efficacious communion, bestowal and Application of saving Grace, and the donation of Faith itself, by which the Application is made.”

See also Henr. Alting's *Problematicam Novam*, Loc. IV, Probl. VIII, p. 260, & *Appendix Problematum*, p. 307.

§. X.

The Form of Predestination is the Before-the-Ages Distinction of men from one another, and on the one hand, the Ordination of the Elect to eternal Life; on the other hand, with respect to the Reprobate, the adjudication of Death on account of Sins, made by way of a just Punishment.

Which the Church of Lyon expressed excellently against John Scotus Eriugena, p. 592:

“There is no contention among us whether, that is, they can be called Predestinations in the plural or cannot: Provided that we faithfully and firmly hold this one thing, that by one and the same Judgment and counsel of Divine Foreknowledge and Predestination, two things are to be most certainly fulfilled; that is, both that the just are preordained to eternal Glory, and that the iniquitous who persevere

in their impieties even unto death are destined for eternal Punishments. For Scripture says both of these most openly—of the just: *And as many as were ordained to eternal Life, believed*; Of the impious who are to be justly damned: *God endured with much patience the vessels of wrath fitted for destruction*. For thus this both is accomplished in the elect and the reprobate by one and the same effect of Divine Predestination and Judgment, just as by one and the same Ray of the Sun both healthy eyes are invigorated and weak ones are irritated; Just as also by one and the same fire both the clay applied to it is hardened, and the wax is melted. Let it also deign to be acknowledged that one must think of God's Predestination just as one thinks of his justice, which, since it is one and always has itself in one and the same way, manifestly receives a twofold distribution, since by it either rewards are bestowed upon the worthy, or punishments upon the unworthy.”

Ibid. p. 594, after the middle:

“His Predestination pertains either to the condition and governance of creatures, which is certainly good and just, or principally and most of all to his works or judgments, which he performs or will perform in the rational creature, namely angelic and human: while from them he justifies some through Grace and makes them blessed, and others he forsakes and condemns through Justice: Because both their good things, that is, of holy men and Holy Angels, are his gifts or rewards: And the evil things of the others, that is, eternal Punishments, are his just retribution, who disposes all things justly. And for that reason his Predestination is always to be understood in good things, always in his own works, which he exercises in the rational creature, as has been said, either mercifully or justly, which things he both foreknew in predestining and eternally predestined in foreknowing.”

Likewise p. 598 f. 599:

“The End is, on the one hand, on the part of God, the praise of the glorious Grace of God, and on the part of Men, eternal salvation; on the other hand, the praise of the glorious Justice of God.”

This will become more clear from the following special Consideration of Election and Reprobation.

Subsection IV.

SUMMARY.

§. I. That GOD, by an Ordering, Antecedent Will of Wisdom, wills the salvation of all men, which is apparent from the Universal, Sufficient ransom (λύτρον, lytron) of Christ, which all the Confessions of the Reformed assert, with the Lutheran Theologians confessing it.

§. II. What kind of sufficiency is required here? Not Potential, but Actual. Upon which are based the Universal Promises, limited by the Condition of Faith & Penitence.

§. III. That the general Promiscuous Vocation is most Serious & directed to salvation.

§. IV. That the Common Promiscuous Vocation is sufficient.

§. V. That there is nevertheless a Special, Abundant Grace, by which GOD, by means of His Word, actually converts the Elect.

§. I. And thus our Opinion on the Order of the Divine Decrees, we have, as we think, sufficiently proven, by both Divine and Ecclesiastical Authority. But because in the preceding Subsection III, §. VII, p. 60, and §. IX, no. 2, 3, 4, p. 64, 67, 69 to 76, we have taught that God, by his Antecedent, Ordaining, Legislative Will, wills that all men be saved, and has made this his Benevolent Will manifest to the World in the Mission of his Only-begotten Son, who, by paying a most sufficient ransom for the sins of all men, has thus far made satisfaction, so that through Faith and Repentance they may be saved; and also that God calls and pathetically invites men indiscriminately, not hypocritically, nor under an impossible Condition, but seriously and Sufficiently, to embrace Salvation through his Ministers—the Prophets, Apostles, and their Successors—with the command of Faith and Repentance; These Theses must now be confirmed by us. And indeed, that God wills all men to be saved, we have proven from Holy Scripture in the preceding Subsection III, N. II, p. 64-65, and that Christ paid a most sufficient ransom for all men, *ibid.* p. 67, 68, 69, N. III. We have adduced the Consensus of Augustine and his followers *ibid.* N. XIII, p. 87, 88, 89 ff. & p. 93, 94 ff. Therefore, we will confirm the same here with the Confessions and Catechisms of the Reformed Church.

In the **Colloquy of Leipzig**, concerning the fourth Article of the Augustan Confession, the delegates of Brandenburg and Hesse testified that they had hitherto always approved and taught it:

“That our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ died for all men and by his death made satisfaction most fully, most perfectly, and in itself most efficaciously for the sins of the whole world. And also that it is his simulated, but Serious will and command, that all men should believe in him and be saved through faith; So that no one is excluded from the efficacy and fruit of Christ's satisfaction, except he who excludes himself by his own unbelief.”

In the **Declaration of Thorn**, ch. IV, on Grace, the delegates of Brandenburg, Poland, and Lithuania say:

“We are falsely accused; As if we deny the Sufficiency of the death and Merit of Christ for all, or diminish its Virtue, when rather we teach here the same thing which the Synod of Trent itself teaches in Session V, Chapter III, namely, *And though Christ died for all, yet not all receive the benefit of his death, but those only to whom the Merit of his Passion is communicated.* We also confess that the Cause or Fault why it is not communicated to all is in no way in the Death and Merit of Christ, but in the men themselves.”

The **Helvetic Confession**, the first in the *Collection of Confessions*, agrees in Ch. XI, p. 16:

“Christ by his Passion and death has expiated sin, disarmed death, and broken condemnation and hell. etc. likewise: We teach and believe that Jesus Christ our Lord, the one and eternal, is the Savior of the human race, and therefore of the whole world.”

Ch. XIV, p. 25:

“We teach that access to God is always open to all sinners, and that he forgives all sins for all the faithful.”

Ch. XV, p. 26:

“For Christ took upon himself the sins of the World, and took them away, and satisfied divine justice.”

Ch. XXI, p. 49:

“Furthermore, that same one obeys the institution and command of the Lord, and with a joyful spirit gives thanks for his own redemption and that of the whole human race, and faithfully performs the memorial of the Lord's death, and attests before the Church, of whose body he is a member: It is also sealed to those receiving the Sacrament that the Body of the Lord was not only given for men in general and his blood shed, but particularly for every faithful communicant, whose food and drink it is unto eternal life.”

The **Brief, popular, and in God's word founded Confession of faith**, first printed in German in 1562 at Heidelberg, afterwards in the year 1601 at Herborn:

“Concerning the Efficacy of Christ's death, we believe that Christ's death is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, as John says, that is, not only for the sins of the Elect to whom he was writing, but also for all other men in the whole world even to its end, but that such propitiation profits no man, except him who believes in Christ: For it is written; *That all who believe in him should not perish, but have eternal life*, John 3:16. *but he who does not believe will be condemned*, Mark 16:16. likewise, *the wrath of God remains on him*, John 3:36, which indeed lay upon all men by nature, as Scripture testifies, *we are all by nature children of wrath*, Eph. 2:3.”

The **Christian Confession of Frederick III, Palatine Elector**, in the *Collection of Confessions of Geneva*, p. 148:

“I believe and confess that Jesus Christ died for us, to set us free from the curse which, through the sin of our first Parents Adam and Eve, had pervaded all men by hereditary succession.”

And *ibid.* p. 150:

“I believe and confess with mouth and pen, and also with heart and soul -- that the seed of the Woman, who is the Lord JESUS Christ, was slain, to provide full and perfect satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.”

The **Confession of Anhalt**, Ch. XI, on Predestination, p. 47:

“Predestination ought properly to be referred not to number, which in God is an act of the mind, but rather to the Counsel of his most free will. To the counsel, I say, or purpose, and the eternal and unmovable Decree of God, concerning that one and same way of receiving men into grace after the lapse, without respect of persons, and on account of the Son the Mediator alone, apprehended by true faith. Which way, revealed in the Gospel, as it is unchangeable, and can be neither overturned nor rendered void to the pious by any force or fraud of the Devil, nor by any bitterness of calamity: so it excludes absolutely no one, as far as pertains to the Fatherly will of the most Clement God: Since the Mediator, together with the assumed nature common to the whole human race, also took upon himself the common cause of our salvation, and came not to save some only, but the whole human race which had perished. Whence also he deigned to seal the universal promise of grace, repeated with so many asseverations, with the most Holy seal not only of an oath, but also of the Sacrament of Baptism, to which he invites all nations, as a universal seal: and he so thirsts for the salvation of all men, that he obliges not some only, but all, from the very beginning of the restored Church even to the end of the world, by a most severe command to repent, from the obedience of which he has never granted immunity to anyone, nor will he grant it, as long as the voice of the Gospel is heard in this globe of the earth.”

As for the **Confession of the Anglican Church**, **Joh. Overallus** writes, in the Appendix to the History of the Lambeth Articles, p. 45:

“Concerning the Death of CHRIST, the opinion of the Anglican Church is so plain and everywhere consistent with itself: that our Lord Jesus Christ died for all men whatsoever, or for all the sins of all men, that it is a wonder that any have dared to call it into controversy.”

And he proves this with the following Documents taken from the Anglican Confession:

“Article II: Christ truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.

Article VII: Both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man.

Article XV: He came to be the Lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world.

Article XXXI: The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual.”

From there **Overallus** proceeds:

“And the same is had also in the common Catechism, as the plainest sense of the part of the Creed in which each one is proposed to believe in God the Son, *who has redeemed himself and all mankind*, according to the Nicene Creed, *Who for us men and for our salvation came down*, etc. And in many places of our public Liturgy; as in the Consecration of the Eucharist: *God who didst give thine only son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who made there by his one oblation of himself once offered a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world*. etc.”

Another **Anglican Confession**:

“We say that he has pacified all things by the blood of his cross: that by that one sacrifice, which he once offered on the cross, he has perfected all things, and for that reason, when he was giving up the ghost, he said: *it is finished*: as if he willed to signify: the price for the sin of the human race has now been paid in full.”

The **Bohemian Confession**, Article VI, in the *Collection of Confessions*, p. 183:

“They teach that his death and blood alone suffice to abolish and expiate all the sins of all men.”

The Reformed Catechisms are consonant with the Confessions.

The **Heidelberg Catechism**, written in the year 1563, in the 37th question:

“Q. What do you believe when you say: "He suffered"?

A. That he, throughout the whole time of his life which he spent on earth, but especially at its end, sustained in body and soul the wrath of God against the sin of the entire human race, so that by his passion, as the one and only propitiatory Sacrifice, he might deliver our body and soul from eternal damnation, and acquire for us the grace of God, righteousness, and eternal life.”

The **Major Catechism of Zurich**, fol. 35:

“The sacrifice of Christ cleanses the soul; it had to make Satisfaction for the sin of all men who have been and who will be.”

The **Major Catechism of Bern**:

“Christ had to take away the sins of all men, so that we might know that the whole world was given life through his death.”

The **Book of the Bernese Agenda**:

“The impious despise the Counsel of God for saving all men through his son.”

The **Bernese Disputation or Reformation**, held in the years 1577-1578, Article X, has:

“That Christ is the satisfaction and redemption for the sins of the whole world.’

The **Basel Agenda**, fol. 114, and **Catechism**, fol. 28:

“Christ did not suffer for his own cause, but on account of the universal world.”

The **Schaffhausen Catechism**:

“Q. What is Jesus?

A. He is the Savior and physician of the whole world: and a little after:
The Death of Christ is the life of the whole world.”

The **Bremen Catechism**, i.e., *Five heads of the Christian religion, together with certain brief and necessary questions and answers*:

“Q. XXVI, on Faith.

Why did the son of God become man?

A. So that he could suffer and die, and with his blood and death pay and make satisfaction for the sins of the human race.”

This is so certain that some Lutheran Theologians frankly confess it, and allege the same public Documents of the Reformed Church, i.e., the same Confessions and Catechisms. In their number are **Dr. Joh. Himmel** in his *Collegio Irenico*, Disp. V, Th. V, p. 92, 93 ff.; **Dr. Joh. Micraelius**, *Orthodoxia Lutherana*, Chap. XVII, p. 352, 356, 357, 358, 359; the **Wittenbergers** in the *Gründlichen Beweis*, p. 375 f. 376, 377, 378, 379. Where on p. 375-376, among other things, they write in this manner:

“If the Reformed gentlemen indeed want to go by and look at public Confessions, then they ought by all means, with Ludovicus Crocius, not to force the old Confessions according to the new dissonant, obscure, and double-tongued Canons of Dort, but to regulate the latter by the former, if it is to be so, then they indeed have enough of them which tend toward the Universality of the merit of Christ.”

The reason why the Public Confessions of the Reformed assert the Universal Merit of Christ, they give on p. 320:

“Should anyone wonder how it comes to pass that the old Confessions of the Reformed are for the most part so much more correct in this, and how the current Reformed for the most part deviate so greatly from it, let him consider that the old Doctors, among whom were Bullinger, Gualther, Wolfgang Musculus, and others, had not been taken in by this grave error.”

Relying on this Harmony of the Confessions of the Reformed Church, **Dr. Ludovicus Crocius**, in his *Duodecade Dissertationum*, Diss. XI, p. 610, posits this Conclusion: *Christ died for all men*. To which Conclusion he adds these words:

“This is the perpetual opinion of sacred Scripture; this is the perpetual consensus of orthodox Antiquity; this is the public Confession of our Church in which we serve God, to pass over others for now, praised by me at the Synod of Dort, from which we cannot, by our conscience, secede even a hair's breadth, but must contradict all who simply deny that Christ died for all men, whether you say sufficiently or efficaciously, and who simply exclude the greatest part of men from all merit and satisfaction of Christ, whose chief Sophisms we have refuted in the preceding dissertation. On that

account, I believe a huge injury is done before God and the whole world to the Reformed Churches if they are accused of this error, that they deny Christ died for all: and, that those who teach otherwise defend not the Catholic Confession of our Church, but a private opinion, which, however, having been disseminated by certain persons for some years now, has begun to creep far and wide.”

Congruent with these Confessions, the following theologians and others have taught.

Hulr. Zwinglius on John 17:9, *I do not pray for the world*:

“*World* is taken variously in the Scriptures, here for the world of which it is spoken in 1 John 2:15-17. The *world* are those who are immersed in vices and contumaciously resist the word of God. For otherwise Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, and the father so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten for it, so that the world might be saved through him. Thus 2 Cor. 5, *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself*.”

The same, on John 6:51, introduces Christ speaking thus:

“I die for all, so that through myself I may give life to all. My flesh will be given over to death for the redemption and life of the whole world, by whose death death will die, and at the same time as me human nature will rise again.”

The same, *Declaration on Original Sin* to Urbanus Rhegius:

“If Christ restored his Church only, it would now follow that salvation through Christ does not extend as far as the disease from Adam spreads.” (See here p. 94 f. 95.)

Henr. Bullingerus, Sermon II on the Nativity of Christ from Titus III; likewise in his Commentary on 1 John 1; likewise on 1 Timothy 2, John 3, Matthew 23, so teaches that Christ died for all the sins of all, that on 1 John 1 he adds:

“They spew blasphemies against the Most Holy Son of God, who teach that Christ atoned for Original sin only, or not also for all the sins of all times.”

Wolffgangus Musculus, *Loci Communes*, on the Redemption of the human race, p. 191:

“The title of this section professes the Redemption of the Human Race. The human race comprises not one or another nation, but the

universal world, namely all the nations of the whole earth, all men from the first even to the last. Israel was redeemed several times from the hand of its enemies, out of Egypt, then from the tyranny of the Canaanites, from Babylon, etc. But here we are not dealing with some special redemption of one people, but with that which is generally of all. Therefore the things which come into consideration here pertain to all men. We know that not all become partakers of this redemption, but the perdition of those who are not saved in no way prevents the Redemption from being called Universal; which was destined not for one nation, but for the whole world. That thawing of the earth, by which all things everywhere are loosened for sprouting in the summer, is rightly called universal, even if many trees and innumerable places produce neither sprouts nor fruits. That sun is the general illuminator of the whole world, although there are many who receive no light from it. Among the Jews in the year of jubilee there was a general liberation of all slaves, even if many, remaining in servitude, rejected the grace of liberation. In that manner also stands this redemption of the human race of which we speak; That reprobate men and those of deplorably impious life do not receive it, happens neither from a defect of the grace of God, nor is it just that it should lose the glory and title of Universal Redemption on account of the sons of perdition, since it was prepared for all and all are called to it. Thus he who redeemed the world, whatever may become of the reprobate, is most justly called the Savior of the world, 1 John 4. And Christ does not lie when he says: *I am the light of the world*, however countless they may be in this world who do not partake of the grace of that light. Also for this reason is this Redemption Universal, that it was so destined for all that outside of it no one is redeemed, nor can be redeemed. In this sense, certainly, it must be understood when the grace of universal salvation and redemption is proposed in the Scriptures. For thus we will take care, neither to obscure the glory of Catholic grace and confine it to a narrow space, nor to say with fanatical men that absolutely no one is damned and perishes for eternity.”

He has twin statements in the Section on the Dispensation of the Grace of God, p. 207, likewise in his exposition of Gen. 22:18, likewise John 3:16, etc.

Rudolph Gualtherus in his Exposition of 2 Cor. 5:

“That Christ died for all, the scriptures testify in more than one place, and his own words are: *So God loved the world* (by the word world the universal human race is comprehended), *that he would give his son, that only-begotten one, for it*, etc. Likewise, *the bread which I will give*

is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. And again: Come to me, all you who labor, etc. Go into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature, etc. Therefore, the whole world, that is, all men, must have been submerged in and overwhelmed by sins, so that no one could help himself. But who could worthily preach this so ardent love of Christ, and the benefit of eternal salvation that will flow back to us from it?" (See Exposition of Rom. 5, Homily XXVI; on 1 Cor. 8, Homily XLII; likewise 1 John 2, Homily V; Commentary on Matt. ch. 1, ch. 9, ch. 16, ch. 22; Commentary on Isa. ch. 60.)

Benedictus Aretius, Commentary on Matthew, on Chap. 1, v. 21:

"The office of the Savior was universal as far as the person of Christ is concerned. For the promise had also been universal: *in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed*. But, as to men, it was brought about by the wickedness and unbelief of mortals that an office that was universal (καθόλως) has an effect as if it were not universal (ὥς μὴ καθόλε). And so it pertains only to his own, and rightly so, since none of the benefits of Christ pertains to the impious on account of the evil of unbelief."

In his Commentary on 1 Tim. Chap. 2, v. 6:

"Here lies a new Argument why one must pray for all. The reason is, because the Lord Christ suffered for all. Why therefore would you doubt to pray for all, when Christ did not doubt to die for all? Moreover, he died for all, as the Apostle here says, and it does not hinder this that not all embrace the benefit of his death. Because by their own evil and the fault of their nature they spurn the offered grace, not by any fault of God. And so let us not be loath to pray for all, even for the most lost scoundrels and tyrants, although they are made no better by our prayers." (See the same in his Commentary on John, Chap. 1, v. 29.)

Dr. Johannes Crocius, Theologian of Marburg, in the *Conversatio Prutensis*, Part II, ch. XVI, p. 472:

"If by the impetration of Reconciliation and remission of sins it is understood that Christ by his death exhausted the whole evil of Adam, crushed the serpent's head, and so made Satisfaction that He himself requires no other sacrifice for any man by which he is placated, nor is there need for any further expiation, and therefore all men by the force and virtue of Christ's death can return into grace with God and attain eternal life, provided they believe, and by faith

apply his death to themselves. If, I say, this is understood, then without any hesitation I would extend the merit and impetration to all and every one. This indeed is what I comprehend by the name of a general effect. For the general effect concerns all and every man, both the reprobate and the Elect: for by his passion and death he has merited for all and every man without distinction, that if they believe and repent, they can be reconciled with God or be restored into grace. Which truth is confirmed by the universal command to believe and repent, together with the Evangelical promise. For unless Christ had so paid the due price for all and every captive, that all could and should exit from captivity, provided they believed in the Redeemer; neither could the command to believe and repent be proposed to all, nor could the unbelieving be punished on account of infidelity: for how can all be ordered to embrace by faith that which does not pertain to all under the condition of faith? how can the reprobate be damned on account of unbelief, if Christ in no way at all died for them? no one is damned except for the neglect of that thing which in some way pertains to him.”

Paulus Steinius, Superintendent of Kassel, in *The Fraternity of the Evangelical Churches*, part I, Chap. XI, p. 340:

“We believe and teach: 1. That CHRIST died universally for the whole world, and for the sins of all and every man, as to the sufficiency and perfection of the death of Christ, and its value and dignity, since the death of Christ is a most perfect ransom (λύτρον) for the sins of all and every man, so that by virtue of this death once consummated by the Lord Jesus Christ, all and every man can be liberated from sins and be eternally saved, if only they believe the Gospel, and with true faith embrace and apply to themselves the most perfect satisfaction and ransom of Christ their Lord. For to this the sayings of sacred scripture point, 1 John 2:2; 2 Cor. 5:14; 1 Tim. 2:6. On this perfection of the Death of Christ rests the Preaching of the Gospel, which universally offers to all and every man to whom the Gospel is announced, Christ crucified with his whole merit, and promises to them the remission of sins, righteousness and eternal life, if only they repent and believe the Gospel.”

The same, in the third part of *The Fraternity of the Evangelical Church*, dedicated to the Senate of Bremen, ch. II, p. 31-32, professes:

“That Christ suffered FOR THE WHOLE HUMAN RACE, and by his death and the shedding of his blood MADE SATISFACTION most fully TO THE SEVERE JUSTICE OF GOD FOR THE SINS OF ALL AND

EVERY man, so that all and every man, if only they would repent and believe in Christ, could, on account of his passion and death once consummated, attain and acquire the remission of sins, righteousness, and eternal life. Which is also the cause why the Gospel is ANNOUNCED not only to the elect, but COMMONLY TO ALL MEN indiscriminately, even the REPROBATE, and in it the crucified Christ is offered, and they are invited and called to his saving communion, and the unfaithful are also for that reason eternally condemned, because they refused to believe in the crucified Christ. All of which things could in no way be done, if Christ had been given to the elect alone, and his life and death also pertained to the elect alone, and in no way to the rest who are not elect. Nevertheless, this also remains certain, that even if Christ was given COMMONLY TO EACH AND EVERY MAN, and he also suffered and died for all of them; besides this universal PHILANTHROPY, grace and mercy, which looks to all and every man in common, our Lord God embraces his elect before others with a peculiar love, grace and mercy, so that he efficaciously draws them, that is, he works in them true repentance and saving faith, by which they themselves apprehend the crucified Christ, and become actual partakers of his merit, concerning which love Paul speaks especially in Rom. 9:15, 18.”

The *Amicable Writings* of the Princes of Hesse, published in the year 1632, Part II, ch. IV, p. 382:

“That Christ was sent by God the heavenly Father as a Savior for the whole world, and thus for all and every man, and that he himself impetrated and merited salvation and eternal blessedness for all and every one, and that he ensures such grace and benefits, having been impetrated, are offered through the Most Holy Gospel indiscriminately to all and every man to whom it is preached, with this most certain promise, that if only they perform true repentance and believe the Gospel, it will come to pass that they will actually enjoy his merit and become partakers of it: All these things we have constantly taught hitherto in our churches of lower Hesse, and still urge and teach. And according to this doctrine all miserable sinners are referred to the sole and only Savior Jesus Christ, and to his most perfect merit and Satisfaction, in whom alone, through true faith, the remission of sins, the righteousness which stands before God, and eternal salvation and blessedness are to be sought. In which consists the nucleus and marrow of the doctrine of the Gospel. Whence on account of this doctrine, which we profess with mouth and heart, and which we preach to our hearers publicly and constantly, in which by

the grace of God we will persevere even to the end of life, we are deservedly named Evangelicals, which name and which boasting in the Gospel of Jesus Christ we will never suffer to be snatched from us by the Darmstadtians, but rather we will fight for it even unto death.”

Matthias Martinius, Theologian of Bremen, in his *Judgment* offered to the Synod of Dort, on the second Article, §. VII, VIII, IX, p. 640:

“External Calling necessarily requires these things before it: The Promise and mission of the Son and Redemption, i.e., the payment of the price to expiate sins and so to placate God that He himself requires no other sacrifice for the sins of any man, being content with that one most full one; and to reconcile men, so that for them there is no need for any other satisfaction, nor any other merit; provided (as ought to happen in Remedies) the application of that common and saving Medicine is made. If this Redemption, as a common benefit bestowed upon all men, is not supposed; the Indifferent and Promiscuous Preaching of the Gospel, committed to the Apostles, to be carried out among all nations, will have no true foundation: Since, however, we are averse to saying this, it must be seen how those speak things consonant with the most known and lucid Principles, who are pleased simply to deny that Christ died for all.”

From the Theologians of the Mark [of Brandenburg], see **Dr. Joh. Bergius** in the *Distinction and Comparison of the Evangelical*, Qu. LXXI, p. 102 ff. We have praised the Consensus of the English Theologians here on fol. 155. They assert the Reasons for their Judgment in the *Epistles of Excellent and Erudite Men*, Ep. CCCXLIII, p. 561 ff. The mind of **Joh. Calvin** is evident from his Commentary on John 1:29, John 3:16, Acts 2:21, Rom. 5:15, 18, Jude v. 4, so that it can scarcely be questioned. The opinion of **Cameron** and those who follow his Method exists in the *Opuscula Miscellanea* of his Works, p. 533-534-535. The entire **Reformed Church of France** in its Ecclesiastical Prayers supplicates God:

“After this we pray to Thee, most benign God and merciful Father, for all men generally, that as Thou wishest to be acknowledged as the Savior of the whole World, in the Redemption made by thy Son Jesus Christ, that those who are still strangers to his knowledge, being in darkness and the captivity of error and ignorance, by the illumination of thy Holy Spirit and by the Preaching of thy Gospel, may be brought back to the right way of salvation, etc.”

Consonant with which, the English Author of *The Whole Duty of Man*, in the Morning Intercession, prays:

“Grant (o Lord) that the precious ransom, which was paid by thy Son for all, may be effectual to the saving of all.”

With which ardent wish we close this section.

§. II. The Scholastics not inconveniently distinguished between the Sufficiency and the Efficacy (or Efficaciousness) of the Death of Christ. This ancient Distinction the Reformed Theologians, with very few exceptions, have deservedly received and applied everywhere. Among them are Jac. Kimedoncius, *On the Redemption of the Human Race*, book I, Chap. XI; David Pareus, *Irenicum*, ch. XXIV, p. 142 & ch. XXVIII, p. 243 ff.; Casp. Sibelius, *Catechetical Meditations*, Part II, Qu. XXXVII, p. 755, and countless others. Concerning whom one may consult Hermannus Hildebrandus, *Orthodox Declaration of the three Articles*, p. 37 to 142; likewise Christoph. Massonius, *Anatomia Universalis*, Part I, ch. XXXIX, p. 567-568 to 571, & Part III, ch. IX, 135 to 161. Maccovius was censured at the Synod of Dort for having rejected this Distinction. (*Epistles of Excellent Men*, p. 574).

Moreover, the Reformed use this Distinction (as indicated by Henr. Alting., *Theologia Problematica*, Part I, Probl. XLII, p. 174 ff.) in two ways: *absolutely* and *relatively*.

- *Absolutely* and in itself: that the ransom (λύτρον) of Christ, considered in itself and estimated from its own dignity, is far and away most sufficient for all and every man.
- *Relatively* as to the Counsel of God and the Scope and Intention of the dying Christ: that God willed Christ to die sufficiently for all, and Christ underwent death for this end, that it might be a most sufficient price for all.

In a word: These latter wish for a Sufficiency not *Potential*, but *Actual*. And to these latter we also accede, and we understand an Actual Sufficiency, by which the merit of Christ was and is sufficient, not only from its intrinsic value, but also from the serious Will, Intention, and Ordination of God the Father giving the Son over to death, and of the Son of God undergoing death. And this, 1. because the sayings of Holy Scripture require such a Sufficiency, 2. because, with Sufficiency so understood, there is no defect in the sacrifice of Christ, and the Fault of destruction is imputed only to the men who perish. 3. because the words of Augustine on the Articles falsely imputed to him, Article I (from which this Distinction is taken), demand this sense. For thus he says in Article I:

“Therefore as to the magnitude and power of the price, and as to what pertains to the one cause of the human race, the blood of Christ is the redemption of the whole world, but those who pass through

this world without faith in Christ and without the Sacrament of Regeneration, are strangers to the redemption.”

Thus the Palatine Theologians in the *Refutation of the Golden Ladder and Aureole concerning the death of Christ*, in the year 1592, p. 13:

“It is apparent that the question is not properly concerned with whether Christ died for all men, but rather in what way and in what sense Christ died and did not die, and that therefore an injury is done to us, these Theologians, before God and the whole world, when we are accused of this capital error (that we say Christ did not die for all men).”

And p. 14:

“Namely, that Christ willed and had to die for the transgressions of all men according to the eternal good pleasure of his Father, but in such a way as the revealed word of the Gospel and experience shows and declares that he died for all. For this purpose and will is not to be investigated by us from the secret counsel of God, as our adversaries falsely ascribe to us, as if we refer men from the word to the abyss of the Divine counsel: but it is to be known from his revealed word and from the work itself. Therefore, just as the Gospel teaches, and experience proves, that Christ died for all; so also it was the heavenly Father's and his own very will and purpose to die for all. For what Christ did, without any doubt it was his will that he should do it, and do it in the way that he did. Now from his revealed word it is clear that he indeed died for all in common, as to the sufficiency and perfection of his merit and sacrifice, as also the Universal Call and Invitation to the faithful acceptance of the same. But especially for all believers and elect, as to the application, efficacy, and fruit of his death. Nor does the matter itself and experience show otherwise. For although in Christ there is all Sufficiency, and the medicine, refreshment, and life of the whole world is offered most fully and abundantly in his death; nevertheless, none enjoy such benefits except those who receive them by faith. Without any doubt, therefore, this was the will of the eternal Father and of Christ our Savior in his death (just as we know it from the word and the event, as if *a posteriori*: in the same way that the whole mystery of God's Election can or should be comprehended by us in no other way), that his Sacrifice should be both the one and sufficient medicine of the whole world against sins and eternal death, by which all penitent sinners might have the fullest consolation, but the impenitent should have no excuse.”

And p. 16, 17, 18:

“Christ by his death acquired from his Father sufficient grace and reconciliation for all the men of the whole world, if all were to believe and desire to be reconciled with God. His death and tomb is the true and heavenly Pharmacy, in which medicine, refreshment, and the water of eternal life is most sufficiently proposed to all men against sin and death, this only is required, that they seek and make use of this medicine by saving faith: For the heavenly Father willed that nothing should be lacking in Himself or in his Son, but that He would most abundantly exhibit all things that make for the eternal salvation of men, by which all contrite and hungry hearts might find in him the most plentiful consolation and refreshment, as Christ himself pronounces: *I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly*, John 10:10. But the despisers would be inexcusable, as the same one testifies: *But now they have no cloak for their sin*, John 15:22. This is the foundation of all Evangelical consolation against any temptations of desperation, when the sorrowful and afflicted soul hears that, although its sins are great and many, yet reconciliation is prepared with God, and indeed a most sufficient one in the most holy passion and death of Christ.”

After a few words:

“This therefore is the sum, that we confess with Scripture that Christ died for all men, because his sacrifice is the one and sufficient remedy for healing the sins and lethal wounds of all men; if only they would make use of it, and not hold it in contempt. We do not say (as our adversaries very often pervert our doctrine) that it *could be* sufficient, if God had *willed* it to be sufficient, but we expressly say that it is *actually sufficient* for the whole world, indeed it would have sufficed for a hundred thousand worlds; and that this was the serious will of Christ and of God the Father, that not even the smallest defect should be in him, but that the fault should reside with man, if by contempt of this spiritual medicine of the soul they die in their sins. Malicious therefore, and I add, most foolish, is the calumny which the furious Apostate of Derendingen writes; that Christ (according to our opinion) offered so perfect a sacrifice, that in reality it is only sufficient for certain ones, namely the Elect, and that he could have provided a more perfect one, which would have been no less sufficient for the rest also, but was unwilling: just as a certain lord pays a ransom for ten captives, but has so much silver still at his disposal that he could also free all the rest, of whom more than a thousand are held in chains, but he does not want to.”

After a few words:

“But Christ held back absolutely nothing with Himself, but actually and in fact poured out all the treasures of his grace for the full and sufficient perfection of the sacrifice for the whole world. Here nothing at all is lacking in Christ and his payment, but in the blind and insane world, which spurns all such riches of grace.”

Jacobus Kimedoncius, Doctor and Professor of Theology at Heidelberg, in his book *On the Redemption of the human race*, which appeared in the year 1592, chap. XI, p. 63, says:

“The ancients applied the distinction of Sufficiency and Efficacy.”

Ibid. p. 67, he warns that this distinction,

“though trite, is yet very ancient, and useful, and for this reason to be diligently retained, and has also been approved by the moderns.”

p. 68 f. 69, he wants the words *Sufficiently* and *Efficiently* to be taken candidly and without sophistry:

“*Sufficiently*, that is, with Augustine as interpreter, as to what pertains to the magnitude and power of the price, or as Thomas declares, insofar as He himself exhibited what was sufficient for the deletion of all sins. But *Efficiently*, or as others say, *Efficaciously*, is understood with respect to the effect, which is found only in the members of Christ, with the others who pass through this world without faith and regeneration being strangers to the redemption, as Augustine also has left distinctly written.”

p. 73, he explains his own opinion in these words:

“Following the ancient distinction, we assert that Christ certainly exhibited what was sufficient for the deletion of all sins and thus deleted all sins; and redeemed all as far as pertains to the Sufficiency, or magnitude, and power of the price, as Augustine explains. But as to the Efficacy, we say that by the death of Christ only the sins of the elect are deleted, who believe in him, and who adhere to him as members to the head: but those who are not incorporated into Christ cannot perceive the effect of his passion. John 3:16.”

Ibid. p. 74 f. 75, to one objecting that the Reformed do not take the word *Sufficiently* in the signification in which pious Antiquity accepted it, he responds:

“But I think it is clear enough from those things which were recited before, how Antiquity used those words of Sufficiency and Efficacy, and that we change nothing in the sense, nor do we deceive anyone by equivocation. Nor do we deny that he made satisfaction for all, whether they be saved or perish, namely as much as pertains to the sufficiency and magnitude of the price, so potent and rich for redemption that if the whole multitude of captives were to believe in him, no diabolical chains would hold them.”

Likewise book II, chap. II:

“In the beginning, as much as pertains to the testimonies about the death of Christ for all, we also concede in their own way, that Christ suffered and died for all men whatsoever, as many as have been, are, and will be.” (Cf. the same, p. 96, 97, 98, 155, 156, 252, 259, 260.)

Zach.” Ursinus, *Explication of the Catechism*, to question XX, p. 142:

Grace exceeds the transgression as to Satisfaction, not as to Application. Therefore, that not all are saved by the grace of Christ is to be ascribed to the unbelieving, who spurn the offered grace.”

Likewise to question XL, p. 305-306:

“Therefore they (the Reformed Theologians) say that Christ died for all and not for all, in a different respect. For all, as to the Sufficiency of the ransom (λύτρον): Not for all, but for the Elect alone, or believers, as to the Application and efficacy of the ransom. The reason for the former is that the ransom of Christ is sufficient for expiating all the sins of all men or of the whole world, provided all would apply it to themselves by faith. For it cannot be said to be insufficient, otherwise some fault for the destruction of the impious would be in a defect of the merit of the mediator, which God forbid. The reason for the latter is: Because all and only the elect or believers apply the merit of Christ's death to themselves by faith, and obtain from it its efficacy, that is, righteousness and life, as it is said: *He who believes in the Son of God has eternal life*. The rest are excluded from this efficacy by their own infidelity, as it is said again: *He who does not believe will not see life, but the wrath of God remains upon him*. If it be asked about the Will of Christ, whether Christ willed to die for all, the response is made with the same distinction: For as he died, so also he willed to die. Therefore, as he died for all by the sufficiency of his ransom, but for believers alone by its efficacy: so also he willed to die for all in common, as to the sufficiency of his merit, that is, he willed by his

death to merit grace, righteousness, and life most sufficiently for all: because he willed that nothing be lacking in himself and his merit, so that all the impious who perish would be without excuse (ἀναπολόγητοι). But he willed to die for the elect alone as to efficacy, that is, he willed not only to sufficiently merit grace and life for the elect alone, but also to efficaciously confer it, to give faith and the holy Spirit, and to bring it about that they should apply the benefits of his death to themselves by faith, and thus obtain its efficacy.”

Ibid. p. 307:

“ Christ died for all. Therefore his death does not pertain to believers alone.”

Resp. to the antecedent by a distinction: He died for all by the merit and sufficiency of the ransom; for believers alone by application and efficacy. For insofar as the death of Christ is conferred upon and profits these alone, it is also rightly said to be their own property and to pertain to these alone, as was declared before. (Id. in *Miscellanea Catechetica*, p. 78, 80, 86, 92, 93.)”

Georgius Sohnius, Vol. I, Disp. on the threefold office of the Son of God incarnate, p. 301:

“Satisfaction is that by which Christ the Mediator paid to God the Father on this earth, when the time was finished, a ransom (λύτρον), that is, a price of redemption, sufficient for the human race: or, by which he exactly performed all those things which divine justice demanded, and thus merited for all men the righteousness and life that had been lost.”

D. Johannes Crocius, Professor at Marburg, in the second part of the *Conversatio Prutensis*, ch. XVI, p. 467:

“I estimate the sufficiency for the whole world not only from the value and dignity of the ransom, but also from the intention of God the Father sending the son, and of the son suffering. Through the former it has a potential sufficiency, through the latter an actual one. The sufficiency therefore with respect to many worlds, if there were any, is Potential: with respect to the world and all and even every one of the reprobate in the world, it is actual. If I should be asked about the effect of Christ's death, I would say I acknowledge a twofold one, namely General and Special. The Special is the reparation of salvation or the restitution into grace, or reconciliation with God; concerning which effect, being asked, I respond without guile and fraud that the

Salvation of the people of Christ alone was actually repaired, the sons of God alone were restored into the grace of God, believers alone were actually reconciled with God. But that the reprobate and those persevering in impenitence even to the end were by the death of Christ restored into grace and actually reconciled to God, or that an actual reconciliation with God and remission of sins was impetrated for them, I have never believed, etc.”

p. 473:

“If I should be asked about the Counsel and intention both of the Father sending and of the Son suffering, I will respond without guile and fraud. 1. Just as the death of Christ, if you look at its quantity and value, was a most sufficient ransom for all and every man, so both God decreed, and the incarnate son willed to undergo death and pay a ransom, which would abundantly suffice for redeeming all and every man, so that for reconciling them with God there is no need for any other satisfaction. 2. The counsel, intention, and will of the Father sending and the Son suffering was that he, by his own death, should and willed to merit this for all and every man, that, if they fulfill the condition of the Gospel, that is, they believe and repent, they can be reconciled to God and be restored into grace. This counsel is made manifest by the promise and the command to believe and repent. 3. But concerning the special effect of his death, that is, concerning the restitution into grace, or actual reconciliation with God, I so state, that neither did Christ intend to restore into grace those persevering in unbelief and impenitence, or to actually reconcile them with God, nor was it the counsel of God to impute the death of Christ for righteousness to the unbelieving and impenitent, and therefore to be reconciled to them and receive them into grace, etc.”

Matth. Martinus, Theologian of Bremen, in his *Judgment on Article II* in the *Acts of the Synod of Dort*, p. 640, §. X, XI:

“Nor will it be enough here to posit such a sufficiency of redemption as *could be* enough: but it must absolutely be such as is enough, and which God and Christ *willed* to be enough. For otherwise the command and promise of the Gospel will be shaken. For how, from a benefit sufficient indeed, but not destined for me by a true intention, will the necessity of believing that it pertains to me be deduced?”

D. Lud. Crocius in his *Judgment at Dort*, in the *Acts*, p. 656, §. II, III, IV, V:

“The counsel, Scope and intention not only of God the Father delivering the Son to death, but also of the Son undergoing death, is to acquire, impetrate, and merit for all and every sinful man, by that most precious death and passion, that, if they repent, when they are capable of doctrine, and believe in Christ, they might be able to be reconciled with God and receive the remission of sins.

Christ, from his own and his Father's counsel, having suffered and died, by his death and passion merited most sufficiently for all and every sinful man, that, if only they repent, and believe, they can be reconciled to God, or be restored into his grace and bosom.

Christ, by his own counsel and will as well as that of his Father, by his death and passion, actually reconciled to God all and every believer, and them alone, and restored them into his bosom: but for the impenitent, those remaining pertinaciously in unbelief to the end, or those holding the price of Christ's death in contempt and sinning against the Holy Spirit, he neither acquired nor impetrated actual reconciliation with God, nor the remission of sins and eternal life.

I judge this doctrine to be most true, consonant with the Scriptures, the nature of the thing, the Church, and specifically also the Confession of Bremen, and the better and more common opinion of Theologians both ancient and recent, and that it must necessarily, purely and holily be retained and defended in the Church of God, both for the glory of God, which is so illustrated that his veracity in calling, his equity in commanding, his justice in threatening may become plain to all who seriously meditate on Scripture: and for the edification, progress and consolation of the called in true faith and piety; and finally for the salutary avoidance and refutation of the diverse heresies which surround this doctrine like rocks.” (See Lud. Crocius, *Assertion of the Augustan Confession*, p. 86, 87, 88; *Duodecade Dissertationum*, p. 675, 676.)

Hermannus Hildebrandus, *Declaration of the first Article*, §. VI, p. 4:

“I do not say that it *could be* Sufficient, if God had *willed* it to be sufficient; but I expressly teach that it is actually and in fact sufficient for the whole world, and that this was the Serious Will of Christ and of God the Father, that not even the smallest defect should be in him, but that the fault should reside with men, if by contempt of this Spiritual medicine of the soul they die in their sins, etc.”

D. Conradus Bergius, Disputation I, *on the Sufficiency and Efficacy of the Death of Christ*, §. XX, p. 13:

“For it is perspicuous that the Sufficiency of Christ's death is not asserted in such a way that only the bare preciousness and infinite dignity is noted (in which manner it could also be said to be sufficient for the fallen Angels), but with the dignity must also necessarily be understood a true and actual benefit, from a certain love of God toward the universal world, or all men lapsed into sin in Adam. In which way a distinction is certainly most openly established between men and the fallen Angels, whom God does not love and pity, nor does he provide any power or remedy for them to emerge from sin, but only for men.”

§. XXVII, p. 15:

“But also from the *Catechetical Explications* of Ursinus themselves it can be clear enough to anyone: that the Sufficiency of Christ's death does not note only a bare dignity, but also includes some true grace or love and benefit of God working toward repentance and salvation, which is the effect of that love.”

§. XXX, p. 16:

“For he has merited, not only that this medicine for sin and death be held as in itself most sufficient or most worthy, and therefore of infinite price; but that it also be most sufficiently offered to all.”

Joh. Overallus, an Englishman, in the *Appendix to the History of the Lambeth Articles*, chap. II, p. 48:

“It was handed down quite correctly by the saying of the School; that Christ died for all sufficiently, for the elect and believing efficaciously, had not certain ones corrupted it, by expounding it with a hypothesis: *The death of Christ would have been sufficient for all, if God and Christ had so intended.*”

Joh. Davenantius in his *Judgment* sent to Herm. Hildebrand, in the latter's *Declaration of the three Articles*, p. 29, no. 8:

“You explain well that old and approved Distinction of Sufficiency and Efficacy.

no. 9: Concerning the Purpose or Will of God the Father in sending his son into this world and of the son dying for the world, it is a crime

for us to think otherwise than God has revealed his will in the sacred letters. Moreover, the Holy Gospel testifies that Christ died for this end, that whoever should will to believe in him may have eternal life. If Judas therefore had believed in him, he would have obtained, by the benefit of this evangelical pact, according to the will of God and his unshaken ordination, the remission of sins and eternal life.”

Jacobus Usserius accepts this Distinction in the same way in *The Extent of the Death of Christ*.

David Paræus in the Acts of the Synod of Dort, p. 187:

“You will see that I so retain the common distinction of the Sufficiency and Efficacy of the death or ransom (λύτρον) of Christ, that it remains true even when it is extended to the eternal counsel of God the Father and the intention of the Savior.”

Likewise in the German Bible of Neustadt, p. 96.

D. Joh. Bergius in *The Will of God for the Salvation of all Men*, chap. XIII, §. XI, XV, p. 104, 107. The French Theologians, **Joh. Camero**, *Theological Works*, p. 534, §. VI; **Moses Amyraldus**, *On the Secession from the Roman Church and on Peace among the Evangelicals*, Ch. VII, p. 164, 165, 166, 167; **Joh. Dallæus**, *Apology for the Synods*, p. 972, employ this Distinction in the same sense.

The words of **Joh. Claude** are worthy of note, *Posthumous Works*, Vol. III, p. 146:

“As for the Distinction between the Sufficiency & the Efficacy of the Death of Jesus Christ, who does not see that the sense of Scripture, when it says that Jesus Christ died for all, is not to signify simply that the price of the Death of Jesus Christ is infinite, & that it could, if God willed it, extend to all. To take it in this sense, one could say that Jesus Christ died for the Demons; For it is true that the price of his death being infinite, it could suffice for the expiation of the sin of the Demons, if God had willed it. But this is nevertheless what Scripture never says & it restricts, on the contrary, the Universality of the death of Jesus Christ to all men: it is clear that the term 'For' marks not the simple Sufficiency of the price; but some certain destination of this Death on the part of God & on the part of J. C. himself for all men.”

See also **Pauli Steinii**, *Evangelische Brüderschaft*, Part I, Ch. XI, p. 377. And thus also the **Synod of Dort**, Chap. II, Can. III, defines:

“This Death of the Son of God is the one and most perfect victim and satisfaction for sins, of infinite value and price, abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world.”

And Can. VI:

“But that many who are called by the Gospel do not repent, nor believe in Christ, but perish in unbelief, does not happen from a defect or insufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ offered on the cross, but from their own fault.”

That these things confirm our hypothesis is demonstrated by **Dallæus**, *Apology for the Synods*, Part IV, p. 971, 972, 973, 974 ff. And **D. Mentzerus** acknowledges that the matter stands thus, in his *Triad of Disputations on the Eternal Election of the Sons of God*, Disp. I, §. XXXIV ff, p. 8.

In Belgium, the sense of this Distinction was emphatically declared by the **TUBA PACIS CLANGENS** (*The Trumpet of Peace Sounding*), published for the public good of the federated Provinces of Belgium in the Dutch language before the Synod of Dort, in its *Examination of the Second Article of the Remonstrants*, p. 111. Whose words the Wittenbergers produce and praise in their *Gründl. Beweis*, p. 380, 381, 382.

“On this sufficient ransom (lytron) of Christ rest the Promises of the Gospel, which, as to their serious and sincere Invitation and Oblation, are Universal; but as to their Application, Collation and fruit, they become Particular, because they are limited by the Condition of a living Faith and a Serious Repentance, which by many is not fulfilled. Repeat what we have admonished on p. 69, 70, & 71.”

§. III. That the **Call is most Serious** we prove by the following sayings of Scripture, sought:

I. From the benevolent Invitation of God with the annexed Promise of Salvation:

- **Isa. 55:1:** *All you that thirst, come to the waters: and you that have no money make haste, buy, and eat: come, buy wine and milk without money, and without any price.*
- **Isa. 65:5:** *I have spread out my hands all the day to an unbelieving people, who walk in a way that is not good, after their own thoughts.*
- **Isa. 66:4:** *I called, and there was none that would answer; I have spoken, and they have not heard; and they have done evil in my eyes, and have chosen the things I would not.*

- **Ezek. 18:23:** Is it my will that a wicked man should die, saith the Lord God, and not that he should be converted from his ways, and live?
- **v. 30, 32:** I desire not the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God.
- **ch. 33:11:** As I live, saith the Lord God, I desire not the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way, and live. Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways: and why will you die, O house of Israel?
- **Ps. 95:6-9:** Come let us adore and fall down: and weep before the Lord that made us. For he is the Lord our God: and we are the people of his pasture and the sheep of his hand. To day if you shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts: As in the provocation, according to the day of temptation¹ in the wilderness: where your fathers tempted me, they proved me, and saw my works.
- **Matt. 11:15:** He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.
- **v. 28-29:** Come to me, all you that labor, and are burdened, and I will refresh you. Take up my yoke upon you, and learn of me, because I am meek, and humble of heart: and you shall find rest to your souls. For my yoke is sweet and my burden light.
- **Matt. 22:3-4:** The King sent his servants, to call them that were invited to the marriage... saying: Tell them that were invited, Behold, I have prepared my dinner: my beeves and fatlings are killed, and all things are ready: come ye to the marriage.
- **Luke 14:17:** He sent his servant at the hour of supper to say to them that were invited, that they should come, for now all things are ready.
- **John 3:16-17:** For God so loved the world, as to give his only begotten Son; that whosoever believeth in him, may not perish, but may have life everlasting. For God sent not his Son into the world, to judge the world, but that the world may be saved by him.
- **Chap. 7:37-38:** Jesus cried out, saying: If any man thirst, let him come to me, and drink. He that believeth in me, as the scripture saith, Out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.
- **Rom. 2:4:** Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and patience, and longsuffering? Knowest thou not, that the benignity of God leadeth thee to penance?
- **Rom. 12:1:** I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercy of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, pleasing unto God, your reasonable service.
- **2 Cor. 5:20:** For Christ therefore we are ambassadors, God as it were exhorting by us. For Christ, we beseech you, be reconciled to God.
- **Rev. 3:20:** Behold, I stand at the gate, and knock. If any man shall hear my voice, and open to me the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him.
- **Rev. 22:17:** He that thirsteth, let him come: and he that will, let him take the water of life, freely.

II. From the command to believe and repent:

- **Luke 8:18:** Take heed therefore how you hear.
- **Acts 3:19:** Be penitent, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out.
- **2 Cor. 6:1:** We exhort you, that you receive not the grace of God in vain.
- **Eph. 5:14:** Rise thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead: and Christ shall enlighten thee.
- **James 1:21:** Wherefore casting away all uncleanness, and abundance of naughtiness, with meekness receive the ingrafted word, which is able to save your souls.
- **1 John 3:23:** And this is his commandment, that we should believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ: and love one another.
- **John 6:29:** This is the work of God, that you believe in him whom he hath sent.
- **Matt. 17:5:** This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: hear ye him.
- Cf. **Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:15.**

III. From the most full Obtestation and Asseveration of God's Affection:

- **Isa. 49:15-16:** Can a woman forget her infant, so as not to have pity on the son of her womb? and if she should forget, yet will not I forget thee. Behold, I have graven thee in my hands.
- **Jer. 8:21-22:** For the affliction of the daughter of my people I am afflicted, and made sorrowful, astonishment hath taken hold on me. Is there no balm in Gilead? or is there no physician there? Why then is not the wound of the daughter of my people closed?²
- **Jer. 31:20:** Surely Ephraim is a dear son to me, surely a tender child: for since I spoke of him, I will still remember him. Therefore my bowels are troubled for him: pitying I will pity him, saith the Lord.
- **Hosea 11:8-9:** How shall I give thee up, O Ephraim? how shall I deliver thee up, O Israel? how shall I make thee as Admah? shall I set thee as Zeboim? my heart is turned within me, my repentance is stirred up. I will not execute the fierceness of my wrath: I will not return to destroy Ephraim: because I am God, and not man: the holy one in the midst of thee, and I will not enter into the city.
- Whence God in Hebrew is said to be *Rachum* (from *Rechem*, which is the Maternal womb), i.e., moved or to be moved from his inmost bowels towards men. **Exod. 33:19; Ch. 34:6; Psalm 103:13.** And **Joel 2:13; Jonah 4:2; 2 Cor. 1:3**, he is called ὁ Πατήρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν, the Father of mercies; and **1 John 4:8, 16**, he is called Love itself; and to him are attributed σπλάγχνα ἐλέους, **Luke 1:78**, the bowels of Mercy, i.e., a most ardent and intimate

Mercy: Christ also is said *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι*, i.e., to be affected and moved with intimate mercy, **Matt. 9:36; Ch. 14:14; Mark 6:34; Chap. 8:2.**

IV. From God's παθητική (loving, passionate, pathetic in the sense of being able to feel) wish:

- **Deut. 5:29:** *Who shall give them to have such a mind, as to fear me, and to keep all my commandments at all times, that it may be well with them and with their children for ever?*
- **Deut. 32:29:** *O that they would be wise and would understand, and would provide for their last things.*
- **Ps. 81:14:** *If my people had heard me: if Israel had walked in my ways, etc.*
- **Luke 19:42:** *Christ weeping says: If thou also hadst known, and that in this thy day, the things that are to thy peace; but now they are hidden from thy eyes.*

V. From the Reprehension of those who do not respond to the Call:

- **Psalms 81:12-13:** *My people heard not my voice: and Israel hearkened not to me. So I let them go according to the desires of their heart: they shall walk in their own inventions.*
- **Prov. 1:24-26:** *Because I called, and you refused: I stretched out my hand, and there was none that regarded. You have despised all my counsel, and have neglected my reprehensions. I also will laugh in your destruction, and will mock when that shall come to you which you feared.*
- **Isa. 66:4:** *The things they feared, I will bring upon them: because I called, and there was none that would answer; I have spoken, and they have not heard; and they have done evil in my eyes, and have chosen the things I would not.*
- **Matt. 11:21 ff.:** *Woe to thee, Corazin, woe to thee, Bethsaida: for if in Tyre and Sidon had been wrought the miracles that have been wrought in you, they had long ago done penance in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment, than for you.*
- **Matt. 22:7-8:** *After those invited to the marriage had spurned the call, the king was angry, and sending his armies, he destroyed those murderers, and burnt their city. Then he saith to his servants: The marriage indeed is ready; but they that were invited were not worthy.*
- **Luke 14:24:** *But I say unto you, that none of those men that were invited, shall taste of my supper.*
- **Matt. 23:37-38:** *Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered together thy children, as the hen doth gather her chickens under her wings, and thou wouldest not? Behold, your house shall be left to you, desolate.*

- **Luke 7:30:** *But the Pharisees and the lawyers despised the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized by John.*
- **Acts 7:51:** *You always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do you also.*
- **Rom. 2:5:** *But according to thy hardness and impenitent heart, thou treasurest up to thyself wrath, against the day of wrath, and revelation of the just judgment of God.*

VI. From the Veracity and Sincerity of God:

- **1 Cor. 1:9:** *God is faithful: by whom you are called unto the fellowship of his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.*
- **1 Thess. 5:24:** *He is faithful who hath called you, who also will do it.*
- *Whence the Gospel concerning Christ is called a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, 1 Tim. 1:15.*

Conveniently with these things, the **Admonition of Neustadt**, Chap. III, the **Synod of Dort**, chap. III & IV, Can. VIII, and indeed all Orthodox Theologians most rightly teach: That God not feignedly, but seriously wills the Conversion and Salvation of all, and seriously and most truly shows in his word what is pleasing to him, and what men themselves both owe and should do for themselves, namely that they should repent, believe, and be saved. Whence the **End of the Call** is the Conversion of men and eternal salvation; but the **Outcome or End by Accident** is Inexcusability (Αναπολογησία) and eternal Death. For God swears in Ezekiel 33:11 that *He does not will the death of the Sinner, but wills that he be converted and live.* In Matt. 22:1 ff. and Luke 14:16 ff. all who are invited are called to the Marriage, to the Supper. In Isa. 55:1-3, God bids the thirsty to come to the waters, to make haste, to buy and to eat, likewise to buy Wine and milk. In John 3:17, *God did not send his son to judge the world, but that the world may be saved through him.* In John 5:34, Christ was addressing the Jews: *These things I say, that you may be saved.* In Acts 17:30, he commands all men everywhere to repent. In Acts 26:17-18, the Apostles are sent to the Gentiles to open their eyes, that they may be converted from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive the Remission of sins and a lot among the saints by faith in J. C. In Col. 1:28, Paul professes: *we preach Christ, admonishing every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in J. C.* In 1 Tim. 2:4, *God wills all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth.* In 2 Peter 3:9, *God does not will that any should perish, but that all should return to penance.* See Isa. 61:1-2; Matt. 11:28.

But that Christ is said elsewhere to have come for Judgment, that he is called a stone of stumbling, likewise set for the ruin of many, that the Gospel is to many an odor of death unto death; This is accidental, or, so to speak, adventitious, as

Calvin teaches excellently on John 3:17. For the words of the Fathers, see back on pages 103, 104, 105.

§. IV.

That the divine **Call is Sufficient** is proven:

I. From those sayings of Sacred Scripture by which the Efficacy of the Word of God is proven:

- **Isa. 55:10-11:** *And as the rain and the snow come down from heaven, and return no more thither, but soak the earth, and water it, and make it to spring, and give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: So shall my word be, which shall go forth from my mouth: it shall not return to me void, but it shall do whatsoever I please, and shall prosper in the things for which I sent¹ it.*
- **Jer. 23:29:** *Are not my words as a fire, saith the Lord, and as a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?*
- **Luke 10:9:** *Say, says Christ, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.*
- **Rom. 1:16:** *The gospel is the power of God, unto salvation to every one that believeth.*
- **1 Cor. 1:18:** *For the word of the cross, to them indeed that perish, is foolishness; but to them that are saved, that is, to us, it is the power of God.*
- **Heb. 4:12:** *For the word of God is living and effectual, and more piercing than any two edged sword; and reaching unto the division of the soul and the spirit, of the joints also and the marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart².*
- **1 Pet. 1:23:** *Being born again not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, by the word of God who liveth and remaineth for ever.*
- **James 1:21:** *With meekness receive the ingrafted word, which is able to save your souls.*
- Emphatically Paul calls the Ministers of the New Testament Ministers not of the letter, but of the Spirit, 2 Cor. 3:6, and the Gospel, the Ministry of the Spirit, *ibid.* v. 8, and the word of Reconciliation, 2 Cor. 5:19, to indicate that in the Ministry of the Word and the Call through the Word of the Gospel, the Word and the Spirit, by the Promise of God, are joined by an indivisible bond, so that the hearers of this word are able to believe and convert themselves.

II. The Sufficiency of the Call is also plain from those sayings of Scripture by which God testifies that he awakens men from the Death of sins by the Call; and has applied all means necessary for producing faith and Conversion:

- **Isa. 5:1-4:** My beloved had a vineyard on a very fruitful hill. And he fenced it in, and picked the stones out of it, and planted it with the choicest vines, and built a tower in the midst thereof, and set up a winepress therein: and he looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wild grapes. And now, O ye inhabitants of Jerusalem, and ye men of Judah, judge, I beseech you, betwixt me and my vineyard. What is there that I ought to do more to my vineyard, that I have not done to it?
- **Isa. 59:21:** This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord: My spirit that is in thee, and my words that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.
- **Ezek. 12:2:** They have eyes to see, and see not: and ears to hear, and hear not: for they are a rebellious house.
- **Ezek. 33:10-11:** To the Israelites objecting: Our iniquities and our sins are upon us, and we pine away in them: how then can we live? God responds: As I live, I desire not the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live. Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways: and why will you die, O house of Israel?
- **Ps. 95:8:** To day if you shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts.
- **Matt. 11:21:** Woe to thee, Corazin, woe to thee, Bethsaida: for if in Tyre and Sidon had been wrought the miracles that have been wrought in you, they had long ago done penance in sackcloth and ashes.
- **Matt. 12:41-42:** The men of Ninive shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they did penance at the preaching of Jonas. And behold a greater than Jonas here. The queen of the south shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and behold a greater than Solomon here.
- **Matt. 23:37-38:** Jerusalem, Jerusalem... how often would I, etc. ...and thou wouldst not?
- And in **Chap. 25, v. 14 ff.** the **Parable of the talents** teaches the same, To one he gave five talents, and to another two, and to another one; by which it is taught that to men is given a measure of Grace that is indeed unequal, but for all is certain and sufficient for gaining a profit. For God is not like a hard man (as that lazy and ungrateful Servant lied) who reaps where he did not sow, and gathers where he did not scatter. But it remains irrefutably true what the eternal divine Wisdom adds to this Parable: To every one that hath shall be given, and he shall abound: but from him that hath not, that also which he seemeth to have shall be taken away.
- **Luke 8:8:** He that hath ears to hear, let him hear. See the same in **Luke 14:35; Matt. 11:15; ch. 13:9, 43; Mark 4:9, 23; Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, 29; Ch. 3:6, 13, 22; Ch. 13:9.** But it often happens as Christ complains in **Matt. 13:13:** Seeing they see not, and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand.

- **John 1:9:** *That was the true light, which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world.*
- **John 3:19:** *And this is the judgment: because the light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than the light: for their works were evil.*
- **Ch. 5:34:** *These things I say, that you may be saved. and v. 40:* *And you will not come to me that you may have life.*
- **John 8:12:** *I am the light of the world: he that followeth me, walketh not in darkness, but shall have the light of life.*
- **Ch. 9:41:** *If you were blind, you should not have sin: but now you say: We see. Your sin remaineth.*
- **Ch. 15:22, 24:** *If I had not come, and spoken to them, they would not have sin; but now they have no excuse for their sin.*
- **Acts 7:51:** *You stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, you always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do you also.*
- **Acts 17:31:** *God hath appointed a day wherein he will judge the world in equity, by the man whom he hath appointed; giving faith to all, by raising him up from the dead.*
- **2 Cor. 3:6:** *God hath made us fit ministers of the new testament; not in the letter, but in the spirit. For the letter killeth, but the spirit quickeneth.*
- **2 Cor. 4:3-4:** *And if our gospel be also hid, it is hid to them that are lost, In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of unbelievers, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not shine unto them.*
- **2 Cor. 5:20:** *For Christ therefore we are ambassadors, God as it were exhorting by us. For Christ, we beseech you, be reconciled to God. (coll. with 2 Cor. 3:6, 8. Whence Leo says: He who insists with the precept, runs before with aid. And Our theologians: The Imperative word is Operative.)*
- **2 Cor. 6:1:** *We exhort you, that you receive not the grace of God in vain.*
- **Eph. 5:14:** *Rise thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead: and Christ shall enlighten thee.*
- **Col. 1:28:** *We preach Christ, admonishing every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus.*
- **Titus 2:11:** *For the grace of God our Saviour hath appeared to all men; Instructing us, that, denying ungodliness and worldly desires, we should live soberly, and justly, and godly in this world.*
- **Jude v. 4:** *Profane men turning the grace of our God into riotousness.*
- **Rev. 3:20:** *Behold, I stand at the gate, and knock. If any man shall hear my voice, and open to me the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.*
- (Cf. **John 6:45; Rom. 2:4; ch. 9:22; 1 Tim. 2:4; 2 Pet. 3:9.**)

III. The Nature of the Covenant of Grace requires this Sufficiency of Grace, which is not an upbraiding for an old and past misdeed, but an oblation of New

Grace and Benefit. The theologians of Brandenburg and Poland expressed this excellently in the **Declaration of Thorn**, on the serious and at the same time sufficient Call, Chap. IV, on Grace, no. 6, where they professed thus:

“We are falsely accused: As if we teach that not all who are called by the word of the Gospel are called by God seriously and sincerely, or sufficiently, to repentance and salvation, but that most are called only feignedly and hypocritically, by a mere external Will of sign, to which no internal Will of good pleasure is subject, as one who in no way wills the salvation of all. We most sacredly profess that we are very far from this opinion, which has been twisted against us from the poorly understood or even inconvenient words of some, and that we attribute to God, the thrice Best and Greatest, the highest Truth and sincerity in all his sayings and deeds, but especially in the Word of Grace calling to Salvation, and that we do not fashion any contradictory Wills in him.”

Congruent with these things, the **Theologians of Frankfurt** in their *Judgment* sent to Hermannus Hildebrand at Bremen in the year 1640, cited by us above on p. 125, §. IV, state:

“That Ordinarily to the external preaching of the Gospel is Conjoined a certain Measure of the Supernatural and Efficacious Grace of the Holy Spirit (although the Spirit breathes variously and manifoldly according to his liberty, when, where, and how he wills), which operates so efficaciously in the Hearers, and so convicts the impenitent and unfaithful of their Impenitence and Unbelief, that they are forced to acknowledge that they perish by their own and most free Fault and contempt of the Gospel, and are deprived of the offered Benefits: and that it is to be imputed only to Negligence, evil desires and Hypocrisy that the Virtue and moisture of the heard Sermon on Divine Grace is not felt, or is suffocated and withers without Fruit.”

Dr. Joh. Bergius, on the *Difference and Agreement of the Evangelicals*, question 77, p. 118, to the Question: "But are all indeed so called by God that they are able to believe?" Responds:

“To be sure: Not indeed from the natural powers of free will, nor through the bare and external preaching, could any man believe. *For the natural man perceiveth not the things that are of the spirit of God. For it is foolishness to him, and though he hears, he cannot know them, unless besides the external word the Spirit of God also illuminates the heart and renews it within, 1 Cor. 2:14.* Nevertheless,

the preaching of the Word is the ordinary medium through which the Spirit of God, in those whom he externally calls, also wills to internally illuminate the heart and so to operate that by his grace they may be able to believe. Rom. 1:16, unless they themselves by sins against conscience maliciously and pertinaciously repel the word from themselves, and thus render themselves plainly incapable of the operation of the spirit, when by his grace they ought to have and could have believed, so that by their own fault they neither can nor will believe, as the Lord says, Ezek. 12:2, *They have eyes to see, and will not see; ears to hear, and will not hear*, Jer. 4:22, etc.”

A little after, p. 121:

“Therefore, when it is said that many, although called by GOD through the Gospel, are yet plainly unable to believe, this is not to be understood nude and simply of an innate impotence; Neither physical, which was bestowed on the essence of man in Creation, as it is said a man cannot fly, since he was not born fit for flying; For the human mind and will was created for faith in God; Nor moral, which consists in the corrupt mind and will; as it is said of infants that they cannot learn that which is beyond their grasp; For this innate ignorance and imbecility of the human intellect and will ought to and could be succored, by means of the word, through the Holy Spirit; But of a Moral impotence that is Affected, voluntary, and malicious, by which they cannot believe for the reason that they are by no means willing; In the way it is said of a thief that he cannot desist from stealing, or of others that they cannot desist from drinking, from lying, etc., because their heart is hardened in vices of this kind.”

The same, in *The Will of God for the Salvation of all Men*, Chap. X, v. 10, p. 59:

“It is well to be marked, when Scripture ascribes the entire guilt of unbelief and perdition to man himself, that it is not speaking merely of the guilt of original sin, which came upon all men through Adam's fall; Although many theologians are accustomed to put forward almost that guilt alone. For although all guilt and sin of men originates from Adam's fall and therefore from original sin, according to which they are also by nature entirely unfit for faith; Yet the grace of God in the Gospel is proclaimed to fallen men for this very reason, that they might be helped from such a fall and the original guilt be taken from them. Therefore, there must be another new guilt, by which they themselves make themselves incapable and bereft of the announced Evangelical grace, and thus through new guilt are also left in the old guilt.”

Ibid. §. VIII, p. 60:

“So also their guilt is not yet rightly described according to Scripture by this, that it is nevertheless their office and duty to repent and to believe in Christ, and that therefore they themselves are guilty of their own perdition when they do not do it, although they cannot do it by their own powers, and God also will not give them new powers for it. For in that way it is also their office and duty to keep the whole Law perfectly, although God after the fall does not give the powers for it nor is he obliged to give them. But in the Gospel (NOTE BENE) God deals with us men not according to the strict right and duty of the Law, but it is the word of grace; Now, in that way it would be no true grace, but indeed a right and duty as strict and impossible as the right of the Law; yea, in some measure even much stricter and more impossible, if God, alongside the preaching of Grace, would not also at the same time give new grace and powers for it.”

Ibid. §. IX, p. 61:

“For as little as God can or will command the dead that they should rise from the dead by their own powers; so little will He also command the spiritually dead that they should rise from sins by their own powers, but those whom he commands such a thing are obliged before all other things to believe this very thing, that He, through Jesus Christ, also wills to give them the powers for it, if only they do not willfully push his grace away from themselves.”

Chap. XII, §. XIX, p. 89:

“In this twofold understanding, no one should or can deny that God has shown to all the called sufficient grace for their salvation. For whoever would deny this *Sufficienciam* or Sufficiency of grace, would have to overturn the entire doctrine of grace of the Holy Gospel, and, which is blasphemous to think, lay the guilt of unbelief and perdition from men upon GOD the LORD himself.”

Ibid. §. XXIX, pag. 96:

“It is also certain and undeniable that the Spirit of God through the external word has its internal operation not only in the Elect, but also in many other called, both in the illumination of their understanding and in the moving of their will; although more in one than in another, according to whether they more or less resist the Spirit of God, who speaks and works through the word.”

§. XXX, p. 95 [sic, likely 96]:

“Therefore it is not to be denied that not only Objective Grace... but also Subjective or Operative Grace, by which we are to believe, is common to all the called, to the extent that God, through the Gospel as through the external means, also wills to work internally in them, if only they do not willfully push it away from themselves, and also in many in fact works a beginning of Repentance and Faith, and would work still further for their salvation, if they themselves by their own fault, which they could very well avoid by such shown grace, did not, in the manner explained above, hinder the further salutary working of grace of the Word and of the Spirit of God in themselves, and make themselves incapable of it.”

Which Declaration of **D. Joh. Bergius**, the Wittenbergers praise in the *Gründl. Beweis*, p. 509 to 533. The same things **Joh. Bergius** repeats and confirms in his *Answer to the Misinterpretations of Dr. Micraelius*, Chap. III, p. 18 ff., p. 34 to 43-44.

D. Conradus Bergius, Disp. I, *on the Sufficiency and Efficacy of the Death of Christ*, §. XXXII, p. 16-17:

“We understand these things without deceit and Sophistry: in what way a true love, true grace, a true benefit, and in the preaching of repentance and remission of sins, not a judicial upbraiding and conviction of sin, as in the preaching of the law; but a gracious and benign invitation to liberation and an exit from sin can most simply be understood by anyone in these things: by which God has most graciously established a Serious and true distinction between sinful men, with no one excepted before sin against the Holy Spirit, and the fallen Angels; not only in the sign of the external Announcement, or in some likeness and affinity of the assumed nature, from which however there is no greater access and power of exiting from misery for man than for Satan himself; but in the very truth of the matter, and so some power or access to the further necessary Means of salvation, and consequently to salvation itself: which only through a new ingratitude and contumacy of men, by which they spurn to pursue the further necessary means, lacks its fruit or end and full effect.”

Disp. II, §. XLVIII, XLIX, p. 50-51:

“It is absurd and injurious to the Goodness, Wisdom, and Power of God, to will something by decree and yet not to ordain the Means by

which that thing may actually and in fact be done: So it is absurd and injurious to the same Goodness, Wisdom and power of God, to approve something, and to be seriously pleased and delighted by it, and to invite to it benignly and mercifully, and yet not to ordain the media by which that, in which he is delighted, and to which he so benignly and mercifully invites, can really be done. Now, moreover, it is notorious from the testimonies above and from the whole analogy of Sacred Scripture, that the precept of repentance and of acknowledging the truth pertains not to judgment and wrath, not to upbraiding and conviction, but to a benefit, and to an invitation of the most benign grace and mercy towards sinners and the unworthy: which is most evidently established from the parable of the Great Supper and of the marriage feast in Luke 14 and Matt. 22, and is most openly understood in this very place from the third member.”

The same he has in *Themata Theologica*, Disp. XII, quest. II, p. 121.

D. Ludov. Crocius, *Syntagma Theologiae*, Book IV, Ch. VI, §. XV, distinguishes the Call into the Call of Sufficient Grace and of Abundant Grace. The Call of Sufficient Grace he describes on p. 1026:

“which so suffices for all men, even the Non-elect, for Salvation, that access to it is not altogether and in all ways impossible for them along with their first Parent, and all excuse is taken away from those who refuse it in God's judgment. He proves this Thesis with prolix reasons, which you may read in the Author himself, ch. 1.”

The same **Crocius** confirms the same things in his *Duodecade Dissertationum*, Dissert. XII, p. 745.

The **British** [delegates] in the *Acts of the Synod of Dort, Judgment on Article II*, Th. IV, p. 603-604:

“In the Church, where according to this promise of the Gospel salvation is offered to all, there is such an Administration of Grace, which suffices to convince all the impenitent and unbelieving that they have perished by their own voluntary fault, and either by neglect or contempt of the Gospel have lost the offered benefit. Christ by his death not only founded the Evangelical covenant, but moreover impetrated from the Father that wherever that covenant should be announced, there also ordinarily that measure of supernatural grace should be administered which suffices to convince all the impenitent and unbelieving of contempt, or at least of neglect, for not having fulfilled the condition.”

Which is excellently demonstrated; read it in the Acts themselves.

Joh. Davenantius in his *Judgment* to Hermannus Hildebrand, in the latter's *Orthodoxa Declaratio Articulorum trium*, p. 31, n. 3, asserts:

“that God concedes to the Non-Elect such a measure of supernatural Grace, which could have profited for their Salvation, being gradually promoted, if they did not by their own voluntary fault place an obstacle to the operations of Divine grace.”

Likewise in his *Animadversions* (in English) opposed to a certain anonymous *Treatise on the Love of God towards the Human race*, p. 201, he says:

“Wherever the Church of Christ is, there is a Sufficient Administration of such Grace, which would have saved even the Non-Elect, if they themselves had not opposed a malignant Voluntary act of their own Will to the Motions and Operations of Divine Grace, according to the words of the Savior, John 3:17 & 12:47-48, & Acts 13:46.”

Concerning **D. Joh. Overall**, finally Bishop of Norwich, **Davenantius** reports in the same place, p. 200:

“that he attributed to the Non-Elect a common and Sufficient Grace in the divinely ordained Means, which would produce salvation, if they were not unwilling to be wanting to the Word of God and the Holy Spirit. Above on p. 154-155 we have produced the words of the same Overall, in which he affirms that God ordained for all in general, according to more and less, the necessary and Sufficient Means and Aids for producing the salvation of men.”

See **Zach. Ursinus**, *Explic. Catechet.*, to qu. VII, sect. IV, n. 3, p. 68.

The **Leiden Theologians**, *Censurae Confessionis Remonstrantium*, Ch. XVII, p. 235:

“We Acknowledge that that force of the Spirit is always conjoined with the Word, which either converts a man, or convicts him of his own contumacy when he is not converted, as Christ testifies, John 16:8.”

Ibid. p. 235 f. 236, Paragraph three, the Call is divided into a Sufficient and an Efficacious Call.

“which distinction, rightly understood, we admit. For we Concede that all those who are called by the Gospel are Sufficiently called, that is, that God out of his justice is not obligated to call them otherwise

than he in fact does call them, and that by that call they are Sufficiently deprived of all pretext of excuse before the judgment of God, if they are not converted; because the fault, why they are not converted, inheres in themselves alone.”

Ibid. p. 240 f. 241:

“In the seventh Paragraph the Remonstrants teach that man can spurn and reject divine grace, and resist its operation; Which we willingly concede, and therefore there was no need for them to prove it so laboriously. For whether we look at the external grace of the Gospel, which is called the ministry of the Spirit, 2 Cor. 3, or also the internal operations of the Holy Spirit by which he convicts the mind of man of the truth of the Gospel and of his duty, we confess that man can resist this operation of grace, and therefore can render himself unfit for believing and for obeying the divine will, when he is divinely called to faith and obedience, and that by his own fault, and that a true one, and one that is vincible by the same grace, if the man did not hold that grace back in unrighteousness, which all men left to themselves do, as the Apostle testifies, Rom. 1:18 & 3:10 ff.”

The words of the same Leiden theologians from the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, which Herm. Hildebrand made his own, will be cited below on p. 169 with the modest admonition of D. Joh. Bergius.

Ant. Walæus, *Loci Communes*, on Reprobation, *Works*, p. 373:

“To the called who are non-elect he attributes in express words not only Grace and Supernatural Gifts; but also Sufficient Grace: Indeed we say further with the same Augustine, that even SUFFICIENT GRACE FOR SALVATION is given to them, which does not conflict with Reprobation, as is clear from the example of the reprobate Angels, likewise of all men created in Adam in the image of God. But only Grace that is infallibly efficacious for salvation is denied to them. For in Adam all had the powers to keep the law, and lost them in him. Therefore Sufficient Grace for salvation can stand together with the Decree of Reprobation.”

Paræus, Book I, ch. XI of *Grace and Free Will against Bellarmine*, p. 124 ff., admits the distinction of Grace into Sufficient and Efficacious. Confer also **Franc. Junius**, *Collatio de Natura & Gratia*, to Reason LVII, and *ibid.* in the Conclusion of the Collation; likewise on Rev. 3:12.

And that some attain justifying Faith by the power of a Sufficient common Grace is not to be simply and precisely denied, states **D. Conr. Bergius**, *Praxis Catholica*,

Diff. VI, §. CXXXIV, CLXV, CLXVI, p. 802, 838, 839, 840, and **D. Elias Grebenitz** in his *Unterricht*, Ch. VI, §. XIX, XXII, p. 182, 186, 187. It is certain that the Cause of further Grace being denied is the Abuse and Contempt of Prior Grace, Matt. 25:29.

The Consensus of **Augustine** on the Sufficient Grace of men called directly, i.e., through the Ministry of the Divine Word, you have here on p. 102 to 106.

As for the **Gentiles**, they, at least, were and are called indirectly, i.e., through the Works of Creation and Providence, and the fame of the true Church, which Call Prevenient Grace accompanies. See here p. 105. This indeed does not suffice immediately for Salvation; It suffices, however, for acknowledging God the Creator of Heaven and Earth as One, Eternal, Wise, Powerful, Good, and Just, and for worshiping and glorifying him, and for seeking the true God. Because they neglect to do this, and refer all their thoughts rather to the immortality of their own Name, to Avarice, and to fulfilling foul Pleasures, likewise to forbidden Divinations, than to the Glory of God, and thus they hold back the Truth, and that Knowledge of God, in a lie and in impiety, it thence comes to pass that they are inexcusable, Ps. 19:1 ff; Acts 17:24, 27; Rom. 1:18, 19 ff. See **Henr. Alting**, *Scripta Heidelbergensia*, Tom. II, Problem. I, p. 1-9.

Elegantly the Author of the Books *On the Vocation of the Gentiles*, Book II, Ch. XV:

“There has always been applied to all men a certain measure of supernal Doctrine, which, although it was of a more spare and more hidden Grace, Sufficed nevertheless for some as a Remedy, for all as a Testimony.”

§. V. But so great and so profound is the native and adventitious Corruption and Depravation of men, that, though endowed with the sufficient Grace of the Call, by which their Mind, i.e., Intellect and Will, is more than enough convicted and impelled concerning the Truth of the Gospel and their own duty, they nevertheless, being left to themselves, ordinarily resist these operations of Grace, even the internal ones, and render themselves, when divinely called to Faith and Obedience, unfit for believing and for obeying the divine Will, and that by their own proper fault, and that a true one and one that is vincible by the same Grace (as the Theologians of Leiden say in their *Censura of the Remonstrant Confession*, Chap. XVII, p. 241).

Therefore God, out of his unmerited, inexhaustible and abundant Mercy, so powerfully—not violently, however, but gently—convinces certain men and bends them to compliance, that:

- in **Psalm 119:18**, he opens their eyes to contemplate the wonders of the law;

- in **Eph. 1:17-18**, he gives them the Spirit of wisdom and Revelation, namely, the eyes of the mind being enlightened, so that they may know the hope of the Call and the riches of Glory in the saints;
- in **Luke 24:45**, he opens their mind to understand the Scriptures;
- in **Acts 16:14**, he opens the Heart, that they may attend to those things which are said by the preachers;
- in **Ezek. 36:26**, he takes away the heart of stone from the midst of their flesh and gives a heart of flesh, and makes them walk in his statutes;
- in **Psalms 51:12** and **Eph. 2:10**, he creates a new heart in them and renews a right Spirit in their bowels;
- in **John 3:5** and **1 Pet. 1:3**, he regenerates them from heaven;
- in **John 6:44**, he draws them;
- in **Eph. 1:19-20**, he resurrects them by the same divine power which he applied in the Resurrection of Christ from the dead;
- in **Phil. 2:13**, he works in them both to will and to perfect;
- in **2 Thess. 1:11**, he powerfully fulfills the work of Faith in them;
- in **Heb. 13:21**, he does in them what is pleasing to himself before him;
- in **Jer. 31:33**, he puts his laws in them and writes them in their hearts.

And thus he discerns the non-converted from the converted, and the non-believer from the believer; according to that saying of Paul in **1 Cor. 4:7**: *For who distinguisheth thee? Or what hast thou that thou hast not received? And if thou hast received, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?*

This Operation of divine Grace is wont to be called in Greek **στρεπνικάρδιος** **Vorticordia** (Heart-turning); by the Scholastics, **Intrinsically Efficacious**; by Augustine, **Victorious** and **Triumphant**; by the Reformed Theologians, **Special**, **Peculiar**, and **Abundant**; and it ought to be coordinated with, not opposed to, Sufficient Grace.

Augustine, Prosper, Fulgentius, Remigius, and others asserted this against the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians. The **Synod of Dort** established the same against the Arminians in Chap. III & IV, Art. XI, XII. The Reformed Theologians believe it is taught especially in the **Formula of Concord** itself (Leipzig edition in octavo), p. 654, 656, 660, 662, 663, 669, 673. It is certain that there, on p. 663, the locations in Scripture for the efficacious Operation of the Holy Spirit in the Conversion of man, which are cited here, are also adduced and urged.

Whence also the Reformed have appealed to the Consensus of the Formula of Concord; Besides the **Admonition of Neustadt**, C. IX, p. 332; the **Heidelbergers** in the *Detailed Report on what the Reformed Churches believe, etc.*, chap. VIII, p. 190, 192, 193, 194, and the *Short Appendix*, p. 299, 300; **D. Joh. Bergius** in the Preface to *The Will of GOD for the Salvation of all Men*, p. 4, 6; **Christoph Massonius**, *Anatomia Universalis Triumphans*, Part IV, chap. XXXIV, p. 287, 295.

But however it may be: Since among the Lutherans and the Reformed it is not a matter of Controversy that:

1. After the Lapse, man is intimately corrupt, dead in sins, and therefore utterly unfit to begin and to perfect any Spiritual Good.
2. Not only Faith itself, but also the inclination and Disposition to Faith is a gratuitous gift of God.
3. Man, in the first moment of Conversion, behaves purely passively, etc.

From this it is clear that the Reformed and the Lutherans can be reconciled more easily than others concerning this Matter.

DISSERTATION II. CONCERNING THE ELECTION OF MEN.

SUMMARY.

§. I. The Consideration of Election follows.

§. II. The various Meanings of the word, Election, & in what sense it is taken here.

§. III. The Definition of Election.

§. IV. The Efficient Cause of Election. Also, the internal Moving Cause (προηγούμενη, proēgoumenē).

§. V. What is to be thought concerning the external Moving Reason (προκαταρκτικῇ, prokatartikē). That We are Elected in Christ & on account of Christ.

§. VI. The Subject of Election, Man Called either immediately or mediately. Neither works nor Faith, from the powers of man, foreseen, is the Cause of Election.

§. VII. Yet the Reformed do not deny that God foresees Faith, to be given or as given by him through His Word & Spirit.

§. VIII. Whether & in what sense the Decree of Election is Absolute.

§. IX. The End of Election.

§. X. The Attributes of Election.

§. I. The Consideration of Predestination is followed by the Consideration of Election. First, the Ambiguity of this Word must be removed, then the Definition or Explanation of its Essence must be subjoined.

§. II. As pertains to the Ambiguity, the word Election is taken either improperly & metonymically, for the Elect, as in Rom. **XI.** 7, "The election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded"; or properly, for the action of God electing, and separating some from others, which is also diverse according to the Diversity of the ends of the one Electing.

For it notes an Election to a public office, either Ecclesiastical, in which sense Christ in Luke **VI.** 13 is said to have chosen twelve, whom he named Apostles (cf. Joh. **VI.** 70; Jerem. **XLIX.** 19; Hag. **II.** 23; Act. **XV.** 7), or Political, in which sense Samuel said of Saul: "See ye him whom the LORD hath chosen?" 1 Sam. **X.** 24.

Sometimes it signifies the general Vocation to the Participation of the Covenant, e.g. Deut. **IV.** 37; C. **VII.** 6, 7, 8; C. **X.** 15; Is. **XIV.** 1; C. **XLI.** 8, 9; C. **XLIII.** 17; C. **XLV.** 4; Ez. **XX.** 5; Zach. **III.** 2; Act. **XIII.** 17; Ps. **LXXXIX.** 4, 20.

Sometimes it notes the Destination of men to salvation & to the means of the same, 2 Thess. **II.** 13. And that made either in time, e.g. Joh. **XV.** 19, or made from eternity, Eph. **I.** 4, 5. In which sense the word Election is taken here, and is called elsewhere purpose (πρόθεσις, prothesis), Rom. **VIII.** 28; foreknowledge (πρόγνωσις, prognōsis); Inscription in the book of Life, Dan. **XII.** 1; Phil. **IV.** 3; Apoc. **III.** 5; Chap. **XVII.** 8; Chap. **XX.** 15; Chap. **XXII.** 19; Luc. **X.** 20; Hebr. **XII.** 23; and by the Pontificals, Lutherans, & some Reformed Theologians, Predestination.

§. III. And Election is the Decree of God, by which God, out of the benevolent affection of His Will, before the foundations of the World were laid, from men who in His Foreknowledge are fallen, called, & relapsed, resolved to elect certain ones in Christ & on account of Christ, i.e., to give them justifying & saving Faith, to justify them through Faith, to adopt them as sons, to sanctify, & to eternally glorify them, to the praise of His glorious Grace.

Augustine in Chap. **XIV** of *On the Gift of Perseverance* defines it in this way: "The Predestination of the Saints is nothing other than the Foreknowledge & Preparation of the benefits of God, by which are most certainly liberated whosoever are liberated." Which words the Church of Lyons cites & approves against Joh. Scotus, Chap. **II**, p. 595.

§. IV. The Efficient Cause of Election is God, considered not hypostatically (ὕποστατικῶς, hypostatikōs), but essentially (ἐσιωδῶς, essiodōs); With Paul as witness in Eph. **I.** 4, 5: "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in

love: And has predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will." Cf. Rom. **VIII**. 29.

The internal or preceding Moving Cause (προηγούμενη, proēgoumenē) is the unmerited & merely gratuitous Grace of God, Eph. **I**. 5; C. **II**. 8, 9: "By grace are ye saved, through Faith... not of works." Rom. **IX**. 15, 16: "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy... it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy."

§. **V**. That we have been elected in Christ is the common Faith & Voice of all Theologians & of the Confessions of the Church, since Paul teaches it in express words in Eph. **I**. 4. Concerning the sense of these words of Paul, however, Theologians disagree among themselves.

Most Lutheran Theologians believe that the phrase "in Christ" is Causal and motivating, whence they will that the Merit of Christ, viewed with respect to the foreseen final Application, is the preliminary or external moving Cause (προκαταρκτικήν, prokatartikēn). D. Johannes Musæus, however, a Theologian of Jena, in the *Jena Theologians' detailed Explanation*, Loc. **IX**, Quæst. **XLVIII**, p. 485, has warned that there is no true & real moving Cause of Election given, but only a Reason a Priori, having the likeness of a Cause, as to our mode of conceiving.

The Reformed Theologians to a man all teach that We have been elected in Christ. Some, however, take the phrase "in Christ" not antecedently, with respect to the Decree, but consequently, with respect to the Execution of the Decree & of Salvation. Who on that account ought not, however, to be accused of overthrowing the foundation, much less be condemned, since they nevertheless found our whole salvation in Christ, nor do they simply exclude Christ from the Decree of Election itself. We indeed will not contend with anyone concerning Scholastic Terms; In the meantime, with many (to be cited here) Reformed Theologians, we establish that the Decree of Election itself, and so the very Act of Election, was made in Christ, and that We were elected through Christ & on account of Christ.

For Christ the God-man (θεάνθρωπος, theanthrōpos) is the fount & Thesaurus of all Grace & spiritual Blessing, from whose fullness not only in time, but also before the foundations of the world were laid, we have received grace for grace (χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος, charin anti charitos), Joh. **I**. 16.

I. Because without him God, being a consuming fire, would have taken counsel not of saving Us, but of eternally damning us; for the Mercy of God would have been impeded by his Justice, so that without the intervention of a ransom, He would not have destined pardon of sins & eternal Life for Sinners. Hence in Is. **XLII**. 1, he is called that elect servant of God, whom "mine elect, in whom my soul

delighteth." Or, as it is in Matth. **XII**. 18: "Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased."

II. Paul in Eph. **I**. 4 writes that God has chosen us in Christ: by which words he teaches that not only the Execution of Election, but the intention itself, and so the very ante-secular Election, and the very act of Election was made in Christ, and that Grace not only of Execution, but also of Predestination is to be derived from Christ, the fount of Grace.

III. He insinuates the same thing in the same place, vs. 4, with the emphatic particle, *as*, by which he indicates that God does not benefit us in time otherwise than in the way He has benefited us from eternity, and decreed to benefit us; Now it is beyond controversy that God in time confers all Benefits, especially spiritual ones, on us on account of Christ; It is therefore consonant that God also elected us from eternity on account of Christ.

IV. This is also clear from vs. 5, where the Apostle says: "He has predestinated us, whom he would adopt through Jesus Christ." Therefore not only the Adoption, but also the predestination of Adoption was made in Christ & through Christ.

To this is added, **V**, that Christ is that promised Seed of Gen. **III** & **XXII**, in whom & on account of whom the Nations of the Earth were to be blessed. And that He is referred to as that immaculate Lamb of God foreknown before the foundations of the world were laid, 1 Petr. **I**. 20.

Likewise, **VI**, that Christ is deservedly established as the Root, Foundation & Head of the Elect; which things infer not only order & dignity, but also influx.

The Confessions, & certain great Doctors of the Reformed Church, lucidly prove this Truth. The Helvetic Confession, which is first in the *Syntagma Confessionum*, has these things in Chap. **X**:

"Therefore not without a medium, though not on account of any merit of ours, but in Christ, & on account of Christ, God has elected us, so that those who are now engrafted into Christ by Faith, they themselves are also the elect; but the reprobate are those who are outside of Christ." And a little after: "We therefore disapprove those who seek outside of Christ whether they have been elected from eternity, and what God has established concerning them before all eternity."

The Anhalt Confession also has in conceived words that we were Elected through & on account of Christ, in Chap. **XI**, after the words alleged back here on p. 128, 129, it teaches:

"According to the Good Pleasure and Counsel of his most Clement Will, through and on account of Christ as mediator; & in Christ as the Head, in whom He loved us already before the Foundations of the World were laid, He has by an immutable Decree destined for eternal Life all who flee to Christ by true faith & persevere in it even to the end of life."

The sense of the **Helvetic Confession** is explained by its principal Author, **Henricus Bullingerus**, in his *Five Decades of Sermons on the Chief Chapters of the Christian Religion*, Dec. IV, Sermon IV, fol. 217:

"God decreed to save all, as many as have Communion with Christ his only-begotten Son, but to destroy all, as many as are alien from the Communion of Christ his only Son. Moreover, the faithful have communion with Christ, the unfaithful are alien from Christ. For Paul in the Epistle to the Ephesians says: *God has chosen us in Christ, before the foundations of the World were laid, that we might be Holy and irreprehensible before him, through Charity: who has predestined us, that he might adopt us as sons, through Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the Good pleasure of his Will, that the Glory of his Grace might be praised, by which he is pleased with Us in the Beloved.* Behold, God has elected us and chose us before the foundations of the World were laid, and he elected us, that we might be irreprehensible, that is, heirs of eternal Life. But he elected us *in Christ*, through or for the sake of Christ. And still more clearly: *He has predestined us*, he says, *that he might adopt us as sons, but through Christ*, and he did this freely, that Glory may be given to Divine Grace. Therefore, whoever are in Christ, are elect, etc."

On the second face [of the folio]:

"The Predestination of God does not rest upon or is moved by either our Dignity or indignity: but from the mere Grace and Mercy of God the Father, it looks only to Christ."

A little after:

"Freely therefore, from his mere Mercy, not on account of our merits, but on account of Christ, and only in Christ, has he elected us, and on account of Christ he embraces us."

Fol. CCXVIII, second face:

"Let us hold it firmly impressed upon our hearts, that God has elected us in Christ, and on account of Christ has predestined us to Life, and

therefore he both gives and increases faith to those who ask, and inspires us to ask for the same.”

D. Joh. Bergius in the Theological Disputation held at Frankfurt in the year 1616, Thesis XXXVIII:

“Christ is so included in that eternal Decree, that he is not only a ministerial Cause of executing Election, but also the Foundation of making or decreeing it, because no Election was made except with respect to the Merit and Obedience of the only-begotten Son, in whom alone the Father was pleased, so that through him and for the sake of him he saves and has decreed to save all and only those who believe in him. For he has also most sufficiently merited this. But that the unbelieving also (namely insofar as they remain in unbelief) should be saved, the whole of Scripture cries out that he in no way willed to merit or impetrate.”

He repeats these words of this Disputation in his *Answer to the manifold Misinterpretations of D. Joh. Micraelius*, Chap. VI, p. 144-145, and confirms them with these words:

“I have, praise God, ever since then constantly remained with this doctrine: that Christ is not only the Means of our salvation, but also the proper Ground of our election, for the sake of whom all saving grace is ordained and given to us.”

The same, in his *Explication of the saying John 3:16*, p. 232:

“In sum, Jesus Christ the only-begotten Son of God is the first-loved, and also as true Man, the first-elect before all men, in whom the Father had his first and highest good pleasure, and on whom all love and good pleasure towards men is founded. And that is the first love, with which He loved them in Him for his own sake, when they were still sinners and enemies, that He ordained and gave Him as a propitiation, as Mediator and Savior of the world.”

In *The Distinction and Comparison of the Evangelicals*, Quæst. LVII, p. 77:

“We are certainly elected by God only in Christ, that is, through and on account of Jesus Christ, as our Savior and Redeemer, Eph. 1:4, 5, 6, 10, 11; 1 Tim. 1:9. For as he is the First-born among all his brethren, so he is also the First-loved and First-elect among all the children of GOD: and the one and only Ground of our election as well as of our redemption and entire salvation. Because the Father has such a good pleasure in him alone, that in him and for his sake, he has elected for

himself a people for his own possession from among sinful men, Rom. 8:29; Eph. 1:6; Col. 1:18, 19; Matt. 3:17; 1 Pet. 1:19, 20.”

He teaches the same things in *The Will of God for the Salvation of all Men*, Ch. VIII, §. VI, p. 47; Chap. XV, §. IX, p. 133-134; Chap. XVI, §. XII, p. 183; and in the *Answer to the Misinterpretations of D. Micraelius*, Ch. VI, p. 141, 143, 144.

D. Fridericus Reichelius in the *Theological Disputation on the Satisfaction of Jesus Christ*, with Georgius Conradus Bergius (afterwards Doctor of Sacred Theology) responding, held at Frankfurt on the Oder in the year 1644, Thesis XII:

“All the Good pleasure, Love, and Grace of the Father is founded in Christ alone, as in Matt. 3:17, This is my Beloved Son, etc., Col. 1:19, In him it pleased (ἐνδόκησεν) that all fullness should dwell, Acts 4:12, Nor is there salvation in any other. John 3:35, The Father loveth the Son, and he hath given all things into his hand, and Chap. 5:20, 23 & Ch. 14:6; Eph. 1:4, He hath chosen us in him, vs. 6, He hath graced us (ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς) in the beloved.

Th. XIII: Nor does it stand in the way that it is objected to us not only by the Socinians, but also by certain others, that the Decree of our Election is absolute. For although our Election is called absolute in the sense that it was made without any respect to a cause, or merit, or condition foreseen in us: It was not, however, made without Respect to the Merit of Christ, to whom we were given by Election: John 17:9; Eph. 1:4, 5, 6. And in whom, as the firstborn and best-loved of all the Sons of God, all love toward the rest is founded, so that he himself is in all things pre-eminent (προτέυων), outside of whom there is in us no good pleasure (ἐνδοκία) or love, but all wrath, malediction, and consuming fire.”

Georg. Sohnius, *Works*, Vol. II, *Exegesis of the Augustan Confession*, p. 1015:

“Christ is not here excluded from Election or the decree of those to be saved, since he is true God and of the same substance (ὁμοούσιος) as the Father, but he is distinguished in this business as Mediator, in whom our Election is made firm, from him with whom he acts as Mediator for us, namely from the Father.”

Joh. Crocius, Theologian of Hesse, in his *Commentary on Eph. 1:4*, p. 236:

“He hath chosen us in him, that is, in Christ, as Mediator, without whom if it be done, eternal death is owed to sinners; Nor does God elect anyone unless his Justice is satisfied. Therefore he elected in Christ, who made satisfaction for the whole Human race. He did not

elect us in ourselves, as if we merited it by Faith or sanctity, or as if we were pleasing to him outside of Christ. There are those who say, he elected in Christ; that is, that he might save through Christ as a Mediator, or that he destined to salvation to be obtained in Christ; I do not condemn those who explain it thus, because in that they hold the Foundation of Salvation intact, in that they found Salvation in Christ alone. To me, however, it is more pleasing that the cause for which God elected us is noted: so that the sense is, he elected us in Christ, i.e., through and for the sake of Christ, as the Helvetic Confession and Hyperius have it on this passage. Thus Election is founded in the Satisfaction and merit of Christ.”

The same, *ibid.* p. 250, n. 5:

“Those who are elect, are elect in Christ. No one is elected outside of Christ. For God has elected us in Christ, in this passage, vs. 4. Therefore the merit of Christ is wrongly excluded from here. He satisfied God for sin, and brought it about that he could, with his justice being safe, elect those sinners whom he willed. Remove Christ, and God is a consuming fire, Deut. 4:24. Therefore the Helvetic Churches in their former Confession, Chap. X, say: *Therefore, not without a mediator, but not on account of any merit, but in Christ and for the sake of Christ has God elected us.* Great theologians, I confess, both among the Papists and among us, teach that not our election from the foreseen merit of Christ, but only its execution was done; But first, the Apostle says distinctly, *He hath chosen us in him*, that is, in Christ. Therefore not only the execution of Election, but also our Election itself was made through Christ. For thus Chrysostom, Photius, and others commonly understand it. Second, he says in vs. 5, he has predestined us, whom he would adopt through Jesus Christ. Therefore not only the adoption, but also the Predestination of the Adoption was made through Christ. You will say: God elected us in Christ, not as Christ is man, but as he is God. But the Apostle shows sufficiently that he is speaking of Christ the incarnate Mediator, since he not only names Jesus Christ many times, but he makes mention of his blood in vs. 7. Add to this that there is no cause why Christ should be considered otherwise here than in the preceding verse, where God is said to have blessed us in Christ. Is he considered there purely as God? No, rather as Mediator according to the promise: *In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed*, Genes. 22:18. Nor does it stand in the way that in Col. 1:16 all things are said to have been created in Christ, as he is God. For the circumstances there compel us to embrace that sense, here no circumstance compels it. If you say

we are said to be elected in Christ so that we may be incorporated into him, I do not indeed deny that we were elected so that we may be incorporated into Christ: but that this and nothing else is signified by that phrase is not firmly proven.”

Matthias Martinius in his *Commentary on Psalm II*, p. 134, 224, 225, writes that we were elected in Christ, through and for the sake of Christ, and likewise that Christ is the Foundation of our Election and Salvation.

Ludovicus Crocius, *Assertion of the Augustan Confession*, Disp. II, §. LV, p. 74-75:

“This Will of God was moved freely by the merit of Christ alone, or as Peter says in his 1st Epistle 1:19, by the precious blood of the unspotted and undefiled lamb, foreknown before the foundations of the World were laid.

§. LXVIII, p. 81: Let those novelties of speech (καινοφωνίαι) and the battles over words (λογομαχίαι) born from them depart, since on both sides it is certain and settled that no one was elected outside of Christ, but that we were elected in Christ, who is the foundation for the Elect, and the fount of all Celestial blessings, from which they are derived unto us.

Likewise p. 499, §. CLXVI, he says: Since all the effects of Election are administered through and for the sake of Christ: I think with those who, with the full phrase, call Christ the foundation of Election: as one without whom it could not justly be done that sinners should be elected, to whom God had veraciously threatened death.”

The same is taught by **Paulus Steinius**, *The Evangelical Brotherhood*, Part III, Chap. II, p. 43 f. 44. The same things are taught by **Joh. Calvin**, *Commentary on Malachi*, chap. 1, p. 728:

“Our election is hidden in the eternal and secret counsel of God, and is founded in Christ alone: but reprobation is also hidden in the judgment of God.”

And Book III of the *Institutes*, ch. XXIV, no. 5.

Hieron. Zanchius writes on chapter 1 of Ephesians:

“It is more approved by me if we say that we were elected in Christ as in a head, so that we might be his members, and those holy, etc. For just as the Father first exalted Christ into Heaven, and made him to sit, and afterwards us in him: so also I think of this Order in eternal

Election. God the Father willed the Son to become the Head of the Church, therefore he elected Members for him. And the Apostle's Words teach this: He has blessed us in Christ (as in a head) just as he has elected us in him. Therefore just as we are not blessed except in Christ the Head: so also we were not elected without Christ, or in any Order of Nature outside of Christ, but in Christ, as in a head, and that a Head already elected."

likewise book V, On the Nature of God, ch. II, Q. III, n. 3, p. 635-636.

That great man, **Lancelot Andrews**, sometime Bishop of Winchester, in his *Judgment on the Lambeth Articles*, annexed to the Lambeth Articles, p. 23-24, asks:

"Does the good pleasure of God in electing us include Christ, or seclude him, i.e., is the Act of Predestinating an absolute Act, or a related one? And he Responds: As for me, I consider it to be related; nor is there any good pleasure of God in men (i.e., Will by which he is well-pleased in men) except in the son, in whom he was well-pleased (ἐνδόκησε), nor is anyone predestined either before or without the view of Christ. But (as the sacred Scriptures have it) Christ was first foreknown (προεγνωσμένον), 1 Pet. 1:2, then in him, Us, Rom. 8:29. Christ was first predestined (ὁρισθέντα), Rom. 1:4, then through him, Us, Eph. 1, vs. 4. Not however, Us in the first place (as it seems to some), and him in the latter place and on account of Us. For we cannot be predestined unto the adoption of sons (εἰς υἱοθεσίαν) except in the natural Son, nor can we be predestined to be conformed to the image of the Son, unless the Son is first established, to whose image we may be conformed."

The **Theologians of Great Britain** in their *Judgment on the first Article*, Acts of the Synod of Dort, Thesis II, p. 491-492:

"Christ, they say, is the Head and Foundation of the Elect. Likewise: In the eternal Election of singular Persons, God by one and the same Act both assigns Christ as a Head to them, and at the same time constitutes them as members of Christ according to his Good pleasure: by which purpose God, even before the temporal Call, intuitus them as given to Christ, and as elected in the same and accepted by him. Likewise Christ is the Fount from which all the streams of saving Grace emanate to us. John 1, vs. 16; 2 Tim. 1:9."

The **Genevans**, *ibid.* Thesis I, p. 352. The **Bremeners**, *ibid.* Th. II, p. 566-567:

"This Decree is most free, inasmuch as God has mercy on whom he wills; and most just, as having been made in Christ the Mediator, the

placator of God's wrath, and the Reconciler of men; most benign, as a purpose of giving Salutary Grace and Glory.”

The **Leiden Theologians** in the *Synopsis of Purer Theology*, Disputation XXIV, §. XXIV, XXV:

“In this Decree of Election we, with all of antiquity and not a few great Authors of the Reformed Church, assign the first place to Christ as the head and Redeemer of the Church, just as in Isa. 42:1. For that reason he was called that elect Servant of God, whom his soul benignly accepts, or that child in whom his soul was well pleased, as Matt. 12:18 cites this place, and in 1 Pet. 1:20 he is called: The Lamb foreknown before the foundations of the World were laid. Nor does it conflict with this that Christ was elected for the cause of redeeming the Church: for although we acknowledge that God the Father, from whom are all things, and who reconciled us to himself through Christ, 2 Cor. 5:18, had a Will or affect of having mercy on certain ones when he constituted Christ the Redeemer in the same eternity, because a Redeemer cannot be thought of without those to be redeemed; yet this Will or affect alone is not yet called Election in the Scriptures, because that Mercy was impeded by Justice, so that he could not destine Salvation to sinners by a completed act, unless a Satisfaction should intervene, and because this Election comprises not only the end, but also the means necessary to Salvation, as was shown in Th. XIX.”

Walæus in his *Response to the Censure of Corvinus*, Ch. XXV, p. 248, 361. **Piscator** in his *Analysis of Ephesians 1* writes that the Merit of Christ is the Procatartetic Cause (Causam προκαταρκτικήν) of our Election. Confer **Polanus** in his *Didascalica*, p. 45, & **Perkins**, *On Predestination*, p. 15. **Thom. Pierce**, *Pacificatorium Orthodoxae Theologiae Corpusculum*, Ch. V, §. VII, p. 50. **Melanchthon**, *Loci Theologici* in the *Corpus Doctrinae*, p. 614.

§. VI. The **Remote Subject** of Election is fallen men; but the **Proximate** subject is men who are called either immediately (e.g., Adults) or mediately (e.g., Infants) and who, by a gracious vocation (as to Adults), have been instructed with a Sufficient Knowledge of Things to be Believed and Done, and indeed with a Common Assent, and therefore with a certain initial Faith (such as is almost that of the Temporarily believing); but who have Relapsed through Actual Sins, and are therefore, if GOD willed to deal with them according to the rigor of Justice, worthy of Rejection equally as others (namely, the Passed by).

But God, out of a Special, abundant, and unowed Grace, elects these Called but Relapsed men on account of Christ the Mediator in this order: that is, he decrees

to infuse into them, by his Word and Spirit (joined to the Word by an indivisible bond), a living, justifying, and saving, rooted Faith; and to actually convert them; to adopt them through Faith in Christ on account of this Only-begotten Son, and to unite them to Him more closely, and he constitutes them Heirs of eternal Salvation, and thus discerns the Elect from the Reprobate.

Therefore, nothing in men can be a Cause externally moving God to elect, neither prerogative of birth, nor gifts of genius, nor power (**1 Cor. 1:26-27**), nor a good use of natural free Will, nor a Pedagogical willing, nor works, nor faith foreseen from the powers of Nature. This is proven by various places in Holy Scripture:

1.

- **Eph. 1:3-4:** *GOD hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places, in Christ. As he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and unspotted in his sight in charity; not because we were such.*
- **Acts 13:48:** *As many as were ordained to life everlasting, believed.*
- **Eph. 2:8:** *It is the gift of GOD that we believe. Whence faith is referred to the infused habits.*

2. Election was made from the benevolent Affection of the divine Will, not indeed from works.

- **Eph. 1:5, 11:** *He has predestinated us unto the adoption of children... according to the purpose of his will. Likewise: According to the purpose of him who worketh all things according to the counsel of his will.*
- **Matt. 11:25-26:** *I confess to thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them to the little ones. Yea, Father; for so hath it seemed good in thy sight.*
- **Luke 12:32:** *Fear not, little flock, for it hath pleased your Father to give you a kingdom.*
- **Rom. 9:11:** *That the purpose of God, according to election, might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth.*
- **vs. 16:** *So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.*
- **Rom. 11:6:** *And if by grace, it is not now by works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, it is no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.*
- **2 Tim. 1:9:** *GOD hath delivered us and called us by his holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the times of the world.*

3. **St. Augustine** also urges this Argument: If the Election of men were from foreseen Faith, men would not be electing God, but men would be electing God, against Christ's assertion in **John 15:16**: *You have not chosen me: but I have chosen you.*

4. The **Subject of Election** proves the same thing, in that it is not innocent and integral men, and therefore worthy of Election and meriting divine Love, but fallen and sinful men, dead in sins, whose Spiritual Life and vital Acts—Faith and Good works, proceeding from the Holy Spirit—cannot be done or be foreseen without prevenient, exciting, and Operating Grace.

5. And although the **Object of Predestination** may be stated as man called, and therefore endowed with Grace that is either only Prevenient, or Prevenient and Preparing at the same time, and thus with the power of believing, yet **Actual Justifying and saving Faith** is elicited from **Operating and Discriminating Grace**, unless you wish to admit that Man in the first moment of Conversion behaves actively, and that the believing and converted man discerns himself from the non-believing and non-converted man.

Whence the **Formula of Concord** (Leipzig edition in octavo of the year 1626), p. 621, n. 4, rejects as false doctrine:

“That not only the mercy of God and the most Holy merit of Christ, but also some Cause in Ourselves is the Cause of divine Election, for reason of which Cause GOD has elected us to eternal Life.”

And on p. 821 it teaches:

“It is false and fights with the word of GOD when it is taught that not only the Mercy of GOD and the one and most holy merit of Christ, but also something in Us is the Cause of divine Election, on account of which GOD has predestined us. For not only before we did any good, but also before we were born, indeed before the foundations of the world were laid, GOD elected us in Christ, so that according to Election the purpose of God might stand: Not of works, but of him that calleth, it was said to her: The elder shall serve the younger, as it is written: Jacob I have loved; but Esau I have hated, Rom. 9; Gen. 25; Mal. 1.”

p. 817:

“Our election to eternal life rests not on our Virtues or Righteousness, but only on the merit of Christ and the benign Will of the heavenly Father.”

Congruent with which things, the **Saxon Theologians** at the **Colloquy of Leipzig** in the year 1631 professed, n. 4:

“That God found no Cause or occasion of Election in the Elect themselves, nor any first salutary inclination, motion or assent to Faith; but that whatever good is in the Elect originates from the mere and most free Grace of God, which was given to them in JESUS Christ from eternity.”

Which the **Formula of Concord** confirms on p. 662, 663, 665, producing also the words of the Blessed **Luther** from the smaller Catechism:

“I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ, my Lord, or come to him, etc.”

(p. 666, 667, 668, 670, 671, 676).

Nor could Faith be foreseen here either as a preceding **Condition**, or as an **Organ** or **Instrument** from the natural powers of free Will.

For as to what regards the notion of a **Condition**: although it is beyond Controversy that GOD, in this Decree of Election, established Faith and Repentance as a Condition for conferring salvation, i.e., that he willed the actual Attainment of Salvation to be suspended upon the Condition of preceding Faith, at least with respect to adults; so that no one ought to attain the Remission of sins and eternal Life except under the Condition of Faith and Repentance. Nevertheless, the **Condition** here is not taken so antecedently and *a priori* that it has the force of an impulsive and meritorious cause for attaining Election and the benefits of the covenant of Grace, the fulfillment of which gives man a right to the promised reward; but **concomitantly**, which has the nature of a means and of a disposition in the Subject, and which is altogether required in the covenanted by the ordination of God, so that without it they ought not to obtain the promised Salvation. 2. The Condition here is not natural, flowing from the powers of Nature, but supernatural and divine, elicited and to be performed from the powers of special Grace.

And as to what pertains to the notion of an **organ** or **instrument**: faith is an organ, not from itself, but kindled and elevated by the Grace of GOD. If therefore it is viewed as such a Condition and Organ or Instrument, God could not have foreseen Faith in the Decree of Election otherwise than insofar as He was going to kindle it in the hearts of men, to give it, and to elevate it for embracing the doctrine and promises of the Gospel.

§. VII. And in this sense, not only **Augustine** and **Fulgentius**, but also the Reformed Doctors acknowledge Foreseen Faith. **Peter Molinaeus** in his *Anatomia*

Arminianismi, Ch. XXIII, p. 133, 137, adduces some passages of St. Augustine against foreseen faith. Yet the same **Augustine**, in his book *On the Predestination of the Saints*, Ch. XIX, has these words:

“Therefore when he predestined us, he foreknew his own work, who made us Holy and unspotted. And in Book II of On the Gift of Perseverance, Ch. XIV: Will anyone dare to say: that God did not foreknow to whom he would give it to believe?”

Fulgentius, Book I to Monimus, Ch. XXIV, says:

“Therefore he predestined to Punishment those whom he foreknew would depart from him by the fault of an evil Will; and he predestined to the Kingdom those whom he foreknew would, by the Aid of prevenient Mercy, believe, and would, by the Aid of subsequent Mercy, remain in him.”

The **Synod of Valencia** in the year 855, Chap. II:

“We faithfully hold that God foreknew that the good would be good through his Grace, and by the same grace would receive eternal rewards.”

The **Confession of Faith** of the divine **John Sigismund**, Elector of Brandenburg of glorious memory, has:

“That God, from mere Grace and Mercy, without any view of human dignity, without any merit and work, before the foundations of the world were laid, has predestined and elected to eternal life all those who constantly believe in Christ, and also knows his own, and just as he has loved them from eternity, so from mere Grace he endows them with true Faith and perseverance even to the end, so that no one can snatch them from the hands of Christ, no one can separate them from his love, etc.”

The **Confession of Anhalt**, Chap. XI:

“According to the Good pleasure and Counsel of his most Clement Will, through and for the sake of Christ as Mediator and in Christ as Head, in whom He loved Us even before the Foundations of the World were laid, He has by an immutable Decree destined for eternal Life all those who flee to Christ by a true Faith, and who persevere in it even to the end of Life.”

The **Helvetic Confession**, the first in the *Collection of Confessions*, Chap. X:

“Therefore not without a means, although not on account of any merit of our own, but in Christ and for the sake of Christ has GOD

elected us, so that those who are now ingrafted into Christ by Faith, they themselves are also the elect, but the reprobate are those who are outside of Christ.

And after some things: We therefore disapprove of those who seek outside of Christ whether they have been elected from eternity, and what GOD has decreed concerning them before all eternity.”

The Author of this Confession, **Henricus Bullingerus**, in his *Five Decades of Sermons on the Chief Chapters of the Christian Religion*, Dec. IV, Serm. IV, fol. 217:

“God decreed to save all, as many as have Communion with Christ his only-begotten Son, but to destroy all, as many as are alien from the communion of Christ his only Son. Moreover, the Faithful have Communion with Christ, the unfaithful are alien from Christ.”

D. Christoph. Pelargus in his revised *Compendium of Theology*, Loc. XIII, p. 225, defines Predestination:

“The Decree of God, by which he, by his mere good pleasure, before the foundations of the world were laid, resolved to make saved, and to lead to the inheritance of celestial life, all who believe in Christ and who persevere in that Faith to the end of Life, to the praise of his glorious Grace.”

In which manner D. Georg. Sohnius also defines it in Vol. I of his *Theological Works*, *Method of Theology*, p. 256-257. With whom agree Mos. Amyraldus, *On the Secession from the Roman Church*, p. 170, and Paulus Testardus in his *Irenicum*, Thesis CCLXXXIX. See le Blanc, *Theological Theses*, p. 125.

The **Leiden Theologians**, *Synopsis of Purer Theology*, Disp. XXIV, §. XXXIV, XXXV:

“This Opinion (concerning Foreseen Faith), if it acknowledged Faith and perseverance in Faith to be a mere Gift of God, conceded out of Special Grace to those to be saved, would differ from us only in the Order of the Decree and in the mode of speaking; in the matter itself and the foundation there would be consensus.”

Josephus Hallus in his *Judgment on the Colloquy of Leipzig*:

“Nothing is more certain than that God foreknew those who would believe, and predestined those to be Saved; Let this be granted in such a way that, as the same Saxon theologians not unwillingly profess, Faith is the unique Gift of God himself, and whatever good is

in the Elect originates from the mere and most free Grace of God, which was given to them in Jesus Christ from eternity: there can surely be no danger in that Opinion of Foreknowledge. Let God have foreseen from eternity what he himself decreed from eternity to give in time to those who would believe, all things are safe in that, nor is there reason that this Rope of contention should be drawn out further.”

D. Joh. Bergius in *The Will of GOD*, etc., Chap. XXI, p. 300:

“The Saxon Colloquists themselves, D. Matt. Hoë, Polycarpus Leyser, and Henr. Höpfner, subjected their own opinion on the same head of doctrine to ours in almost the same words, except that they inferred Election from foreseen faith. Which, however, if only this be firmly held, which they profess equally with us (that God found no cause or occasion of Election in the elect, not even a first Inclination, motion or consent to faith, but that all that good which is in the elect originates from the mere and most free Grace of GOD, given to them in Jesus Christ from eternity: and therefore that GOD elected from eternity none other than those whom he foresaw would, by the virtue and operation of his Spirit, believe in time and persevere in faith, whom it is accordingly impossible to finally fall from the grace of God), Josephus Hallus rightly admonished in his above-mentioned Epistle to Duræus, should not be denied or opposed even by us.”

The same in *The Distinction and Comparison*, Quæst. LVIII, item That the Words of Christ, Ch. XIX, p. 323-324.

Ludov. Crocius, *Assertion of the Augustan Confession*, Disp. II, §. LVI, p. 75, says:

“With Fulgentius we state that God predestined to punishment those whom he foreknew in himself would depart by the fault of an evil will, and he predestined to the kingdom those whom he foreknew in himself would, by the aid of prevenient Mercy, believe, and would, by the aid of subsequent Mercy, remain in him.”

D. Georgius Pauli, Reformed Pastor of Danzig, *The Reformed Augustan*, i.e., an *Apology for his Scholastic Dictates*, Chap. XV, p. 254:

“If it be stated that God from eternity foresaw Faith as a Means which he ordained for attaining the End of Election, and as a work of his own gratuitous Grace in Christ, which he himself through his Word and Spirit effects in those to be saved, and preserves to the end, and therefore decreed to effect and preserve in them, I confess there is nothing Pelagian in this doctrine, and the difference between our and

your doctrine will be of very small moment, and the dispute will remain over this one and truly Scholastic Question: Whether in the Decree of GOD Election precedes Faith in order; or whether Faith precedes Election? Which, among all the Questions about Predestination, the Most Reverend Mr. Josephus Hall, Bishop of Exeter, has rightly pronounced above to be the slightest, since it is certain that this whole thing is accomplished by one and simple act by the infinite and most Wise Moderator of things, and that GOD foresaw those who would believe and predestined those to be saved.”

D. Gregorius Francus, Professor of Theology at Frankfurt, *Meditations on the Genuine Sense of the Absolute Decree*, th. XXVI, p. 217:

“But you ask, whether Election was made on account of foreseen Faith? since Paul says in 2 Thess. 2:13 that we were elected ἐν πίστει ἀληθείας, in belief of the truth. I Respond: GOD saw from eternity by what means man could be led to salvation. In this sense, foreseen Faith must be admitted.”

(Cf. Molinæus, *Anat. Armin.*, c. XVI, §. XIII, p. 97; Henr. Alting, *Probl. Nov.*, Loc. IV, *Probl. XV*, p. 285; Wendelinus, *Exerc. VIII*, §. XII, p. 69.)

And to this these places of Scripture point:

- **2 Thess. 2:13:** GOD hath chosen you from the beginning unto salvation, in sanctification of the spirit, and belief of the truth.
- **James 2:5:** Hath not God chosen the poor in this world, rich in faith?
- And **1 Pet. 1:1-2:** The elect are said to be according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, unto the sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience.

Therefore the Evangelicals agree on this:

1. That the Son enters into the Decree of Election, and constitutes a part of the divine order (τάξεως); For as GOD in time saves no one without Faith, so also he has decreed to save no one without Faith.
2. That Faith is a necessary Means or Condition for obtaining Salvation.
3. That Faith is required of Us as our Duty, to be performed by Us.
4. That this Faith, however, is not from Us, but its Principle is the Grace of GOD.
5. That this Faith is not a meritorious act of Mercenaries, but an Act or Organ of Beggars, etc.

Whether these things do not testify to a Fundamental Consensus will be for the Peacemakers to judge.

§. VIII. From this it is also easy to gather whether the Decree of Election is **Absolute** or indeed **Ordained**. To be sure, although this Decree is **Absolute** inasmuch as the term *Absolute* signifies that which is perfect in all its numbers; which is Supreme, conjoined with infinite Power and Glory; and absolutely free; and for which no meritorious Cause is given in Us; Nevertheless, if **Absolute** here is contrasted with **Ordained** and **Respective**, and by it a Respect to Christ and an Ordination of the Means is denied, we deny that this Decree is **Absolute**, but we say that it is so **ordained** with Respect to Christ and with the Condition of Faith and Repentance, and with the Means of Salvation, that no one ought to become a partaker of eternal Salvation, unless he has used the Means ordained by God, and has performed, by the Powers of Grace, the Condition posited by God.

The Reformed Theologians of Brandenburg, Poland, and Lithuania in the **Declaration of Thorn**, Chap. IV on Grace, no. 18, say:

“We say that an Opinion alien to our mind is attributed to Us by those who accuse Us, as if we state that the eternal Election was made absolutely without any respect to Faith or Good Works; When on the contrary we rather state that in Election, Faith and Obedience were not indeed foreseen as a cause or Reason for Election itself in those to be elected, But yet as a Means to salvation preordained for them by GOD himself!”

In which Sense they deny the Decree of Election to be **Absolute**, and will it to be called **Ordained**.

D. Christoph. Pelargus in his *Apological Antitheses* opposed to the Theses of Frid. Baldwinus, Thesis LXX:

“That I may not dissemble, it has always seemed to me that in this Mystery one must abstain from Words not expressed in Scripture, and because there is nowhere any express mention of any absolute Decree; one must use Apostolic, not new Phrases.”

And **Gregor. Francus**, *Theological Meditations on the Genuine sense of the Absolute Decree*, Th. III:

“The common Consensus of Theologians has not honored the Absolute Decree so far as to insert it into the public Confessions of the Protestant Churches. For as much as I can recall, there exists no Confession, neither new nor old, which has used the mention of an Absolute Decree for the Explication of the Counsels of GOD which are noted by the words Election and Reprobation: Most rightly, I opine.”

And after he had reviewed various Significations of Absolute, in Th. XXIII & XXIV, he denies that Election is absolute, if you look at the relation and the means through which God brings that eternal plan towards the Elect into Effect. And at the end of Th. XXV:

“In this respect the Decree of Election is not Absolute but Ordained, and is so called by us.”

D. Johannes Crocius on Eph. 1, p. 254, no. 13:

“There are those who say Election is absolute, others object. If equity is brought to judge the matter, the dispute is easily settled from the Apostle. It is absolute from every moving cause, and instrumental cause, and preceding condition, which is in us and from us. For God did not elect us because we were going to be Holy and faithful, or if we were going to be, but so that we might be. It is not absolute with respect to Christ, nor to the Order and means of Salvation. Not with respect to Christ, for it is founded in the Satisfaction of Christ; He chose us in Christ. Not with respect to the Order and means of Salvation. For he did not choose us to Life so that we might attain it without faith and holiness, but so that we might believe through the heard Word, so that we might be Holy here and in the world to come.”

In the same Sense **Ludovicus Crocius**, *Syntagma of S. Theology*, Bk. IV, Ch. I, §. X, no. 4, p. 978-979:

“And if it is true that God in Election had respect to absolutely no condition in animal man by which he was precisely moved to elect one before another: yet the Decree of Election can hardly be called simply absolute: because even if on the part of animal man there is no determination or condition of it: yet there is some on the part of GOD, who himself bound it to the merit of Christ and to the means—the preaching of the Gospel, for instance, and faith—that apply it. For he destines salvation for his elect in this order, that they should hear the Gospel, and from it conceive faith, by faith apprehend the merit of Christ: and through faith be eternally saved.”

Which he repeats in the same words in his Duodecade of Exegetical & Apologetical Dissertations, Dissert. IX, §. XCI, XCII, p. 507. And in his Assertion of the August. Confession, Disp. II, §. LV, LVI, LVII, p. 74-75, item Coronis, p. 489-490-491, §. CXLIX, he writes:

We call the Decree of Election Absolute because it respects no dignity or merit in Us on account of which we might be elected by God; Not,

however, that it is outside of Christ or without Christ, or that it was made without the view of Christ. And §. CLI.

D. Georg. Pauli, Reformed Pastor of Danzig, agrees in his *Reformed Augustan*, Ch. XIII, p. 182-183:

“The Decree of Election is called Absolute with respect to the Meritorious and impulsive Cause; but it is not Absolute with respect to the Gratuitous Conditions of the New Covenant and the Means of Salvation. For God does not elect us absolutely, against the reason of the gratuitous Covenant, to be given the end or eternal Blessedness without any means, but he has decreed to transmit us to this end through certain means and Federal conditions of the New Grace.”

The same is taught by **Steinius** in Part III of *The Evangelical Brotherhood*, p. 26, 44. *The Amicable Writings of the Princes of Hesse in their Vindication*, Part I, Chap. XVIII, p. 311:

“Concerning us we can truly profess this, that we have never taught any other than such an Ordained Decree of Election.”

Polanus, *Syntagma Theologiae*, Bk. IV, Ch. VI, p. 666, admits an Ordained Decree. The **Leiden Theologians** in their *Synopsis of Purer Theology*, Disp. XXIV, Th. XIX, p. 279:

“God never elects anyone absolutely to Salvation, if *absolutely* excludes the Means which GOD has ordained for the attainment of salvation.”

The same, in their *Censure of the Remonstrant Confession*, Ch. VIII, p. 125:

“That an Absolute Election and Reprobation of certain ones is asserted by Calvin or by the Synod of Dort, in the Sense in which the Remonstrants use this Word, is an absolute lie.”

Thus **Antonius Walæus** in his *Loci Communes Theologici*, on Election, Vol. I, p. 332:

“And this is also what the principal Doctors of the Reformed Church often push away from themselves; when it is imputed to them that they state some absolute Will of God here. For first they deny it is absolute because it includes the means through which the destined end is obtained.”

The same in his *Response to the Censure of Corvinus*, Chap. XXIV, Vol. II of his works, p. 244, and *ibid.* p. 245:

That you again harp on about an Absolute Decree is a mere calumny, by which you perpetually burden the Orthodox opinion of the Church. We say that GOD has destined his Elect to salvation not by an absolute Decree, but by one that includes those very means which Holy Scripture proposes for Salvation, whether those means be internal or external, and because the truly faithful also know this, they therefore know they are obliged to make use of these means also, etc.

§. IX. The **End of Election** is, with respect to GOD, the Praise of his glorious Grace. Which **Paul** teaches, **Eph. 1:6**. With respect to the Elect, it is eternal Salvation, **Matt. 25:34; Acts 13:48**.

§. X. The Attributes of Election viewed in itself are:

I. Eternity, Matt. 25:34; Eph. 1:4; 2 Tim. 1:9; 2 Thess. 2:13.

II. Particularity, Matt. 20:16; John 15:19; 1 Cor. 1:26-27; Rom. 11:7; James 2:5; Luke 10:20; Dan. 12:1; Phil. 4:3; Rev. 20, last vs., which is to be noted against Samuel Huber.

III. Immutability, Mal. 3:6; Isa. 46:10; Rom. 9:11; 2 Tim. 2:19.

With respect to the Elect, the Attributes are:

I. The Certainty of Election, Luke 10:20; Rom. 8:38-39; 2 Tim. 4:8.

II. Final Perseverance.

DISSERTATION III. ON REPROBATION.

SUMMARY

§. I. Synonyms of Reprobation.

§. II. The Definition of Reprobation.

§. III. Its Efficient Acting Cause, also the preceding Cause (προηγούμενη, proēgoumenē).

§. IV. The externally moving, meritorious, preliminary Cause (προκαταρκτική, prokatartikē): Sins, where there is a brief Analysis of Chap. IX to the Romans.

§. V. The Distinction between the Negative & Positive Act is proposed & weighed.

§. VI. The Distinction between instituting the Question absolutely & comparatively is considered.

§. VII. That the Decree of Reprobation is not absolute.

§. VIII. The Subject: Men deserving Rejection by their own Fault. There concerning Infants, especially of unbelievers.

§. IX. The End: The Praise of Divine Justice.

§. X. The Attributes of Reprobation.

§. XI. Conclusion.

§. I. Not only, indeed, has GOD destined a Reward for the Pious out of His Gratuitous Mercy; but also a Punishment for the impious out of His Justice. This Destination to Punishment is called in Latin, **Reprobatio** (Reprobation), but in Greek **ἀποδοκιμασία** (disapproval). Which word, indeed, does not exist in so many syllables in the Sacred Writings; the sense of the word, however, is had in them. It is called otherwise, in **Jude v. 4**, προγραφὴ εἰς τὸ κρίμα, a *prescription or writing beforehand unto Judgment*. In **1 Thess. 5:9**, Θέσις εἰς ὀργήν, a *placing or appointment unto wrath*. Although **Joh. Ad. Schertzer**, *Fasciculus Dissertationum*, Disput. XI, §. II & IV, and **Joh. Andr. Quenstedt**, *Systema Theologicum*, Part III, Chap. II, Sect. I, Th. XXIII, p. 21-22, state that this passage is wrongly drawn to this topic; **Joh. Frider. König** in his *Theologia Positiva Acroamatica*, however, refers it here.

§. II. As for what regards the matter itself; **Reprobation** is the Divine Decree, by which God, before the foundations of the world were laid, out of His Justice, resolved to eternally cast off men who are finally impenitent and unfaithful, on account of their sins, committed either against the Law of Nature or against the Gospel, to the praise of his glorious Justice. **D. Joh. Bergius** in his *Explication of the saying John 3:16*, and from him **D. Lud. Crocius**, *Syntagma Sacrae Theologiae*, Bk. IV, ch. I, Th. X, no. 5, p. 980, define it in this manner:

“Reprobation is the just sentence of the judgment of GOD upon all impenitent and unfaithful despisers of the light and of the means of Grace, which he ordained and gave for their Salvation, that, namely, on account of this their contempt, impenitence, and incredulity, He, out of a just judgment, would finally turn His Grace away from them, and, as vessels of wrath, would deliver them over to a reprobate sense in their hearts and to the power of Satan for hardening, and at the end also, according to their merits, would reprobate them to eternal destruction.”

§. III. The acting **Efficient Cause** of Reprobation is God, in the same way that a Judge is the cause of the Punishment of the guilty: which **Peter Molinaeus** has most salutarily observed in his *Anatomia Arminianismi*, Ch. XXVI, §. VI, p. 166.

The primary or internally **moving Cause** is the vindictive **Justice of GOD**, by which the most just God resolved not only to pass by and not elect ungrateful men, who are despisers of the Benefits of God, sinners, unfaithful, contumacious and finally impenitent, but also to consign them to most just punishments.

§. IV. The procatactic or externally moving and **meritorious Cause** is **Sin**, not only Original, but, in adults, also actual, avoidable sins, committed either against the Law or against the Gospel. Nor are sins only a preceding Condition and quality in the Object, but a true meritorious Cause. This is proven by distinct testimonies of Sacred Scripture.

- **Ezek. 18:20:** *The soul that sinneth, the same shall die.*
- **vs. 30:** *I will judge you every one according to his ways, O house of Israel.*
- **Hosea 13:9:** *Destruction is thy own, O Israel: thy help is only in me.*
- **Prov. 1:24-31:** *Because I have invited and you refuse, I stretch out my hand and no one regards; but you have drawn back from all my counsel and have not acquiesced to my correction: I also will laugh in your calamity, I will mock when that which you feared comes upon you: When destruction comes like a raging storm and your calamity arrives like a whirlwind; when oppression and anguish rushes upon you. Then shall they call upon me, but I will not hear; they shall seek me in the morning, but shall not find me: Because they have hated knowledge and have not chosen the fear of the Lord; They have not consented to my counsel, but have despised all my correction. Thus they shall eat of the fruit of their own way, and shall be filled with their own evil counsels.*
- **John 3:19:** *And this is the judgment: because the light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than the light: for their works were evil.*
- **Matt. 23:37-38:** *Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered together thy children, as the hen doth gather her chickens under her wings, and thou wouldest not? Behold, your house shall be left to you, desolate.*
- **Rom. 1:18:** *For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and injustice of those men that hold the truth in injustice.*
- **Ch. 2:5-9:** *But thou, according to thy hardness and impenitent heart, treasurest up to thyself wrath, against the day of wrath, and revelation of the just judgment of God: Who will render to every man according to his works. To them indeed, who according to patience in good work, seek glory and honour and incorruption, eternal life: But to them that are of contention, and who consent not to the truth, but believe iniquity, wrath and indignation, Tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Greek.*

2. The exact correspondence of the Execution with the Intention proves this. For just as God in time condemns no one except for sins, unbelief, lack of Charity, and final impenitence (**Matt. 25:41 ff.; John 5:27-29; 2 Cor. 5:10** -- to which can not inconveniently be referred all the Judgments against the stubborn and contumacious sinners; e.g., against the inhabitants of the first world, whom GOD destroyed by a flood, Gen. 7; against the Sodomites and Gomorrhites, Gen. 15:16; against Pharaoh, Exod. 14; against the seven cursed Nations, Levit. 18:27, 29; Deut. 18:12, 14; against Korah, Dathan and Abiram, Num. 16:32), so also He decreed to damn no one except on account of the same sins. The reason for this matter is manifest: For the Decree of Reprobation is nothing other than the pronouncing of a sentence upon a Reprobate man; but actual Damnation is the Execution of this pronounced Sentence. Therefore, just as a sentence of death, e.g., of hanging,

beheading, or breaking on the wheel, is passed upon thieves, murderers, robbers, and other malefactors for the same cause and the same crimes for which cause and for which crimes they are hanged, beheaded, or punished by breaking on the wheel: So also reprobate, ungrateful men are reprobated for the same meritorious cause and the same sins for which they are damned in time.

3. Reprobation is an act of hatred and wrath. But God, who is Love itself, holds nothing in hatred except sinful men and their sins.

- **Ps. 5:7:** *Thou hatest all the workers of iniquity.*
- **Ps. 11:5:** *The soul of GOD hateth the impious and him that loveth iniquity.*
- **Ps. 45:8:** *Thou hast hated iniquity.*
- In **Lev. 26:30; Deut. 12:31; Hosea 9:15**, GOD is said to hate idolaters and idols.
- **Prov. 6:16, 19:** *Six things there are, which the Lord hateth, and the seventh his soul detesteth.*
- **Zech. 8:17:** *These are the things that I hate, saith the Lord, etc.*
Molinæus asserts the reason in Anat. Armin., Ch. XIII, §. XI, p. 72: Whom GOD hates, it is necessary that he hates GOD, or is going to hate him. If therefore GOD first hated the man made by him, before the man hated GOD, it could not happen otherwise than that the hatred of GOD, with which he hates man, would become the cause of the hatred with which man hates GOD, and thus GOD would become the Author of sin.
Nor is GOD angry with anyone, except on account of sins. Thus saith the Lord, Jer. 21:12: *Execute judgment, lest my wrath burn like a fire, and be not extinguished because of the evil of their works.*
- **John 3:36:** *He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.*
- **Rom. 1:18:** *The wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all ungodliness and injustice.*
- **Rom. 9:22:** *The unbelieving and rebellious Jews, who had stubbornly spurned the so often offered Grace of GOD, are called Vessels of wrath, because they had provoked and, as it were, collected the wrath of God by their sins.*
- **Eph. 5:6:** *For because of these things (namely, on account of Fornication, Avarice, etc.) cometh the wrath of God upon the children of contumacy.*

4. The Truth of this Opinion is established from this, that Reprobation is a just punishment, and therefore cannot happen without foreseen guilt. For the Justice of GOD does not permit that they should be consigned to eternal infernal torments, who have not been guilty of the gravest sins, and indeed of avoidable ones, since punishment and guilt are connected to each other by so indissoluble a Bond that a just punishment cannot have a place where no guilt has preceded.

5. The universal Philanthropy and Mercy of GOD, the most Sufficient Merit of Christ provided for the human race, and the general and promiscuous Call (concerning which see Chap. I, §. IX, n. II, III, IV), and therefore the Goodness, Sanctity, and Veracity of GOD confirm this opinion.

6. The Examples of all ages and Times confirm our Thesis. For as many adults as have been reprobated by God as a just Judge, have been reprobated on account of sins, and indeed on account of avoidable ones. Thus Cain, only after having been called by God to repentance and being disobedient to this Call; Pharaoh, only as contumacious and hardened; the seven cursed Nations, only as guilty of detestable crimes; Saul, only as refractory to the Divine voice; Judas, only as avaricious, a traitor, finally impenitent and despairing, was reprobated in the Divine Foreknowledge. As for what pertains to Ishmael and Esau (if these also are to be counted among the reprobate, which Disputation we will not enter into here), these without a doubt were comprehended in the Covenant struck with Abraham and therefore were not absolutely reprobated. For since the Lord willed his covenant to be sealed no less in Ishmael and Esau than in Isaac and Jacob, it is apparent that they were not entirely alien from him; unless perhaps you count Circumcision for nothing, which was communicated to them by the command of GOD, which cannot be said without insult to GOD; as **Joh. Calvinus** says in his Commentary on Rom. 9:6, p. 81. In which way **David Pareus** also writes of Ishmael in his Commentary on Gen. 17: *He does not simply exclude him from the Covenant and the Grace of Salvation; for he willed him also to be circumcised as a son of Abraham: and Circumcision would have been ratified for him, if he had not defected.* And on vs. 23: *GOD willed him to be circumcised, so that the Grace of the covenant might be offered to him no less than to others and remain ratified, until he should exclude himself from it by manifest apostasy, and thus be rendered without excuse (ἀναπολόγητος), etc.* If therefore Ishmael and Esau were reprobated, they were reprobated on account of the Condition of the Covenant not being performed, or being neglected.

7. The unbelieving Jews provide a notable Example, who by their Unbelief and Contumacy were the cause of their own Rejection. For Christ in **John 1:11** says: *He came unto his own, and his own received him not.* In **John 5:34**, Christ spoke to them so that they might be saved; but in **vs. 40**, they were unwilling to come to him that they might have life. In **Luke 7:30**, they spurned the Counsel of GOD against themselves. In **Matt. 21:37-38**, they not only killed the other servants of God, but even the Son himself; Whence Christ in **vs. 40** asked in the Parable: *When the lord therefore of the vineyard shall come, what will he do to those husbandmen?* Who in **vs. 41**, self-condemned (ἀντοκατάκριτοι), said: *He will bring those evil men to an evil end; and will let out his vineyard to other husbandmen, that shall render him the fruit in due season.* This is also taught in **Luke 13:6 ff.** by the Parable of the Fig tree bearing no Fruit. In **Matt. 22:1 ff.** and **Luke 14:16**, those

invited to the Marriage and the Supper were unwilling to come. For which cause the King not only excluded them, but also sent his army and destroyed those murderers and burned their City. In **Luke 19:41**, the tears of Christ did not soften them; Nor in **Matt. 23:37** did the Pathetic address of Christ bend them: *Jerusalem, Jerusalem, etc., How often would I, etc.* Therefore Christ himself in **John 15:22** so convicts them of avoidable malice: *If I had not come and spoken to them, they would not have sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin.* And **vs. 24**: *If I had not done among them the works that no other man hath done, they would not have sin; but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father.*

8. The ninth Chapter to the Romans confirms the same, where the Apostle teaches that GOD, as a most free Agent and just Judge, rejected the rebellious and contumacious Jews on account of their Contempt of the Messiah and the Gospel, and took up the Gentiles in the place of the Jews. This not only appears from the first five verses; but also from vs. 30-33: What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, who followed not after justice, have attained to justice, even the justice that is of faith. But Israel, by following after the law of justice, is not come unto the law of justice. Why so? because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by works. For they stumbled at the stumblingstone. As it is written: Behold I lay in Sion a stumblingstone and a rock of scandal: and whosoever believeth in him shall not be confounded.

From there, indeed, in vs. 6 the Jews inferred: If God were to cast us off, the Promises of GOD would fall or be made void, by which God bound himself that he would be the GOD of Abraham and of his posterity; But this cannot happen; Therefore it is false that we have been cast off by God. The Apostle denies the Consequence of the major Proposition. Because even if God rejects the unfaithful and contumacious Jews, and takes up the Gentiles, although not descended from Abraham, in their place; it does not therefore follow that GOD is not veracious and constant in keeping his promises. Which he proves in vs. 7 with a Distinction of the Israelites, and teaches that the Promise was indeed made to the Israelites; But not all who are carnally descended from Israel are true Israelites, but only those who are the Children of the Promise, i.e., who receive the Promise by Faith; and that GOD is thus far free, as a most free Agent, to declare one a partaker of the Promise, another bereft of the Promise, whether the Promises be Spiritual, or Corporal, or mixed of both. Lest anyone should doubt this truth, he shows by evident examples in vs. 8-9 that GOD in the very family of Abraham used this liberty and made such a distinction: since not Ishmael, although the elder and born in vigorous age, nor the sons from Kethura, but Isaac was declared the heir of the promise of the Land of Canaan, and the one from whom that Promised Seed ought to be born. And lest anyone should argue that Ishmael, as born from a female Servant and therefore a viler mother, was deservedly excluded from the inheritance, he adduces in vs. 10-13 another example, namely of Jacob and Esau,

born from the same Father Isaac, conceived by the same free mother Rebecca, and brought into the Light in one birth, one of whom, however, and indeed the younger by birth, was preferred to the other, the elder by birth, by the free and to no one obligated WILL of GOD (from which he states the Cause to be in the Caller alone, i.e., in the mere good pleasure (ἐνδοκία) and Mercy of the calling God), when He, without respect to works and merit, out of his good pleasure and mere grace, chose him as heir of the Promise concerning the Messiah to be born from his Blood, the Land of Canaan to be given to his posterity, and the Church to be preserved in his family, with Esau and his posterity being passed by, according to the divine oracle of Gen. 25:23: Two nations are in thy womb, and two peoples shall be divided out of thy bowels, and one people shall be stronger than the other, and the elder shall serve the younger; and Mal. 1:1-3: I have loved Jacob, but have hated Esau; with the word "hatred" being taken comparatively for a lesser Love, as in Gen. 29:30-31; Deut. 21:15-16; Luke 14:26; John 12:25; Matt. 6:24; 2 Sam. 19:7; Prov. 14:20; Ch. 19:7; or He elected Jacob out of mere Grace without a view of merit to eternal life, but reprobated Esau out of Justice on account of foreseen sins and final impenitence, Heb. 12:16-17. (Repeat what we have said here, n. 6, p. 263-264.)

From there in vs. 14, he denies that GOD is unjust, even if out of his liberty he prefers Jacob to Esau and elects one sinner while rejecting another sinner, or casts off the disobedient and contumacious Jews and takes up the Gentiles in their place: vs. 15: For he saith to Moses in Exod. 33:19: I will have mercy on whom I have mercy; and I will shew mercy to whom I will shew mercy. After, that is, the Israelites had sinned concerning the calf and Moses had interceded with his prayers, so that God promised he would again dwell among them, God professes that out of his most free Will and unowed mercy he would pardon some of the calf-worshippers for this most grievous sin and show them grace, but that some he would punish out of justice on account of their most atrocious sins, for reasons unknown to men but known to himself. What God did then, the Apostle contends He is permitted to do today and always also, namely to cast off the obstinate Jews who are contemners of the Messiah and his benefits, and to adopt the Gentiles out of gratuitous mercy. Whence, in vs. 16, he infers: So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy. As the running and Hunting of Ishmael and Esau little profited them for impetrating the paternal inheritance and blessing: So also Justification, the celestial inheritance, and eternal salvation do not befall the Jews who will perversely and who run and who wish to be justified by the works of the Mosaic law, and who weary themselves with useless labor. Which Paul himself explains here in vs. 30: the Gentiles, who followed not after Justice, have attained to Justice, even the justice which is of faith; But Israel, by following after the law of Justice, is not come unto the law of Justice, because they sought it not by Faith, but as it were by the works of the law.

vs. 17: Nor is this new; For the Scripture saith to Pharaoh, or of Pharaoh: And for this same purpose have I made thee to stand (העמדתיך) or have I let Thee stand. The Septuagint: thou wast preserved (διετηρήθης). According to Paul: I have raised thee up (ἐξήγειρά σε), I have not only elevated Thee to the Throne, but I have preserved and borne with you, an ungrateful and contumacious man, when I could have cut you off with one plague and immediately laid you low; indeed, I have awakened You, secure and as it were asleep, by my so many and so great signs and miracles, before the eyes of the whole world, I have produced you into the midst and as it were into the arena, so that, with my manifold Goodness and Longsuffering, by which I invited You to repentance, having been spurned by You, I might shew in thee my power, and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth. In which a not dissimilar image of the contumacious Jewish people of that time is proposed. For to them he had sent not only the Prophets, who prophesied of the Messiah, but now also the Messiah himself for the cause of their salvation, with innumerable miracles, by which they were awakened from the sleep of security, or at least ought to have been awakened; But these ungrateful ones spurned the Counsel of GOD against themselves and repudiated so great a Salvation and its Author. God could have immediately avenged their contumacy, but with great patience he bore with them, and for several years let them go on in peace, until finally, the measure of their sins being filled, he cut them off.

vs. 18: Therefore he hath mercy on whom he will, out of gratuitous mercy; and whom he will, he hardeneth; as a just Judge, out of a just Judgment. For he who has spurned the Inviting Will of GOD will feel the Vindicating Will of GOD, as Augustine, or Prosper, says, on the Articles falsely imputed to him, Article XVI. Of which matter we have an illustrious example in Pharaoh, who in the first six plagues hardened himself by a voluntary and avoidable malice and obstinacy, and having been warned several times, not only refused to let the Israelite people go, but also afflicted them with heavier burdens; until finally at the seventh plague, Exod. 9:12, God, kindled with just wrath, hardened the heart of Pharaoh, according to the prediction of Exod. 4:21, i.e., he withdrew his Grace from him, from which thing it came to pass that the state of Pharaoh was rendered utterly desperate and irremediable.

vs. 19: But to the Jew objecting to these things: Why doth he then find fault? for who resisteth his will? He responds:

1. O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it: Why hast thou made me thus? Or hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump, to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour? With which words he reprehends the unworthy cavils of the Jewish respondent, and admonishes him of his condition, that a little man, a little

worm, dust and ashes, dares to dispute and contend with GOD, and his Creature with its Creator, and to accuse him either of injustice or of too much severity.

2. (Not so much by reason of its exercise as) By reason of liberty he compares GOD to a potter: For just as a potter from the same clay can fashion one vessel to honor, i.e., to an honorable use; another to dishonor, i.e., to a vile and abject use, e.g., a chamber-pot, a cooking-pot: So also it is free for GOD to call the Gentiles who do not follow Justice to Grace, but to reject the Jews although they followed Justice from the law; since all men are creatures of GOD, to none of whom GOD is bound, whether they be Jews or Gentiles.

3. He teaches: That the Jews have absolutely no cause to be indignant, since they were taken from the same lump as the Gentiles, i.e., are guilty of the same most grievous sins and crimes. Which,

4. in vs. 22 he proves with most significant words: What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much patience vessels of wrath, fitted for destruction, That he might shew the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he hath prepared unto glory? For here it is plain that the discourse is not about any sinners whatsoever, but about the obstinate, the enormous, those who know not how to be corrected, and therefore the finally impenitent, because the Apostle says:

1. That GOD willed to show his wrath. But the object of Wrath are men who are perverse, refractory to the Divine will, and thence worthy of wrath, as Fulgentius rightly says to Monimus, Bk. I: It is known that the Wrath of GOD cannot be spoken of unless the iniquity of man is believed to have preceded. GOD would never render destruction to the Vessels of wrath, if a spontaneous sin were not found, because neither would GOD justly inflict wrath upon a sinning man if the man had fallen into guilt from the Predestination of GOD.
2. Because he says: That GOD endured with great Patience and Gentleness; by which he implies: that GOD exhibited the greatest supply and abundance of Goodness and Grace to those men, tolerated their crimes for a long time, deferred their punishment for a long time, and sincerely invited them to Repentance.
3. Because he calls them vessels of wrath, i.e., men who have accumulated and, as it were, collected the wrath of God for themselves against the day of Judgment not by light sins of any kind, but by atrocious sins and their own crimes, and therefore by the abuse of the Riches of Divine Goodness and Patience. Whence
4. He adds: That these vessels are fitted for destruction, in Greek κατηρτισμένα, perfected and consummated, and therefore ripe for destruction, because by their own fault, obstinacy and voluntary

hardening in sins, and by perseverance and final impenitence in the same, they have made themselves worthy of eternal ruin. In which sense the verb Καταρτίζειν and καταρτίζεσθαι and κατηρτισμένος is taken in Luke 6:40; 1 Cor. 1:10; Eph. 4:12; 2 Tim. 3:17. And thus Augustine rendered it here, Epistle CV: If they are vessels of wrath which are perfected for perdition, which is rendered to them as their due, let them impute this to themselves, because they are made from that lump which GOD justly and rightly condemned on account of the sin of one man. And the Church of Lyon, On the Three Epistles, Chap. XXXII & XXXIII, p. 120, says twice of the Vessels of wrath, that they are fitted and perfected for destruction. And the difference of phrasing is to be especially noted; For he does not say: which he prepared for destruction, as he says in vs. 23 of the Vessels of Mercy, which he hath prepared unto Glory; but changing the verb and the phrase he says: The vessels of wrath are fitted or perfected, that is, by their own work and their own sins, for destruction. For GOD did not prepare a soul that was going to live shamefully and wickedly for this purpose, that it should live in such a manner, but he was not ignorant that it was going to be such, and he foreknew that he would judge justly concerning such a one. Augustine, on the Articles falsely imputed to him, Article XI.

See **D. Joh. Bergium** in *The Will of GOD for the Salvation of all Men*, Chap. XVII, p. 188 ff., & Chap. XII, §. XX, p. 78; likewise in the *Explication of the more difficult passages of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans*, p. 650, 656, 657, 680, 707-711, 734-736, 738-741, 743-744, 763-764; likewise in the *Explication of John 3:16*, p. 270, 280-284; in *The Distinction and Comparison*, Qu. LXIII, p. 85; Qu. LXVIII, p. 95-96. **Pareum** in his Commentary on Rom. 9, p. 804-805. **Matthæum Polum** in the *Synopsis Criticorum* on this passage. **Pet. Molinaeus**, *Anat. Armin.*, c. XIV, §. IX, X, XI, p. 80. For Augustine's Explication, see here p. 272-273.

9. Solomon confirms this in **Prov. 16:4**, teaching: that GOD works all things for his own sake; he also ordains the wicked for the evil day, i.e., for just punishment. Likewise **Jude vs. 4**, saying: *There are certain men crept in, who were written of long ago for this judgment, ungodly men*; with which words he teaches that these impious men, on account of their foreseen sins (vs. 4, 8, 10, 11), were long ago destined for Damnation and inscribed in the Catalogue of those to be damned. Which **Peter** in his **1st Epistle 2:8** does not deny, when he says they were appointed for this: For he teaches that they were not appointed for this except with some preceding ingratitude making them deserving of it. The **Leiden** theologians, *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, Disp. XXIV, §. LVI, p. 310: 2. They can also be said to have been appointed to believe. See **Calvin** on this passage.

10. This is the common Opinion of the **Fathers**, and also of **Augustine** himself and his Followers, as the following things show.

Augustine, *City of God*, Bk. II, ch. XII:

“The Cause of Predestination is sought and is not found; but the Cause of Reprobation is sought and is found.”

Likewise, *Bk. III against Julian*, ch. XVIII:

“GOD is good, GOD is Just: He can liberate some without good merits, because he is good: he cannot damn anyone without evil merits (nor reprobate), because he is just.”

Book I against Julian, after resp., p. 48:

“In those whom he liberates, let us acknowledge a Judgment, most hidden indeed, but without any doubt Most Just.”

Book on the Gift of Perseverance, ch. XI:

“Investigable is the Mercy by which he has mercy on whom he will, with no preceding merits of his, and investigable is the truth by which he hardens whom he will, with merits indeed preceding from him, but which are for the most part common to him with the one on whom he has mercy.”

Book on Predestination:

“Behold the unhappy man is bound to death, not by the Predestination of God, but by his own offense; for although Predestination precedes the Offense in Time, the Offense nevertheless precedes Predestination in Effect. For Predestination would not happen unless the Offense were going to be: which Offense he who foreknew it would be, as a just Judge predestined the Offense's retribution. From the foreknowledge of the offense, therefore, emanated the Predestination of Retribution: just as from the Foreknowledge of Virtue, the Predestination of Remuneration is wont to happen.”

Book on the Predestination of the Saints:

“Those whom he foreknew would serve the Diabolical Persuasion without Correction, these for certain he predestined to Punishment.”

In *Tractate LIII on the Gospel of John*, on the words: *Therefore they could not believe, because Isaiah said, etc.*: We have related his words above on p. 102-103. To which he adds:

“But the Prophet, he says, gives another cause, not of their will. What cause does the Prophet give? because GOD gave them a Spirit of compunction, eyes that they should not see, ears that they should not hear, and he blinded their eyes and hardened their heart. I will respond that their Will also merited this. For thus does GOD blind, thus does he harden, by forsaking, not by helping, which he can do by a secret Judgment, but not by an unjust one.

And a little before: To whom we respond: that GOD, foreknowing future things, foretold through the Prophet the infidelity of the Jews, foretold it however, for GOD does not for that reason compel anyone to sin because he already knows the future sins of men: he foreknew their sins, not his own, not anyone else's, but their own.”

Likewise, *On the Merits and Remission of Sins*, Bk. II, ch. XVII:

“The Grace of GOD helps the Wills of men, and that they are not helped, the cause is likewise in themselves, not in GOD, whether they are predestined to be damned on account of the iniquity of their pride: or to be judged and instructed against their own pride, if they are sons of mercy.”

To *Simplician*, Q. II, he deals with Esau in words produced by Us above on p. 107, n. 5. *Ibid.*:

“GOD does not hate Esau the man, but GOD hates Esau the sinner.”

Book of 83 Questions, Qu. LXVIII, he deals with Chapter 9 to the Romans:

“Concerning Pharaoh it is easily answered, that by his prior merits, with which he afflicted the sojourners in his Kingdom, he was made worthy that his heart should be hardened, so that he would not believe even the most manifest signs of God commanding. From the same lump, therefore, that is, of sinners, he brought forth both vessels of Mercy, whom he would aid when the Children of Israel cried out to him: and Vessels of wrath, by whose Punishment he would instruct them, that is, Pharaoh and his people, because although both were sinners and for that reason pertained to one lump, yet they were to be treated otherwise who had groaned to the one God. Therefore he endured with much patience the Vessels of wrath, which are perfected for perdition. And by that very thing which he says, *in much patience*, he has sufficiently signified their prior sins, in which he endured them, so that he might then fittingly vindicate when by their Vindication aid was to be given to those who were being liberated, and so that he might make known the Riches of

his Glory on the Vessels of Mercy, which he prepared for Glory. Perhaps disturbed by these things, he returns to that question: *He hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth, why doth he yet find fault? For who resisteth his will? Altogether, he hath mercy on whom he will and whom he will he hardeneth;* But this Will of GOD cannot be unjust. For it comes from most secret merits, because even the sinners themselves, since they have made one lump on account of the general sin, are nevertheless not without some diversity among them. Therefore something precedes in the sinners, by which, although they are not yet justified, they are made worthy of justification, and likewise something precedes in other sinners, by which they are worthy of being hardened. You have the same man saying elsewhere, *because they did not approve to have God in their knowledge, God gave them up to a reprobate sense.* That he gave them up to a reprobate sense, this is that he hardened the heart of Pharaoh. But that they did not approve to have GOD in their knowledge, this is that they were found worthy to be given up to a reprobate sense. Yet it is true, because it is *not of him that willeth, not of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.* Because even if by lighter sins someone, or certainly although by graver and many sins, yet with great sorrow and groaning for sinning, he has been worthy of the mercy of GOD, it is not of himself, who, if he were left, would perish; but of God that sheweth mercy, who comes to the aid of his prayers and sorrows. For it is little to will, unless GOD has mercy, who calls to peace, unless the Will has preceded, because *on Earth peace to men of good Will.* And since no one can even will unless he is admonished and called, whether intrinsically, where no man sees, or extrinsically, through the sounding word, or through some visible signs, it is brought about that GOD also brings about the willing itself in us. The words follow, which were alleged by us back on p. 102, n. 3. After which he proceeds: The call therefore before merit works the will. For that reason, even if someone attributes it to himself that he came when called, he cannot attribute it to himself that he was called: but he who was called and did not come, just as he had no merit of reward that he should be called, so he begins the merit of punishment when, having been called, he has neglected to come. Thus there will be those two things: *Mercy and Judgment I will sing to thee, O Lord.* To Mercy pertains the call, to judgment pertains the Beatitude of those who came when called, and the punishment of those who were unwilling to come. Was Pharaoh then unaware how much good those lands had obtained through the arrival of Joseph? The knowledge of that deed, therefore, was his call, so that by treating the people of Israel mercifully he might not be ungrateful. But that he was unwilling

to obey this Call, but exercised cruelty on them to whom humanity and mercy was owed, he merited the punishment that his Heart should be hardened, and that he should suffer such blindness of mind: that he would not believe so many and so great and so manifest signs of GOD, so that by his Punishment, whether of hardening or of the final visible submersion, the people might be instructed, by whose affliction he procured for himself the merit both of the secret hardening and of the manifest submersion.”

On the Articles falsely imputed to him, Art. XI:

“By what foolishness, by what dementia is it defined that it is to be referred to the counsel of GOD, what cannot be wholly ascribed even to the Devil: who in the crimes of sinners is to be believed the Helper of their enticements, not the generator of their Wills? Therefore GOD predestined none of such affairs to happen, nor did he prepare that soul that was going to live shamefully and wickedly for this purpose, that it should live in such a manner, but he was not ignorant that it was going to be such, and he foreknew that he would judge justly concerning such a one. And so to his Predestination nothing more can be referred, except what pertains either to the due retribution of Justice or to the unowed bestowal of Grace.”

Ibid. Art. XII:

“By their will they went out, by their will they fell. And because they were foreknown as going to fall, they were not predestined; but they would have been predestined if they were going to return and were going to remain in Sanctity and truth: and by this the Predestination of GOD is to many a cause of standing, to none a cause of falling.”

Art. XIII:

“And if from his eternal Science he has it foreknown what he will render to the merits of each one, yet he has not by this, which cannot be deceived, inflicted on anyone either the necessity or the will of transgressing. If therefore anyone falls from Justice and piety, he is carried headlong by his own will, is drawn by his own concupiscence, is deceived by his own persuasion. Nothing there of the Father, nothing of the Son, nothing of the Holy Spirit. Nor in such an affair does any of the Divine Will intervene: by whose Help we know many are impelled, lest they fall.”

Art. XVI:

“They who have spurned the inviting Will of God will feel the Vindicating Will of God.”

Prosper Aquitanus in his *Response to the Chapters of Objections*, to Obj. VI:

“It is most ineptly said that the Predestination of GOD operates in men either to good or to evil, so that some necessity seems to compel men to either one.”

And to Obj. VII:

“To ascribe their lapse to GOD is of immoderate wickedness, as if he is for that reason the impeller and author of their ruin, because he foresaw that they would fall by their own will, and on account of this did not by any predestination distinguish them from the sons of perdition.”

Fulgentius, book I to Monimus:

“It is fitting for the faithful to believe and to confess that the good and Just GOD did indeed foreknow that men would sin, because nothing of the future could lie hidden from him (for they would not even be future things if they had not been in his foreknowledge), but that he did not, however, predestine any man to sin. Because if GOD were to predestine any man to sin, he would not punish the man for his sins. For by the Predestination of GOD, either the pious remission of sins is prepared, or the just punishment of sins. Therefore GOD could never have predestined man to this, which he had disposed both to prohibit by a precept and to wash away by mercy and to punish by justice.”

Ibid.: “GOD destined to punishment those whom he foreknew would depart from him by the fault of an evil Will.”

The same: “Justice will not be just, if it is said not to have found the guilty man to be punished, but to have made him: nay rather, the injustice will be greater, if GOD imposes a penalty on the lapsed, whom he is said to have predestined to ruin while he was standing.”

Likewise: “Therefore, just as sin is not in him, so sin is not from him: but what is not from him is therefore not his work: but what is never in his work, was never in his Predestination. Therefore the evil were not predestined to this, that they should work evil, being drawn away and enticed in their own concupiscence, but to this, that they should be justly punished unwillingly. For by the name of Predestination not some coercive necessity of the human will is expressed, but the

merciful and just everlasting disposition of the future divine work is preached.”

The **Church of Lyon** in the book against John Scotus Eriugena, Chap. IV, p. 610-611:

“But that he says the aforementioned Gottschalk infers necessities and Force from predestinations; if he says this as if that Predestination of the reprobate to destruction imposes on any of them a Force and necessity to evil, that is, so that they are inevitably evil, and can in no way be otherwise, this is altogether alien from the Catholic faith: because it is too absurd and impious to say of the omnipotent GOD (who wills no one to be evil) that he forces and compels anyone to be evil: and (of whom it is written, the just Lord hath loved justice), that he compels anyone to be unjust. But this is what is now done in all the reprobate concerning their sins and their extreme punishment, which was done in the first sinning man by the first judgment: that just as he was compelled to sin by no impulsion or compulsion or predestination of GOD, but sinned only of his own accord; yet he received the judgment and damnation of his sin unwillingly and involuntarily, which was the first punishment of man: so also the whole multitude of the reprobate, which descended from that damnation, is not compelled to sin by the Predestination of GOD, since GOD has predestined no sins: but yet by the just and eternal judgment of his divine Predestination it is compelled to pay the punishment, receiving from GOD a force and necessity of just damnation, which had no force or necessity of perpetrating iniquity.”

And after a few words: “But he who says that GOD has inflicted or does inflict on man a force and necessity of sinning, manifestly and horribly blasphemes against GOD, whom by compelling to sins he confirms to be assuredly the Author of sin.”

Ch. I, p. 590, concerning **Augustine**:

“Thus the most faithful Doctor both asserted the immovable Truth of Divine Predestination, even in the Damnation of sinners, and yet taught most sincerely that they would escape the Punishments if they corrected themselves and changed for the better, because that Divine Predestination in punishing Sinners exercises a just Judgment; but it takes away the remedy of Salvation from no one if he converts, because his promise is true and faithful, by which through the Prophet he not only promises, but even swears, saying: *As I live, saith the Lord God, for I desire not the death of the wicked, etc.*”

Likewise, ch. III, p. 604:

“Concerning Sin indeed, just as the Catholic Faith everywhere holds, he (Scotus) has said rightly that it is not from GOD, because he neither willed, nor commanded, nor impelled man to sin; nay, even before he sinned, he prohibited him from sin and terrified him with the punishment of death, lest he should sin, and after he sinned, He justly punished him as rebellious and contrary to his Will.”

A little before: “If he (Scotus) says this, that by his Predestination Omnipotent GOD compels no one to evil, so that he is evil and cannot be otherwise, he says it altogether rightly.”

Likewise, p. 604: “No one of the faithful says that GOD has predestined sins.”

Likewise, Chap. XI (in Gilbert Mauguin), p. 649: “The reprobate are predestined to Destruction by no prejudice of GOD, but only by their own merit, either original or actual, nor does divine Predestination impose on them a necessity of perishing, just as it does not a necessity of sinning, but only the necessity of suffering just Punishments.”

Chap. XI, p. 655:

“And yet the most Benign Judge and creator left even those, whom by the merit of their iniquities and impieties he had predestined to so horrendous an Exit and destruction, not without the goodness and piety of his mercy, granting them a time and Space for repenting, so that within 120 years they might either satisfy GOD by worthily repenting, or etc. might perish inexcusably.”

Ibid. p. 661:

“It is of the most open Blasphemy, that GOD by the prejudice of his Predestination should compel anyone to sin, and by sinning to perish. But by the just Judgment of his Predestination, those whom he has decreed to punish as they persevere in sins, he rather calls back from sins and strikes into those who hear a salutary Terror, so that fearing they may be corrected, and being corrected they may by no means be damned.”

Likewise, on the damned, ch. XVII, p. 781:

“Who will one day know that GOD is the Lord; that is, they will say by necessity, to their own Confusion, what they never willed to know by piety and devotion for their own Salvation.”

The same **Church of Lyon**, *On the Three Epistles*, ch. XII, p. 89:

“GOD who does not will the death of the wicked, without a doubt punishes the wicked man who perseveres in his impiety. Thus in one and the same man showing both his goodness and his Severity; Goodness, by which he does not will him to perish; severity, by which he does not will to leave him unpunished who perseveres in iniquity.”

ch. XLI, p. 138:

“That GOD has predestined the impious and the iniquitous to impiety and iniquity itself, that is, so that they should be impious and iniquitous, and could not be otherwise, absolutely no one in modern times is found to say or to have said, which is certainly an immense and detestable Blasphemy.”

ch. XLII, p. 138:

“Nor by the same Predestination of GOD are they compelled not to be able to escape, but by their own most persevering iniquity, which they were unwilling to relinquish, they are deservedly compelled to perish.”

ch. XXVIII, p. 114:

“Thus although Christ died for all, even for those who will perish in their own Impiety; he so exhibited to them the goodness of his Passion, that yet by his just judgment he condemned such impious ones who would remain in their impiety, as he himself says, He that believeth not, is already judged; And therefore his goodness, because he is believed to have suffered even for such, did not evacuate his predestination towards them, by which he always both foreknew they would remain in their impiety and predestined they would justly perish.”

Likewise: “The Predestination of GOD is neither violent, because it compels no one to be evil, so that he cannot be otherwise; nor unjust, which punishes only those who will have persevered in evils by their own fault; nor prejudicial, which does not prejudice anyone, so that he perishes as if by its sentence and not by his own merit.”

The **Synod of Valencia**, ch. II:

“We faithfully hold that GOD foreknew that the good would be good altogether by his Grace, and by the same grace would receive eternal rewards: He foreknew that the evil would be evil by their own malice, and by his Justice would be damned to eternal retribution. Nor has the foreknowledge of GOD imposed on any evil person a necessity that he could not be otherwise; but what he was going to be by his own will, He, as GOD who knows all things before they happen, foreknew by his omnipotent and immutable Majesty. Nor do we believe anyone is condemned by his prejudice, but by the merit of his own iniquity. Nor that the evil themselves perish for the reason that they could not be good; But because they were unwilling to be so, and by their own fault remained in the mass of Damnation, either by original or also by actual merit.”

Ch. III:

“We confidently confess a predestination of the Elect to life, and a Predestination of the impious to death: in the Election of those to be saved, however, the mercy of GOD precedes; in the damnation of the evil, the just judgment of GOD precedes. But that by Predestination GOD has only foreknown those things which he himself was going to do either by gratuitous mercy or by just judgment. But in the evil he foreknew their malice, because it is from them: he did not predestine it, because it is not from them. The Punishment indeed following their evil merit, as GOD who foresees all things, he has foreknown and predestined, because he is just. But that some have been predestined to evil by divine power, that is, so that they as it were could not be otherwise; not only do we not believe, but also, if there are any who wish to believe such an evil thing, with all detestation, as the Council of Orange, we say anathema to them.”

Conveniently with these things, the **Reformed** teach that Sins, not only Original, but also actual, are the cause of Reprobation.

The **Anhaltine Confession** teaches in Chapter XI on Predestination, p. 45, that all are cast off who spurn this Propitiator, proposed by God, with pertinacious impenitence.

Henricus Bullingerus, *Decade of Sermons* IV, Sermon IV, folio 217, column 1, says:

“GOD has decreed to destroy all, as many as are alien from the communion of Christ, his only Son.”

Joh. Henr. Hottinger, *Ecclesiastical History*, Century XVI, Part IV, Chap. VI, p. 910-911, reports that the **Helvetians** in the year 1588 proposed the causes of Reprobation thus:

“That the nearest and proper cause and guilt, that wicked people are damned, is to be found in themselves, namely the inborn Original Sin, in which otherwise all Men are conceived and born, in Heathens also the Rebelliousness against the Law of Nature, in the falsely-named Israelites the Disobedience against the Law and Gospel.”

And after mention of the Efficient acting cause of Reprobation they proceed: “But, when one speaks of the causes for which the unbelieving and wicked are rejected and damned, not only the highest cause, namely the high and righteous Will of GOD, should be brought in; but also the Sin and Guilt of the wicked man who is damned (the decision calls this the *causam procatarepticam* in Latin), which is in him, so that one may see that in no way is injustice done to him, but his deserved wage is given. For which reason also the third article of complaint is set forth altogether uncharitably and without ground; as if one taught that God looks only to this, that in the rejection and damnation of the wicked He seeks great honor for His power and glory alone, and does not at all consider the unbelief and wicked life of Man. Which H. Beza and Herr Musculus never taught, never wrote or subscribed.”

The **Confession of Faith of the Divine Joh. Sigismund, Elector of Brandenburg**, of Glorious memory, has it thus:

"That those who do not believe in Christ, GOD has justly passed by from eternity, and has prepared for them the eternal infernal fire according to that saying: *He that believeth not in the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of GOD abideth on him*: not as if God is the Cause of the Perdition of men: not as if he is delighted by the death of the wicked: not as if he is the Author and impeller of sin: Not as if he does not will all to be saved: For Scripture testifies the contrary; but because the cause of sin and perdition is to be sought in Satan and in the impious themselves, who on account of their unbelief and disobedience have been reprobated by God to damnation."

The things are consonant which the Theologians of **Brandenburg and Hesse** professed in the **Colloquy of Leipzig**:

"That GOD from eternity also consigned to eternal destruction those who persevere in sins and unbelief, not indeed by an absolute decree

of such a kind, as if he had preordained the greatest part of the world, or any man, to everlasting Damnation or to the cause of the same, without respect to their sins and unbelief, or had created them for it in time: but that Reprobation no less than damnation was made from his just judgment, the cause of which is in the men themselves, namely sin, impenitence and unbelief; So that the entire Cause of the Reprobation and Damnation of the unfaithful resides in themselves: But the Cause of the Election and salvation of the faithful is situated in the mere Grace of God in Jesus Christ, from the opinion of his own Word: *Destruction is thy own, O Israel; But thy salvation is only with me.*"

And in the **Declaration of Thorn**, chap. IV, n. 8, on Grace, the delegates of **Brandenburg and Poland and Lithuania** say:

"The others who hold the Truth in Unrighteousness, and contumaciously spurn the offered Grace of Christ, have been rejected by a just judgment."

Likewise, n. 18: "In Reprobation, we state that not only original sin, but also, as to adults, Infidelity and contumacious Impenitence, was not indeed properly preordained by God, but was foreseen and permitted in the Reprobates themselves, as a meritorious Cause of Desertion and Damnation, and was reprobated by a most just judgment."

Joh. Bergius in his *Treatise on the Difference and Agreement of the Evangelicals*, p. 83, to Question LXII, "What is your doctrine of Reprobation?", Responds:

"That God has decreed from eternity to deliver over to the power of Satan for total blinding and hardening, and to reprobate to eternal judgment and condemnation, those men, or even entire peoples, who spurn his manifold Goodness and Benefit by which he invites them to the acknowledgment of himself and to repentance, and who pertinaciously persevere in their sins against the acknowledged word of GOD, or against the law inscribed in their hearts, on account of such sin, impenitence and their unbelief, foreseen in them from eternity, and permitted by a just judgment."

And in *The Will of GOD for the salvation of all men*, Ch. XV, §. XXX, p. 156-157:

"The entire reprobation properly consists in the Judicial Decree, in the Righteous Judgment-Will, according to which, after the first Grace of GOD, or also the Second, Third, Fourth, yea well a hundredfold Grace of their often repeated Calling has been stiff-neckedly rejected, God for that very reason in turn has so

rejected them out of righteous Judgment, that He has finally left them without other further grace to their own will, and has given them over to complete hardening and damnation. Where then also the entire Guilt and Cause of their reprobation, as well what concerns the complete forsaking as what concerns the damnation to Death, both in the eternal Counsel and Providence of God, and afterwards in the deed, is to be sought and found only in themselves.”

D. Georgius Pauli in the *Reformed Augustan*, p. 186, says that these things have been treated so truly and moderately by the Blessed Dr. Bergius that Momus himself would scarcely find anything which he could reprehend with any appearance of reason.

Joh. Crocius in the *Conversatio Prutensis*, Part II, Chap. XX, p. 518:

“I state that unbelief is the cause of the Decree itself concerning the reprobation of these or others to eternal punishments, although not the only cause: I hold the former against Beza, the latter against others: and that on account of the conformity of the decree and the execution, which ought to be denied by no one. Now, moreover, it is established that the cause of damnation is unbelief; Mark 16, *He that will not believe shall be damned*, & John 3:36, *He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of GOD abideth on him*. Therefore, just as in human judgments the same crime is the cause of the decree by which the guilty one is adjudicated to death, which is the cause of the execution, so another cause of the divine Decree ought not to be fashioned than that of the execution. Again, however, it is manifest that men are not damned only on account of unbelief; But also other sins come into consideration. For the Apostle establishes that the wages of sin is death, Rom. 6:23, which he writes reigned even in those who had not sinned after the likeness of the transgression of Adam, Rom. 5:14. Whence he also enumerates other sins one by one, Gal. 5:19-21; 1 Cor. 6:10; Coloss. 3:5-6, *Mortify therefore*, he says, *your earthly members, Fornication, impurity, effeminacy, evil cupidity, and avarice, which is idolatry: For which things the wrath of GOD cometh upon the children of contumacy.*”

Ludov. Crocius, *Syntagma S. Theologiae*, Bk. IV, Ch. I, p. 979:

“Reprobation, on the other hand, is not such a counsel and purpose of GOD, according to which he has, either from an absolute and most freely preconceived hatred, precisely and absolutely excluded even one single man, let alone the greater part of the world, from all saving grace, without guilt and cause, and has devoted him to eternal

destruction. Such a horrid opinion is indeed attributed by the Pontificists and some others to certain of our Theologians, nay even to Luther himself, together with certain pernicious consequences deduced therefrom: but yet, as usually happens in contentious disputations, for the great part from distortions of words and opinions. But far be it that we should attribute such a judgment to so just a Judge of the world, Gen. 18:25, who indeed so constantly and seriously asseverates that he is not delighted by the death of the sinner, Ezek. 18 & 33. But Reprobation is etc., as above §. II, p. 258.”

D. Georgius Pauli in the *Reformed Augustan*, Ch. XIII, p. 183:

“GOD from an absolute Will without respect to sin has adjudicated no one to damnation, but sinners and those well-deserving of damnation: and sins are the cause properly so called, meritorious and impulsive, of Damnation in the reprobate. In which Reprobation differs from Election: For Election was made from mere divine good pleasure indeed to faith, but not on account of foreseen faith, or another good quality in us, as a meritorious cause, Eph. 1:9-14. But reprobation was made not from mere divine will, but on account of foreseen unbelief and other sins, John 3, vs. 18-20. For just as GOD in time damns no one except for unbelief and other sins in which he finally perseveres, Ezek. 18, *The soul that hath sinned shall die*, John 3, *He that believeth not is already judged*, So neither has he resolved to damn anyone except for unbelief and other sins. Therefore the reprobate are called Vessels of wrath; But GOD is angry with no one except for sins; according to the sayings, John 3:36, *He that believeth not in the son, etc.*, Rom. 1:18, *The wrath of GOD is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and injustice of men*, Eph. 5:6, *For these things (Fornication, avarice, etc.) the wrath of GOD cometh upon the children of contumacy.*”

Joh. Davenantius in his *Judgment* to Herm. Hildebrand:

“You rightly deny that we state that GOD without a view of sin has deputed or created the greatest part of the world for eternal damnation. It is not only false, but impossible, that GOD, who from eternity intuitus all future things as present, could have predamned even one man without a view of his sins. Nor is it said that he created the non-elect for damnation, whom it is established were sufficiently ordained for blessedness in Adam. And when they are born one by one and pass their life in this world, they have nothing from GOD which effects their damnation, but all things from themselves, but

from GOD very many things which could avail for salvation, if their own voluntary wickedness did not render them useless to them.”

See also **Herm. Hildebrandum** in his *Declaratio Orthodoxa*, Art. II, §. III, IV, V, p. 13-14.

Petrus Molinæus, *Anat. Armin.*, Ch. XXVI, §. VIII, p. 166-167:

“Here it is asked; what is that sin for which GOD reprobates: Namely whether men are reprobated for the sin of Adam alone contracted and for the stain which the reprobate have in common with the Elect; or whether they are also reprobated for actual sins which they are going to commit in the whole course of their life? The Solution is at hand. For although natural corruption is a sufficient cause for reprobation, yet there is no doubt that for whatever cause GOD damns, for the same cause he has decreed to damn. Moreover, he damns the reprobate for sins which they have actually committed: for in hell there are not only the punishments of original sin, but also of actual sins. Therefore GOD also destined to Damnation for the same sins. But to Reprobate and to destine to Damnation are the same. Thus plainly GOD executes something in time, just as he has decreed from eternity to execute it. Moreover, he punishes in time for actual sins, Therefore he also decreed from eternity to punish for the same. Thence it is that the punishment of the Capernaïtes will be graver than that of the Sodomites, and of him who knew the will of his master than of him who did not know it, because among the actual sins for which they are punished, there is a great difference. Nothing stands in the way of GOD, considering man lying in corruption and natural pravity, from also considering the same man polluted in the sins which through that natural pravity he is going to commit.”

And the same, §. X:

“Among the sins for which someone is destined to punishment, without doubt is unbelief and the Rejection of the Gospel: For by this very rejection one sins against the law by which GOD is to judge us; For the law commands GOD to be loved with the whole heart, and to be obeyed in all things and without exception, and therefore also that he who commands to believe be obeyed, whatever that might finally be which he will either command or teach.”

He also has it in his judgment sent to the Synod of Dort, Acts of the Synod of Dort, p. 402.

D. Christoph. Pelargus, *Compendium of Theology*, Loc. XIII, Qu. X, p. 236:

“Q. What do you state concerning Reprobation?

A. I call it the eternal Decree of GOD, by which he has predestined to eternal punishments all those left in their sins and not believing in Christ; as it is expressly written: he that will not believe the son: the wrath of God abideth on him. Likewise: he that believeth not in the son, is already condemned. Thus Scripture says: the wicked are προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρῖμα (written beforehand for this judgment), appointed to wrath: vessels of wrath κατηρτισμένα (fitted) for destruction: made for the evil day: appointed to disobedience: made for capture.”

The **Synod of Dort**, Article I, §. XV, defines:

“That GOD, by a most free, most just, irreprehensible and immutable good pleasure has decreed to leave certain ones in the common misery into which they have plunged themselves by their own fault, and not to endow them with saving faith and the Grace of Conversion: but having been left in their own ways and under a just Judgment, to finally, not only on account of unbelief, but also all other sins, to condemn and eternally punish them for the declaration of his justice. And this is the Decree of Reprobation, which by no means makes GOD the Author of sin (which is blasphemous to think), but constitutes him a tremendous, irreprehensible, and just judge and avenger.”

And in the **Conclusion**:

“That GOD by a bare and pure arbitration of his will, without any respect or view of any sin, has predestined and created the greatest part of the world for eternal damnation: In the same way that Election is the fount and cause of faith and of good works, Reprobation is the cause of infidelity and of impiety: and many other things of that kind; These things the Reformed Churches not only do not acknowledge, but even detest with their whole heart.”

§. V. Certain Theologians, not only the Reformed but also Roman Catholics, and among these Bellarmine himself, distinguish between the positive and negative Act of Reprobation, or between Predamnation and Preterition (Passing Over).

They say the Affirmative act, or Predamnation, is an act of GOD the Judge, by which He has decreed to finally inflict the due penalties upon certain men justly left in the corrupt mass, who, by their own free will, abuse the light of nature, or even of the Gospel, in diverse ways and degrees. And none doubt that this Act

presupposes sin in man, since in GOD there cannot be a Will to punish any but sinners, nor can the decree or infliction of punishment be just without fault.

But the Negative Act, or Preterition (which some also call negative Reprobation), they make to be an Act of divine Power and judgment, by which GOD, as the supreme Lord, according to His own right (with absolute power, *αὐτοκρατορικῶς*), has not determined to have mercy on the rest of men, whom He did not elect. Indeed, they wish for there to be no other cause of this act than the Good Pleasure or Will of GOD.

1. But, although these two Acts can be distinguished in the mind, and although we may not pick a fight with anyone on account of this Distinction, and we may suffer those who use it to be fully convinced in their own sense: nevertheless, different meritorious Causes cannot be attributed to them. For, speaking accurately, each Act is one and the same Act of Reprobation, and they differ in name only. For example, Cain and Judas, by that very same Act by which they were passed over and not elected, were predamned. And therefore, different Meritorious Causes—which is the question here—cannot be assigned to these two acts, such that GOD predamns on account of a foreseen fault, but passes over or does not elect out of absolute good pleasure. But Cain, Judas, Nero, and other impious men were not only predamned but also passed over and deserted on account of the same fault and crimes. It should also be noted here that a deficient cause in necessary matters is reduced to an Efficient one, which the *Metaphysics* of the Blessed Dr. D. Grebenitz, contracted by Dr. D. Samuel Strimesius, expresses thus: *The a priori cause, being deficient in its operation, is the genuine Moral Cause both of the Defect and of the Consequences of the Defect.* (Sub-Sect. II. de Causa in Specie Part. II. Axiomat. Ax. II. p. 96).

2. Secondly, because that prior Act, Predamnation, should no more be called positive than the latter, that is, Preterition and Non-Election. For to predamn, as to the matter itself, is to pass over in electing, or not to elect; and not to elect, or to pass over, is in reality to predamn, and thus it is no less a positive act than Predamnation. The affirmation or positivity which is observed here is only nominal and of reason, since as to the matter itself it implies the negation of Election. Peter Molinaeus observed these things in his *Anatomia Arminianismi*, c. XIII. §. XVI. p. 74-75, in these words worthy of note:

“He would not escape who should say that by Reprobation men are not destined for damnation, but are only passed over, or not elected. For in this way, milder words are sought by which the same thing is said. For it is the same thing whether GOD destines a man for damnation, or whether He does that from which damnation necessarily follows. Whomever GOD does not elect, whether he is said to be omitted or reprobated, is always excluded from the Grace

of GOD. Certain damnation follows this exclusion, because without the Grace of GOD there is no Salvation. Indeed, since it is agreed among all that by Election men are destined for salvation, let them tell me, to what are the non-elect and the passed over destined? Surely, if Election destines some to salvation, it is plain that by this Reprobation, which is called Omission, the rest are excluded from Salvation and destined for perdition.”

3. And indeed, even if this distinction between these two acts, Predamnation and Preterition, had a foundation in reality itself, and thus they were rightly distinguished, nevertheless, different causes should not be assigned to them on that account. Nor could the Good Pleasure of GOD be alleged as the cause of Preterition or Non-Election, since the Good Pleasure of GOD is indeed the Cause of Election, that is, why from among equal sinners certain ones are Elect, but it can in no way be the Meritorious Cause of Preterition, or why certain ones are left in their sins and not Elected. For the distinction among equal sinners, and therefore Election, is a work of unmerited Mercy, and it is made from the gracious Good Pleasure of GOD. But Reprobation, whether it is conceived positively or negatively, because it is an act of Justice and of Punishment, could not happen from the mere Good Pleasure of GOD and without a meritorious cause in those being reprobated.

And this is evidently established from many places in Holy Scripture:

- **I Samuel XV. 23, 26.** *Because you have rejected knowledge, I will also reject you.*
- **Psalms LXXXI. 12, 13.** *My people did not listen to my voice, and Israel did not yield to me. Therefore I let them go to walk according to the judgment of their own mind, saying, let them go with their own evil counsels.*
- **I Chronicles XXVIII. 9.** *If you forsake him, he will cast you off.*
- **Hosea IV. 6.** *Because you have despised knowledge, I will also despise you.*
- **Matthew XXI. 33, 41.** *The father of the family takes his vineyard away from the wicked farmers.*
- **Chapter XXIII. 37, 38.** *GOD takes the kingdom of Grace away from the ungrateful and stubborn.*
- **Chapter XXV. 24, 26.** *GOD does not reap where He has not sown.*
- **Luke XIV.** *GOD withdraws the supper from the scorners, saying: I say to you, that none of those men who were called will taste my supper.*
- **Acts XIII. 46.** *It was necessary that the Word of GOD should first have been spoken to you: but seeing you put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles.*
- **Romans I. 28.** *And even as they did not think it fit to retain GOD in their knowledge, so GOD gave them over to a mind void of all judgment, to do those things which were not at all fitting.*

- **II Thessalonians II. 10, 11.** *Because they did not receive the love of the truth, that they might be saved, for this reason GOD will send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: That they all might be damned who did not believe the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.*

4. The negative act, or Preterition, which can be admitted here, is the negation, not of Sufficient grace, much less of all grace, but only of Special and Abundant Grace, which the Theologians of Great Britain in the Acts of the Synod of Dort on the I. Article concerning Reprobation, §. I. p. 500, define thus:

“Non-Election is the eternal Decree of GOD, by which He has determined, according to His most free Will, not to have mercy on certain persons fallen in Adam, to the extent of efficaciously snatching them through Christ from the state of misery and infallibly leading them to blessedness.”

And the Leiden Professors in the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* Disp. XXIV. §. L:

“Negative Reprobation is called the eternal act of divine power and judgment, by which, according to the counsel of His Will, He has not determined to have mercy on the rest, whom he did not elect, to the extent that He would give them that peculiar and unowed Grace.”

Who, in §. LIV, add:

“That this may be rightly understood, it must be diligently noted that this Preterition does not take away or deny all Grace in the passed over, but only that which is peculiar to the Elect. For that which is dispensed to men in varied measure through the administration of common Providence, whether under the law of nature, or under the Grace of the Gospel, is not taken away by this act of preterition, but is rather presupposed; because the non-elect are left under that common Governance of divine Providence, and the Exercise of their own will.”

Caspar Sibelius repeats and proves these things verbatim in *Meditationes Catecheticae*, Part. III. Qu. LXXXIII. p. 959. See also the Judgment of the Leiden Professors in the Acts of the Synod of Dort, Part. II. p. 11. By the benefit of this more common Grace they ought to and can believe, so that they become inexcusable if they are deficient in their duty.

Hermannus Hildebrandus, Minister of the Divine Word from Bremen, in his *Declaratio Orthodoxa Artic. trium*, Declaration of Article II, §. IV. p. 13, had said, quoting from Walaeus:

“Negative Reprobation or preterition is called the eternal act of Divine power and judgment, by which God, according to the secret counsel of His Will, for the demonstration of His justice, has not determined to have mercy on the rest, whom He did not elect, to the extent that He would decree for them to be affected by that peculiar and unowed Grace of Election, but would leave them in that state of Corruption, and leave them under the Exercise of their own will and the governance of common Providence. But, that this may be rightly understood, and that occasion for the calumnies of adversaries may be cut off, it must be diligently noted that this preterition does not take away or deny all Grace in the passed over, but only that which is peculiar to the elect, just as we have an example of this manner of speaking and some image of the matter in I Samuel XVI, where all the remaining sons of Jesse are said to be refused and not chosen. And accordingly, neither are the gifts or goods, which are dispensed to men in varied measure through the administration of common Divine Providence, whether under the law of nature, or under the Grace of the Gospel, taken away by this act of Non-Election or Preterition, but are rather presupposed, so that they are stripped and deprived of all pretext of Excuse before the divine Judgment.”

But the Judgment of Dr. Johannes Davenantius, Bishop of Salisbury, sent there to Hildebrand, p. 31. n. 3, should not be overlooked:

“The description of Reprobation is not displeasing, but even in this place it is more aptly said that God has decreed not to efficaciously deliver the reprobate, than to leave them entirely in their miserable condition. And from this it will also be more clearly evident that God is not the Author of sin, since He sometimes grants even to the reprobate themselves such a measure of supernatural Grace, which could have profited for the gradual promotion of their Salvation, if they did not by their own voluntary fault place an obstacle to the operations of Divine Grace.”

Also most especially to be observed is the Judgment of Dr. Johannes Bergius and M. Adamus Christianus Agricola, Brandenburg Court Pastors, *ibid.* p. 50. Artic. eod. 2. n. 3:

“When you define reprobation as the purpose of leaving some in the common misery and not giving the Grace of Conversion and faith: Although we are not ignorant of whose Words you use, which you also most correctly explain in n. 4, that not all Grace of Conversion is thereby denied, we would wish, however, that even in the description of Reprobation itself, this might be expressed a little more clearly, so

that it may appear that such an absolute purpose, as is most hatefully imputed everywhere to our Churches, is not established by us, but one which presupposes, beyond the common misery from the first fall, a contempt of Grace which is inexcusable (*ἀναπολόγητον*), whether in individual men or even in entire peoples, rejected by the just judgment of God. Otherwise, how could God be said to seriously and sincerely invite them to repentance and faith, to whom He has determined by an absolute purpose, without new fault in themselves, simply to deny the Grace of faith and Conversion, we for our part do not see; indeed, we hold entirely that their very Vocation, if it is serious and sincere, is the first Grace of delivering from misery and of giving faith and conversion, which, having been offered, they themselves repudiate. But how great and how dire a crop of Calumnies grows for our adversaries from this ground, you are not ignorant, and we here daily experience it enough; we must all take care to counter these things a little more cautiously from now on, if the peace of the Church is in our heart and care.”

The ancient Anti-Pelagian Doctors manfully asserted this Truth.

- Augustine, in *On Nature and Grace*, Chapter XXIII, and Sermon LXXXVIII *On Time*, writes that GOD forsakes only those who deserve to be forsaken.
- The same, in *On the Gift of Perseverance*, Chapter VI: *By his own will each one forsakes GOD, so that he is deservedly forsaken by GOD. Who would deny this?*
- In Book II of *On the Merits and Remission of Sins*, Chapter XVII: *It is the grace of GOD which helps the wills of men; that they are not helped by it, the cause is likewise in themselves, not in GOD.*
- In Tractate II on John: *It is necessary that you not depart from him, who never departs. It is necessary that you not forsake, and you will not be forsaken. Do not will to fall, and he will not will your setting. If you bring about your fall, he brings about your setting. But if you stand, he is present to you.*
- In the Soliloquies: *Wherever I go, you, Lord, do not forsake me, unless I first forsake you.*
- In *To the Articles Falsely Imposed upon Him*, Article VII: *GOD, before He is forsaken, forsakes no one, and He converts many forsakers to Himself.*
- And Article XIV: *GOD does not forsake one who is about to depart, before he departs, and He often brings it about that he does not depart, or even if he has departed, that he may return.*
- Article XV: *GOD takes away the Way of Correction from no one, nor does he despoil anyone of the possibility of Good, because he who turns himself away from GOD, has deprived himself of both the willing and the being able of*

what is good. It is not therefore a Consequence, as those who object such things think, that GOD has taken away Repentance from those to whom He has not given Penitence, and has struck down those whom He has not lifted up: since it is one thing to have driven an innocent person into a crime, which is foreign to GOD; it is another thing not to have given pardon to a criminal, which is from the merit of the sinner.

Prosper, in *On the Vocation of the Gentiles*, Book II, Chapter XX: Let us know most certainly that no one of the faithful, who does not depart from GOD, is forsaken.

We have adduced above on page 178 the unanimous (ὁμόψηφα) words of the Church of Lyon from the tract against Johannes Erigena Scotus, p. 594.

The Reformed follow these Assertors of divine Grace.

- The Confession of the Most Serene Elector of Brandenburg, Lord John Sigismund, says that GOD has justly passed over those who do not believe in Christ, and has prepared for them the eternal infernal fire.
- In the Declaration of Thorn, C. IV. n. 18, our Theologians profess: In Reprobation, not only Original Sin, but also, as regards Adults, faithlessness and stubborn impenitence in the reprobate themselves, is foreseen as the meritorious cause of Desertion and Damnation.
- Dr. Christoph Pelargus in his revised *Compendium of Theology*, p. 160 ff., has an entire Title in which he proves from Scripture and the Fathers that GOD forsakes no one unless He is forsaken; wherein he also excuses our Doctors.
- Dr. Gregorius Francus in *Meditations on the Genuine Sense of the absolute Decree*, Th. XXXI. p. 220: Since there are two acts in the Decree of Reprobation, one negative, which they call Desertion or Preterition, from Acts XVII. 30 & C. XIV. 16, the other positive, rejection (ἀποβολή), Romans IX. 15, severity (ἀποτομία), *ibid.* vs. 22, Bellarmine, and those who side with him, dare to assert that the cause of the latter, that is, of the destination to punishment, is manifest, namely sin, but that the cause of the former, that is, of preterition, ought not to be required. And there have been some of our own who have not hesitated to approve and follow his opinion.
- Th. XXXIV. But in truth, the evident authority of holy Scripture compels us to establish that the cause not only of predamnation, as they call it, but also of Desertion is sin or the aversion of man from GOD. Man's perfidy, I say, preceded, and it merited and had as its companion divine desertion. For just as GOD does not reap where he has not sown (Matthew XXV), and does not dismiss a steward unless he is a thief and a squanderer (Luke XVI), so He would never deny a man, unless that man had first denied Him (I Timothy II. 12). Because you have despised, I will despise you (Hosea IV. 6). If you forsake, He will cast you off (I Chronicles XXVIII. 9). In Fulgentius, a lucid writer and

one well-versed in this Controversy, this axiom frequently occurs: GOD does not forsake, unless those who first forsake him. And for Augustine that is a solemn saying: GOD is not an avenger before man is a sinner.

- Th. XXXV. A far more urgent reason is added. For desertion is a punishment; but punishment is inflicted by a just GOD only on the guilty. Therefore, it is necessary that the man who is deserted be guilty; GOD deservedly deserts this man, having been made an Apostate. The Apostle in the proper seat of this argument, where he disputes about the causes of reprobation, says, Let their table be made a snare and a retribution (Talionem) to them: from Psalm LXIX. 23. The rule of all justice is recompense (ἀνταπόδομα) or Retribution (Talionem): which, therefore, neither Reason nor scripture suffers to be excluded from this supreme judgment of GOD. Those who have proceeded further and have spoken otherwise of this Mystery, so as to establish the Decree of reprobation as preceding absolutely all things and causes in things, are foreign to the true opinion.

Dr. Johannes Bergius in *Explanation of the Saying in John III. vs. 16*, p. 241:

“Reprobation is not such a Counsel or Purpose of GOD, according to which He has precisely and absolutely excluded even a single man, let alone the greater part of the World, without fault and cause, out of an absolutely and freely conceived hatred from all saving Grace and has doomed him to eternal Destruction.”

Which Ludovicus Crocius repeats and proves in the same number of words in *Syntagma Theologiae* L. IV. C. I. p. 979, and *Duodecad of Dissertations* IX. §. 93. p. 508.

Dr. Johannes Bergius in *The Will of God for the Salvation of all Men*, Chap. XV. p. 157:

“I know very well that many distinguished theologians teach that reprobation consists first in Preterition, that GOD has left the reprobate in their sins, has passed over and bypassed them in his election of grace, which they call Negative Reprobation, or Non-Election. Then, in Predamnation, that he has ordained them to damnation on account of their sins. Therefore, the cause of their reprobation to damnation is indeed in themselves; but the cause of Preterition, or non-Election, of their being forsaken, or not-being-chosen is properly not in themselves, but alone in the absolute, free, yet just Will of GOD: especially when one speaks of them comparatively, why He forsook these before others, or passed them over in the election.

But I answer to this (1) that one must not posit such a Preterition or forsaking, by which GOD left them without saving grace right from the beginning, and completely excluded them from salvation, before they forsook him, when He nevertheless called them out of grace to salvation after they had already forsaken him. That this is also the actual opinion of most and the most distinguished theologians, who may have used such a distinction, or even of the Synod of Dort, could easily be shown from their own words.

(2). But when one asks about the Measure of Grace, why GOD did not show them still greater, more powerful, and indeed such grace by which they certainly and infallibly would have been converted, which He surely could have done according to His omnipotence, but instead called them to repentance according to His general grace in such a way that He nevertheless left them to their own will, then I gladly confess—and no one will be able to deny it—that the cause consists alone in the absolute, free, yet just and holy Will of GOD, who alone knows best, and also has the free power, how He should or wants to distribute the measure of His grace among the sinful children of men, who also for His part is not indebted to any man for any grace, or for greater grace, than He has freely given or promised them.”

The Blessed Dr. Johannes Simonis, Professor of Theology in this our Viadrina [University], Ninth Duodecad of Theological Positions, Pos. VIII, IX:

“VIII. Because in Election, to pass over or not to elect, and to predamn, or to destine to damnation, is one and the same act of Reprobation, and they do not differ, except in name alone, since by the very same act by which Judas was not elected, he was also predamned, it follows that different causes cannot be assigned to them, so that not electing happens out of absolute Good Pleasure, but predamning on account of foreseen fault; For Judas was not only predamned on account of foreseen impenitence and incredulity, but also passed over in Election, or not elected.

IX. Nor should the prior act, non-Election, be called more Negative than the latter, Predamnation; For to predamn, as to the matter itself, is not to elect. And non-Election, because it bespeaks a passing over in Election, is just as much a Positive act as predamnation. The Positivity or affirmation, which occurs here, is only of name and of reason, since, as to the matter, it bespeaks a negation of Election.”

Dr. Georgius Pauli in *Reformatio Augustano* or *Apology for his Scholastic Dictates*, c. XIII. p. 184:

“And sins are not only the cause of the damnation of the reprobate, but also of the Subtraction of Grace previously offered, of the Blinding and Hardening in the Reprobate, according to the Sayings of I Sam. XV. *Because you have rejected Knowledge, I will reject You*, etc. Therefore not even the privation of Grace and the hardening in the Reprobate happens according to the absolute Good Pleasure of God, but on account of antecedent sins, by which they themselves have attracted these evils to themselves, and have been despoiled of the goods which they previously enjoyed.”

Dr. Gerhardus de Neufville of Bremen in Disp. II. on the Mystery of Election and Reprobation, Anno 1619, Aphorism XXXVIII, XXXIX:

“Nor indeed is the Distinction necessary here between Reprobation to not giving Grace and to not giving Glory, or, as others say, between the Decree not to show mercy and the Decree to damn. For both the negation of Grace or desertion, which is expressed by the phrase 'not to show mercy,' and damnation itself and eternal death, is a just punishment due to the sins of the Reprobate, and each proceeds from the just hatred of GOD. See the Judgment of the British at the Synod of Dordrecht. p. 502, 503. Th. III. & IV. also p. 674, 675. Th. IV. The Judgment of the Leiden Professors *ibid.* Part. II. p. 13. and *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* Disp. XXIV. §. L, LI, p. 307, 308. Each of these acts has sinful man, guilty of condemnation, as its object, just as all of Antiquity rightly judged, etc. §. LII. Nor however is this to be taken as if these two Acts were in reality diverse etc. Whence it is necessarily inferred that, just as preterition presupposes the common sin, so predamnation in the divine foreknowledge presupposes in addition all the other particular sins as well, to be committed both against the law and against the Gospel, which would merit a punishment of this kind.”

§. VI. As for the Distinction made between putting the Question absolutely and comparatively, it should be noted:

It is as if, regarding the cause of Reprobation, if you ask absolutely, “*For what reason did God reprobate this or that person?*” the answer is indeed their sins. But if you ask comparatively, “*Why did He reprobate this one rather than that one, since both are equally sinners and therefore worthy of reprobation?*” the cause is not their sin and malice, because these are common to both, but the Will and Good Pleasure of GOD (because it so pleased Him).

When one asks about the meritorious Cause of Reprobation, or *why certain men are reprobated*, whether the question is put absolutely or comparatively, the

answer must always be: The sin and stubbornness of men is the cause for why men are reprobated.

However, when one asks about the cause of the *distinction*—“*Why did God reprobate this one, but elect that one?*”—the gratuitous and benevolent Will of GOD must be established and placed as the cause of the Distinction, not in Reprobation, but in Election. Why GOD elected certain ones from among equally evil men, the cause is the gratuitous Good Pleasure of GOD. But why the rest are consigned to their due and merited punishment, the cause to be alleged is not the Will of GOD, but the malice and stubbornness of those men, because they merited that punishment.

For example, King Pharaoh showed Grace to the Butler but inflicted punishment on the baker. If here you ask absolutely, “*Why did he show grace to the butler, but see to it that the baker was hanged?*” the answer is: The gracious Will of the King was the cause for why the butler’s committed crime was pardoned; but the committed crime was the cause for why the baker was put to death.

But if you ask comparatively, “*Why did the King absolve the butler rather than the baker?*” it is permissible to bring forward the gracious will of the king as the cause. But if you put the question comparatively in this way: “*Why did the King order the baker to be executed rather than the butler, since both had sinned equally?*” the very best answer will be: the baker was punished on account of his crime, but the butler, out of royal grace, obtained pardon for his offense.

Otherwise, the acting Efficient Cause or the antecedent (*προηγμένη*), intrinsically moving cause, would be confused with the predisposing (*προκαταρκτική*), or external, impulsive, meritorious Cause. The Will of GOD, and indeed the judicial Will, can be and is the acting cause of Reprobation; but it is so far from being the impulsive, meritorious cause that it cannot even be so.

Thus, if there were ten men guilty and convicted of rebellion, and from their number the Prince should order five rebels to be executed, while granting pardon to the remaining five; and it were asked, “*Why are the first five put to death?*” you would rightly answer: because they merited this punishment and the Prince, out of Justice, wills for them to be executed. But if you should ask, “*Why was Grace shown to the remaining five?*” you could rightly bring forward the gracious and clement Will as the Cause (the Efficient, acting, and intrinsically moving Cause; but by no means the externally impelling and meritorious one). Punishment is inflicted on account of the offense and fault, but it is pardoned out of Grace.

Christ himself sheds light on these matters in **Matthew XI. 20-26**:

“Then he began to upbraid the cities in which most of his mighty works had been done, because they did not repent. “Woe to you,

Chorazin! Woe to you, Bethsaida! For if the mighty works done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I tell you, it will be more bearable on the day of Judgment for Tyre and Sidon than for you. And you, Capernaum, who are exalted to heaven, will be brought down to hell. For if the mighty works done in you had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. But I tell you that it will be more tolerable on the day of judgment for the land of Sodom than for you.” At that time Jesus answered and said, “I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that you have hidden these things from the wise and understanding and revealed them to little children; yes, Father, for such was your good pleasure before you.” “

Also **Matthew XX. 11-15**, in the Parable of the workers hired for the vineyard:

“the first, upon receiving a denarius, grumbled against the master of the house, saying, ‘These last worked only one hour, and you have made them equal to us who have borne the burden of the day and the scorching heat.’ But he replied to one of them, ‘Friend, I am doing you no wrong. Did you not agree with me for a denarius? Take what is yours and go. I choose to give to this last one as I give to you. Am I not allowed to do what I choose with what belongs to me? Or is your eye evil because I am good?’ “

Here Christ speaks of the Denarius given out of grace to the undeserving, not indeed of punishment inflicted on whomever He wishes. And so, He speaks of the liberty of GOD in conferring benefits, even on those not strictly deserving, but not, however, of the liberty and power of imposing punishments without demerit. Paul confirms this in **Romans XI. 20**, where he speaks differently of the Reprobate and the Elect. Of the Reprobate: *They were broken off because of unbelief*; but of the Elect: *But you stand through Faith (through Grace)*.

From what has been said, the passage in **Luke VIII. 10** can also be easily explained: *To you it has been given to know the mystery of the kingdom of GOD, but for others they are in parables, so that seeing they may not see, and hearing they may not understand*. This is especially true if we consider the parallel passage in **Matthew XIII. 11-13**: *To you it has been given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it has not been given. For to the one who has, more will be given, and he will have an abundance, but from the one who has not, even what he has will be taken away from him. This is why I speak to them in parables, because seeing they do not see, and hearing they do not hear, nor do they understand, etc.*

Dr. Johannes Bergius in his *Tractate on the Difference and Agreement of the Evangelicals*, qu. LXIV. p. 89. seq.:

“It is one thing if I ask why God did not elect them to that grace and appoint them to it, through which they would in actual fact certainly and infallibly believe; but another thing why He elected them to Salvation. And another thing, why He rejected and reprobated them to total hardening and eternal Condemnation.

To the first question, it is rightly answered that this flows from mere free will and good pleasure, the most just causes of which are best known to Him alone, who owes this grace to no one. This Non-Election to grace of such a kind is not, however, properly the reprobation of men. For GOD did not for that reason plainly reprobate them, because He did not appoint for them, or elect them to, that grace by which they would certainly and infallibly believe; nor did He for that reason plainly forsake them, or exclude them from all saving Grace. But He forsook and reprobated them for this reason: because the grace and benefits which He had appointed and bestowed, or had offered to them for salvation, through which they ought to have acknowledged Him and turned to Him, they maliciously and pertinaciously spurned and cast away, etc.”

And a little later:

“Thus also it is rightly answered to the second and third question. For as concerns the second, although for our Lord GOD, according to His supreme and absolute power over all creatures, it was plainly free whether He willed to elect anyone or no one to eternal salvation and Celestial Glory—since He was not obligated to any man, any creature, not even any Angel, even if they had persisted in the first state of innocence in which they were created from the beginning, much less after their lapse and Disobedience, to promise or give eternal and celestial Glory, or to predestine to it; but according to His absolute Will and good pleasure could have left them in their natural state and passed them by in regard to Salvation, which is plainly Supernatural—nevertheless, after He, out of mere and most free grace, in Christ, commonly not only commanded repentance and faith in Christ to lapsed man, but also promised eternal and celestial life, He wills to exclude no one from eternal salvation by His free and absolute Will and Good Pleasure, but on account of their own impenitence and unbelief.

Much less can it be answered to the third question, that He reprobated any man to damnation by His absolute Will without respect to sin; because it would be repugnant not only to His Truth and Promise, but also to His natural Goodness or Justice, if He should,

either in time and in act condemn, or in His counsel appoint, any man created in His own image to the punishment of eternal infernal torments, unless they had merited it by their own sins. *Far be this from You, who are the judge of all the earth, you will not judge so* (Genesis XVIII); *because you are just, you would consider it alien to your power to condemn anyone who is not deserving* (Wisdom XII).

So that the whole of Reprobation—both the negative or privative, as they call it, namely that He finally excluded them from all Grace and eternal Salvation; and the positive, that He reprobated them to eternal death and condemnation—was done not by absolute power and Will, but only by the just judgment of GOD on account of sins. But that He did not elect them to the same Grace as others, by which they would in actual fact become faithful and thus certainly be saved, that depends only on His most free, although most just, Will.”

See the same author in *The Will of GOD for the Salvation of all Men*. C. XV. §. XXXIII. p. 159, 160.

The Reverend Dr. Johannes Simonis, most celebrated Professor of Theology in this our Frankfurt, in the Ninth Duodecad of Theological Positions, Pos. X, XI, XII:

“X. That men in the sight of the predestinating GOD were equally evil does not lead to the conclusion that some of them were indeed damnable along with the others, but not actually reprobated, on account of their sins and unbelief, but that the Cause of actual Reprobation is the Good Pleasure of GOD. For because GOD took up and elected some from among the equally evil by His singular Good Pleasure, it follows by itself that the rest, not so taken up out of Grace, were also rejected on account of the same fault through which they were made evil and damnable.

XI. Therefore, whether you ask absolutely why men were reprobated, or comparatively, why *these* rather than others equally evil, in either case the cause is sins and final Unbelief, since the distinction was not made in Reprobation, which is subsequent to Election, but in Election. For since GOD determined to impart greater Grace to those whom He elected, and thus to draw them out of all perdition, and did so out of His most free Will and Grace, it is clear that the cause of the distinction must be sought here, and that from this it follows that the others are damned only on account of their own fault.

XII. Let there be, for example, ten rebels, equal in respect of their crime and punishment. Just as here, why the Prince grants the Grace

of Life to three, his sole Will and Good Pleasure is the cause; so, conversely, their rebellion is the reason why the others are dragged off to Punishment. The penalty is imposed on account of the fault; it is pardoned on account of grace. You wrongly place the cause for why these equally rebellious men are dragged off to punishment in the Good Pleasure of the Prince, since this is the cause only of the Grace shown to those three.”

Dr. Gregorius Francus, formerly Professor of Theology in the University of Frankfurt, in *Theological Meditations on the Genuine Sense of the Absolute Decree*, §. XXXVII:

“But you say: We have all forsaken: We have all become unprofitable: Each has gone his own way: therefore it is necessary that we all be reprobated, passed over, deserted, if the cause of GOD's desertion is our desertion and our sin. Therefore no cause can be given for desertion, and thus not even sin.

I reply: The desertion of GOD, insofar as it is a punishment for sin, is not connected to sin by a necessary and indissoluble bond; for it can be dissolved by the free will of GOD, and abolished by His benign clemency.

You insist: Nevertheless, there must be some other cause for desertion besides sin. I reply: But that is not necessary. Imagine you are a creditor to several Debtors (a simile which Augustine uses in his book *On Predestination and Grace*, Chapter XVI), and to some you indeed forgive the debt, but to others you do not forgive it, but take revenge, confining the defaulters in prison and subjecting them to other punishments. If you were asked, if others were asked, what is the cause of the punishment? No one would answer otherwise than that they are unable to pay. But if someone should demand from you the cause of the distinction, and should ask why you showed the grace of pardon to these rather than to those, you would reply that you have exercised your right in the case of some, while in the case of others you have abolished the debt and offense by your clemency, and that the reasons for this action of yours are kept hidden with you. Would any mortal man accuse one who speaks thus of iniquity?

Pharaoh showed grace to the butler; he inflicted punishment on the baker. He could have punished both; he could have honored both. But the baker paid the penalties for his deeds, whom grace passed by; the butler is honored, though convicted and found guilty of an equal or perhaps greater crime. Pharaoh could neither pass over nor hang the

baker unless he had been made a criminal; but the butler, however criminal, he could absolve through clemency. The former was condemned in the court of justice; the latter was exempted from punishment in the court of grace.”

§. VII. From this it becomes clear that the Decree of Reprobation is not Absolute, since GOD has reprobated no one out of absolute Will without respect to sin, but has adjudged sinners, who have in multiple ways merited Damnation, to that damnation.

The Palatine theologians advised this in the *Ausführlichem Bericht* (Detailed Report), c. VIII. p. 193:

“As far as reprobation is concerned, it is not a mere counsel; rather, in it there is a manifest and well-known cause of reprobation, namely sin. This we also concede, in the correct understanding. For GOD damns no one except on account of sin, therefore He has also resolved to damn no one except on account of sin. And in this respect the counsel of reprobation to damnation is certainly not a free, mere counsel.”

The Theologians of Brandenburg and Hesse professed at the Leipzig Colloquy:

“GOD has also from eternity consigned to eternal destruction those who persevere in sin and unbelief, not indeed by an absolute decree of such a kind, as if He had, either from eternity preordained, or in time created, the greatest part of the world, or any man, for everlasting Damnation or for the cause of the same, without respect to their sins and unbelief: but etc.”

(as above p. 246). And in the Declaration of Thorn, chapter IV, concerning Grace, the theologians of Brandenburg and Poland and Lithuania say:

“n. 18. We say that a Sentence foreign to our mind is attributed to us by those who accuse us, as if we hold that eternal Election and Reprobation were made absolutely, without any respect to faith or unbelief, of good or evil works. When, on the contrary, we rather hold that in Election, Faith and obedience are foreseen, not indeed as a cause or Reason of Election itself in those being elected, but yet as a Means preordained by God for them unto Salvation; but in Reprobation, we hold that not only Original sin, but also, as regards adults, stubborn Unbelief and Impenitence are foreseen—not indeed properly preordained by God, but in the Reprobate themselves as the meritorious Cause of Desertion and Damnation, foreseen and permitted, and reprobated by a most just judgment.”

Dr. Gregorius Francus, in his *Meditation on the genuine Sense of the Absolute Decree*, §. XXVIII, XXX, annexed to the *Treatise on the Heaven of the Blessed*, p. 218, denies that the Decree of Reprobation is Absolute in the following words:

“But now we come to the Decree of Reprobation. Is this also absolute, so that it was made without any respect to sin, and therefore depends entirely on the sole will and efficacious Providence of GOD, so that its principal and original cause resides not in man, but in GOD, and His mere will accomplishes the whole thing, from which it has also come to pass that every kind of crime and punishment has burst into the world, so that the sins which are committed among men even today are to be referred back to that Decree as to their first principle? etc. But all these things are abominable deliriums, especially that which makes GOD the cause of sin.

Here, therefore, the Decree of Election and of Reprobation differ quite significantly: in the former, we find the entire cause of Salvation in GOD; here, we acknowledge and profess that the cause of the evil of fault, the occasion, beginning, and progress, and therefore also the source and cause of the guilt and of the damnation and punishment, is in us and from us.”

Dr. Johannes Bergius in his *Tractate on the Difference and Agreement of the Evangelicals*, question LXIII, p. 84-85, asks:

“Is it not therefore your opinion that GOD, by an absolute Will and Decree, without any view of sin, has excluded any man from all grace, or has predestined him to eternal condemnation?”

Reply: By no means. For just as GOD now in actual fact affects no one with the punishment of hardening and condemnation by His absolute Will, but by a just judgment, on account of that person's sins; so also in His eternal counsel He appointed and reprobated no one to the punishment of hardening and condemnation out of absolute Will, but by a just judgment, on account of the same sins. And for that reason there is a huge difference between election and reprobation, etc.”

The same author states this in his *Explanation of the Saying in John III. 16*, in the words cited above in §. II. p. 12. C. II. With these Ludovicus Crocius agrees in *Syntagma Sacrae Theologiae* L. IV. C. I. p. 979, and *Duodecad of Dissertations* IX. §. XCIII, XCIV, XCV, p. 508-509.

Johannes Bergius in *The Will of GOD for the Salvation of all Men*, C. XV. §. XXX. p. 156:

“From this it is clearly illuminated, first, that reprobation does not consist in such an Absolute Decree or Counsel of GOD, by which he simply denies to the reprobate all saving grace for their salvation, or has condemned them to damnation without their own fault. For how could He have denied them all grace, when He has called them to repentance out of grace? How could He have condemned them to eternal death without their fault in his eternal counsel, when He has so faithfully and graciously offered them the forgiveness of their debts by means of repentance? etc.”

Dr. Georgius Pauli in *Reformatio Augustana*, C. XIII. p. 183:

“But when the discussion is about Reprobation, the decree of Reprobation can much less be called simply absolute. For GOD has adjudged no one to damnation out of absolute Will without respect to sin, but sinners and those well-deserving of damnation. And sins are the cause, properly speaking, meritorious and impulsive in the reprobate. In this, Reprobation differs from Election, etc.”

The Blessed Dr. Johannes Simonis, in the Ninth Dyodecad of Theological Positions, Position I & II, to which we annex Positions V, VI, & VII, because they contain certain things that illustrate this §. VII as well as the preceding ones:

I. It is certain that this Decree of Reprobation is not absolute, but that men are reprobated on account of final Impenitence and Unbelief, which GOD most certainly foresaw in them would result from their own malice and stubbornness.

II. This is not contradicted by the fact that this malicious Unbelief did not exist in act from eternity; for it is common that what is future can still possess the power of moving, although with respect to GOD nothing is properly future. Nor is that unbelief a Consequence of Reprobation, unless you understand a Consequence of order alone, and by no means of dependency; but the contrary is true.

V. It is not said in Romans IX that Jacob was loved and Esau hated *before they had done anything good or evil*. For Historical Truth refutes this. In Genesis XXV. 23, it was said, *the older will serve the younger*. Also, hatred sometimes signifies a lesser Love in Scripture (Luke XIV. 26). And that the passage there deals with the prerogative of Jacob and the lowlier condition of Esau in temporal matters is clear from Malachi I. 2-3. And although those things may also be accommodated to spiritual matters, it does not follow that Esau was hated absolutely and without cause.

VI. And just as GOD does not have mercy, except on him who is already miserable by his own fault, so He does not harden, except him who has merited this punishment by his fault. The absolute will of GOD cannot be resisted, but He has reprobated no one by this will; yet He can rightly make from the lump of clay vessels for dishonor, that is, condemn the impious.

VII. Nor did the Apostle for that reason exclaim in Romans XI. 13, *O the depth of the riches etc.*, because GOD reprobated men without a view of sin or Unbelief; but because He graced with His Grace the idolatrous and most profane sinners of the Gentiles, while rejecting and leaving in their unbelief the Jews, who were nevertheless His chosen people.”

John Calvin in his *Response to the Calumnies of Nebulonius* on Article I:

“You seize upon the first Article, that GOD by the pure and bare arbitration of His Will created the greatest part of the world for Perdition. But that whole part about "the greatest part of the world" and about the "pure and bare Arbitration" is fictitious, and has proceeded from the workshop of your own malice.”

And a little later he adds that he repudiates this in his writings in a hundred, or more, places.

The Leiden Professors in their *Censure of the Remonstrant Confession*, Chapter VIII, p. 125:

“To assert that an absolute Election or Reprobation was made by Calvin or by the Synod of Dort, in the sense in which the Remonstrants use this word, is an absolute lie.”

See also Steinius, Part III of the *Evangelischen Brüderschafft* (Evangelical Brotherhood), p. 26-27.

§. VIII. The Subject of Reprobation are Men who, immediately or at least mediately, directly or indirectly, are, in the Divine foreknowledge, Called; but who maliciously reject the Divine Vocation, and by that voluntary, malicious, and stubborn Rejection of theirs, heap up and gather for themselves the wrath of GOD (whence they are most aptly called Vessels of wrath), and merit their own rejection by their own avoidable Fault.

The Church of Lyon, in the 9th Century, expressed this emphatically in its *Book on the Three Epistles*, C. VI. p. 79: “Because therefore they are such and will persevere as such even to the end, they are deservedly, by the foreknowledge of

GOD, foreknown as evil, and by the Predestination of GOD, justly reprobated and damned.” And in Chapter XXXII, p. 120: “These Vessels of wrath were preordained not for Mercy but for judgment, and by their own merit and by divine judgment they are both fitted and perfected for destruction; so that both by their own preceding merit and by the just preceding judgment of divine Predestination, because they were unwilling to be converted to the good, they suffer eternal evil. Therefore, they suffer a just punishment not because they could not, but because they would not be converted from evil to good. The fault, therefore, is not of GOD the Father, nor of His Only-begotten Son, nor of the Holy Spirit.”

Augustine expresses this in his reply to *The Articles falsely imputed to him*, Article XIII, as follows: “The Father does nothing there, the Son does nothing, the Holy Spirit does nothing!”

For GOD the Father loved All men, in a way suitable to their Nature, that is, not only for this animal Life, but for the Intellectual and celestial Life; He sent His only-begotten Son to all of them, and ordained for them sufficient Means of salvation, by the benefit and use of which they ought to and could be eternally blessed. The Son of GOD carried out the office committed to Him by the Father with the greatest Faith; He not only opened the way of salvation to all indiscriminately by His Doctrine and excluded no one, and most lovingly invited all who are burdened and weary to Himself; but He also underwent a bloody death for all, and saw to it that the salvation, obtained by that atoning Death, was sincerely and seriously offered to the whole World through the Apostles and other heralds of the Gospel. The Holy Spirit not only illuminated the Apostles themselves and other Preachers of so great a salvation, and by His own inspiration and celestial light made them most certain of the Truth of the Gospel, and most richly instructed them with the gift of tongues, of Prophecy, and of other endowments necessary for carrying out their office; but He also always so fertilizes and accompanies their Preaching, and the Word of Life, with His celestial Grace and Virtue, that whoever hears it is so efficaciously imbued and internally affected by the rays of this celestial Light that they are able to embrace the salvation offered to them. But whoever resists these internal operations of the Holy Spirit and places an obstacle to them, are nevertheless most sufficiently convinced that they perish by their own avoidable Fault.

Rightly, therefore, the Synod of Dort says in Chapter II, Article VI: “That many who are called by the Gospel do not repent, nor believe in Christ, but perish in unbelief, does not happen from any defect or insufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ offered on the cross, but by their own fault.” And in Chapters III & IV, Article IX: “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 who calls through the Gospel and even confers various gifts on them, but in the Called themselves, some of whom securely do

not admit the word of life; others admit it indeed, but do not let it into their Heart, and therefore after a fleeting joy of temporary Faith they fall away; others suffocate the seed of the Word with the thorns of the cares and pleasures of the age, and bring forth no fruits. This our Savior teaches in the parable of the Sower, Matthew c. XIII.”

(See Dr. Johannes Bergius in *Explanation of the Saying in John III. 16*. Ed. in 12mo. p. 245-249. Dr. Ludovicus Crocius, *Syntagma Theologiae*, lib. IV. Cap. I. p. 981-982. *Duodecad of Dissertations* IX. §. XCIX, CII, CV. p. 511, 515, 518. Hermannus Hildebrandus, *Declaratio Orthodoxa Articulorum trium*, p. 254-255.)

Here Theologians treat of the happy or unhappy state of infants who die without Baptism. We hold that the infants of the faithful are to be considered in the Covenant of GOD, and that covenantal Grace is to be attributed to them. For in the civil forum the infants of Citizens are considered heirs, although on account of their age they neither understand anything about the inheritance, nor can they fulfill the Condition annexed to the inheritance. And so we believe that the infants of the faithful who die without Baptism are also to be reckoned entirely among the Elect and Blessed.

The more difficult question is about the infants of the Unfaithful who die in infancy, into which class they are to be referred. Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, and the writer of the Questions which are commonly attributed to Athanasius, dictate for these little ones a Punishment not of destruction, but of exile; not inclusion in the prison of Gehenna, but exclusion from the Kingdom of heaven, and they teach that they are in a middle Condition between Reward and punishment. From which opinion not even Augustine himself was initially estranged. Pelagius, according to Augustine in *On Original Sin*, c. XXI, is reported to have said of them: “Where they do not go, I know; where they go, I do not know.” Augustine attacks this opinion of Pelagius in book II of his *Imperfect Work Against Julian*: “You make two eternal felicities, one which is in the Kingdom of GOD, the other which is outside the Kingdom of GOD.” He especially attacks it in Sermon XIV, *On the Words of the Apostle*.

But Augustine, while he happily destroyed the foreign opinion, with difficulty found what he himself should assert. He himself confesses this in Epistle XXVIII to Jerome: “When it comes to the punishment of little ones, believe me, I am constrained by great anxieties, nor do I find at all what ought to be answered. Although I desire, ask, wish with ardent prayers, and expect that through you the Lord may take away my ignorance of this matter, yet if I am by no means deserving, I will ask for patience for myself from the Lord our GOD.”

He himself, however, as also Prosper, Fulgentius, the Fathers in Exile in Sardinia, and the Africans, who had much business with the Pelagians, as well as the

Councils of Carthage and Milevis, determined that infants departing without Baptism are to be punished with an infernal punishment, yet a most mild one, and indeed in such a way that it is nevertheless better for them to have been born than not to have been born. Augustine, Book III of *On Free Will*, c. XXV: "Some say: what place will be appointed for a little child in the future judgment? There is no place among the Just, since he has done nothing right; nor among the wicked, since he has not sinned? I answer, it is superfluous to ask about the merits of one who has merited nothing: for it is not to be feared that there could not be a middle sentence between reward and punishment, since there is a middle life between sin and a right deed." And book V against Julian, c. VIII: "I do not say that little ones dying without the Baptism of Christ are to be punished with so great a penalty that it would be better for them not to have been born." Also: "Who would doubt that unbaptized little ones will be in the lightest damnation of all? What and how great it will be, although I cannot define, I nevertheless do not dare to say that it would be better for them to be nothing than to be there." And in the *Enchiridion*, c. XCIII, he writes that little ones are punished with the mildest punishment of all.

Vincentius Victor dissented from these and declared all infants to be partakers of salvation. Augustine said he thought worse than Pelagius. In subsequent times, this opinion of Augustine and of the rest of the Fathers mentioned here seemed too harsh. Hence John Gerson and some others judged that not all infants who die unbaptized are excluded from heaven, but only those who had obtained Baptism neither in reality nor by vow, either their own or that of their family.

The Pontifical and Scholastic theologians today commonly agree with Thomas Aquinas. He writes thus in *On Evil*, Question V, Article II: "Punishment is proportioned to Fault, and therefore to mortal actual sin, in which is found Aversion from the unchangeable Good and Conversion to the changeable Good, there is due the Punishment of Loss, namely the Lack of the divine Vision, corresponding to the Aversion, and the Punishment of sense, corresponding to the Conversion. But in Original Sin there is not a Conversion to a Creature, but only an Aversion from GOD, or something corresponding to Aversion, namely the Destitution of the Soul of Original Justice. And therefore, to Original Sin is not due the Punishment of sense, but only the Punishment of Loss, namely the Lack of the divine Vision, etc." And they wish for these infants to sustain this Punishment of Loss in what they call the Limbo of Infants. From this common opinion of the Scholastics, only Gregory of Rimini went in a different direction and defended the harsher opinion of Augustine, whence he was called "the Tormenter of infants." Whose opinion, however, as also that of Augustine, none of the Pontifical theologians today approve.

Meanwhile, at the Council of Trent, the Augustinians insisted vehemently that (on account of the reverence due to Augustine) Gregory of Rimini not be condemned,

nor that Article, which they acknowledged to be false, be declared heretical. In the same place, the Dominicans and Franciscans did not agree enough among themselves; the Dominicans asserting that infants dying without Baptism will, after the Resurrection, remain in Limbo and in darkness, in a subterranean place, but without fire; but the Franciscans assigning to them a place upon the earth and in the light. Ambrosius Catharinus added that they will be visited and consoled by the Holy Angels and the Blessed; he also bent all the powers of his intellect so that the opinion of St. Augustine not be disseminated among the populace, and affirmed that Augustine had spoken thus, carried away by excessive heat in the Disputation against the Pelagians, but not that he had defended that opinion as certain. (See Paolo Sarpi or Pietro Soave, *History of the Council of Trent*, Book II, p. 296-297.)

Ambrosius Catharinus and Albertus Pighius taught that infants dying without Baptism will, after the last Judgment, enjoy natural Beatitude, as if in an earthly Paradise, forever. Gabriel Biel and Thomas Cajetan, in the III Part of Thomas on question LXVIII, Art. I, II, XI, think that the Vow of Baptism should be held for Baptism, especially since no one is obligated to the Impossible. The Remonstrants hold that all infants, even those of Pagans, are saved eternally by the Covenant of Grace and the universal Death of Christ. (See Philippus a Limborch, *Christian Theology*, book III, Chapter V, §. II.)

As for what Protestant Theologians hold:

I. They agree that Original Sin is, of itself and by its own nature, meritorious of eternal Death and damnable, yet it does not always actually damn.

II. They unanimously reject the Limbo of infants. Some, however, approve the Mind of Augustine and of the other Fathers mentioned above concerning the Pains of hell, and think that one should not judge differently of the infants of Gentiles than of adult Gentiles who are not converted, except that their Punishment will be milder. Others, however, warn that judgment should not be rushed, from I Corinthians V. 12-13. We also accede to these, and think it is too severe that GOD has consigned all the infants of unbelievers to eternal torments. On the contrary, we maintain that all who are in the covenant, whether they be such immediately or mediately, are saved. And therefore we approve the sober judgment of the most celebrated Franciscus Junius on this matter, which is extant in his Collation on Nature and Grace against Puccius, Rat. XVIII, p. 331, Col. II, and which sounds thus:

“No one of us is so mad, or has ever been found to be so mad, as to have affirmed simply that infants will be damned. Let those who teach otherwise see for themselves by what right they do so, relying on what authority. For even if according to themselves and our common nature they are damnable, it does not

however follow that a sentence of damnation ought to be passed on them. What then? Will they be saved? We hold entirely that whoever are of the Covenant, whoever are of the Election, will be saved. Now, ordinarily, those are of the Covenant who have proceeded from covenanted parents, whether immediately, that is, from a proximate Father and Mother, or either of them, or mediately, that is, from covenanted ancestors, although with an interrupted continuation, just as GOD says that he will exercise mercy on a thousand generations (Exodus XX. 6). And the Apostle commanded that the Jews, in their time, be included in this class (Romans XI. 28). Nor do we doubt that by the same virtue of the covenant GOD sanctifies some from the number of unbelievers as His own, on account of that covenant, you see, which their ancestors had received. But from Election; because the Lord has not excluded Himself, nor has He Himself snatched away or cut off from Himself the Right and authority of communicating further the Grace of His election with those whose neither parents nor ancestors have come to the covenant. But just as He formerly called to the Covenant recently according to His Election those who were not, that they might be in the Covenant, so also from that most free Agent the same benefit happens at all times. But why should it happen less to Infants than to others? Concerning whom that can deservedly be said which the Author of Wisdom wrote of Enoch: He was snatched away, lest malice should change his understanding, or deceit beguile his soul (Chap. XI). Therefore, we say that infants are, according to themselves, deservedly damnable by the Justice of GOD, and if GOD should have damned any (a matter which He Himself sees to), they are justly damned. But yet we affirm that they are saved from the covenant, and from election, whomever He has ordained to eternal Life. Out of charity, however, we presume that those whom He calls to Himself as infants, snatching them away in due time from this miserable valley, are saved, according to His paternal Election and Providence, rather than abdicated from the kingdom of GOD. We acquiesce entirely in his counsel.”

Also deserving of consideration are the things which Zwingli has in his *Declaration on Original Sin* to Urbanus Rhegius, vol. II of his works, p. 120: “This I have said, that original sin cannot damn the children of Christians, for this reason, that although sin according to the law would indeed damn, yet on account of the remedy provided through Christ it cannot damn: especially these, who are in that Testament which he made with Abraham. For concerning these we also have other firm and clear Testimonies. Concerning others, who are born outside the Church, we have nothing else, that I know of, than the present Testimony, and similar ones in this fifth chapter of Romans, by which it can be proved that those who are born outside the Church are clean from original contamination. But if someone should say of these also, that it is more probable that the children of the Gentiles are saved through Christ than that they are damned, he will now certainly less empty Christ than these who damn those born within the Church if they die without the washing of Baptism, and he will have

more Authority and foundation in the scriptures than these who deny this. For he would assert nothing else than that the children of the gentiles also, while they are tender, are not damned on account of original defect, and that by the benefit of Christ; but that for adults no grace is left, because they did not trust in Christ.” And soon after: “Someone might therefore say, that nature has been restored through Christ; now those things which we have said would follow. But if only his Church has been restored, now it would follow that salvation through Christ is not as widespread as the disease from Adam spreads. For there is no one, I think, who would deny that the children of gentiles are born just as much with a propensity to sin as our own. Nevertheless, however the matter stands concerning the children of gentiles (for someone could, and perhaps not without justification, contend that those Sayings of Paul: *Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound, and just as sin reigned in death, so also grace reigns to eternal life through Jesus Christ*, and similar ones, were said by synecdoche, and are to be understood of none other than the faithful and their children), for that reason we also attribute liberation from original sin only to these, leaving the others to the judgment of GOD. Granted, let us audacious little men adjudge some to eternal death, concerning whom we do not have the open word of GOD, are they therefore truly damned?”

Besides that which God professes in Exodus XX. 6, that he will exercise mercy even to the thousandth Generation, the Theological Axiom must also be considered here: “Not the Deprivation of the Sacrament, but the contempt of it, damns.”

(See the Blessed Dr. J. Bergius in *The Will of God etc.*, Chap. XIX, §. I, V, seqq., p. 213-225. Dr. Ludovicus Crocius, *Duodecad of Dissertations* VI, §. III, seq., p. 282-285; also Dissert. XI, §. LIII, p. 685-686. Dallaeus, *Apology for the two Synods*, Part. III, p. 464-467, & Part. IV, p. 636-639.)

From this it is also clear what is to be held concerning the Opinion and Imputation of the Heresy of the Predestinarians. Sigebertus of Gembloux, a Monk, in his *Chronicle* for the year 415, writes that they were so called because, while disputing about Predestination and divine Grace, they asserted that the labor of Good Works does not profit the piously living if they have been predestined by God to death, nor does it harm the impious that they live wickedly if they have been predestined by GOD to Life. To be sure:

1. This opinion is most contrary to Scripture and inimical to true Piety, inasmuch as it tears the Means, which by the ordinance of GOD are necessary for obtaining the End and are therefore joined with the End by an indissoluble bond, away from the End; and is therefore to be detested with one's whole heart.

2. It must not be concealed that certain men, most learned in every respect, and indeed from among the Pontificals—Cornelius Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres; Wilhelm Estius; Lambertus Fromondus; Haurannus Vergerius; Gilbertus Mauguinus—and from among the Reformed—James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh; William Twisse; John Forbes; both Frederick Spanheims; Johannes Hornbeek; Samuel Maresius; Johann Heinrich Hottinger; Franciscus Burmannus; the Blessed Dr. Philippus Buchius—either doubt or certainly believe that the Predestinarian Heresy never existed, but that the doctrine of Augustine and Prosper was calumniously handed down by the Semi-Pelagians under the name of that Heresy.

3. And although most Pontificals, Lutherans, and indeed many of the Reformed—and among these Lambertus Danaeus, Dr. Christoph Pelargus, Johannes Bogermannus, Petrus Molinaeus, Henricus Altingius, Matthaeus Martinius, Gerhard Johannes Vossius, Caspar Sibelius, George Bull—hold that this heresy did exist, yet by the judgment of these Affirmants themselves it is certain that this Heresy found few Supporters. Whence they name as the Authors and Supporters of this Heresy only: 1. The Atrumentine monks, so called from Atrumentum, a City of Africa, who are believed to have taken the occasion for their error from a misunderstanding of Augustine's books against the Pelagians. To lead them back to the way, Augustine wrote two Books to explain his doctrine: one *On Grace and Free Will*, the other *On Rebuke and Grace*. 2. Lucidus the Presbyter, who embraced the opinion of his Adversary Faustus, proposed in the Synod of Arles and of Lyon. 3. Gottschalk the Monk, who in the year 848 was condemned in the Synod of Mainz and of Rheims, and on account of his irreverent treatment of the bishops, was beaten with rods in the latter Synod, and, lest he persuade anyone of his opinion, was enclosed in a monastery as in a prison, and was detained there for many years. On his account, Adversarial Writings were published between Hincmar and Johannes Erigena Scotus on the one side, and Remigius and Florus in the name of the Church of Lyon, and others on the other side; and the Synods of Mainz and Quierzy were held against Gottschalk, and those of Valence in 855 and Langres in 859 were held to excuse Gottschalk, etc.

4. This Heresy is imputed to the Reformed not without a defect of Charity, because the Reformed in the Doctrine of Predestination do not sever the means from the end, but urge them as most conjoined, both in Theory and in practice, with the greatest emphasis.

§. IX. The End of Reprobation is the praise of the glorious Justice of GOD (Proverbs XVI. 4; Romans IX. 17, 22).

§. X. The Attributes of Reprobation are:

I. Eternity. Matthew XXV. 41: *Go, you cursed, into the eternal fire, prepared for the Devil (not for men, unless they degenerate into the seed of the Serpent by their own avoidable sins) and his angels.* These men are called cursed, because **1.** not only are they subject to the curse of the Law, Deuteronomy XXVII. 62; Galatians III. 13: *Cursed is everyone who does not abide in all the precepts of the divine law to do them;* but also **2.** because they have foully repudiated that blessed Seed, and the Blessing proposed in Him, and thus have preferred the curse to the Blessing. Jude vs. 4.

II. Immutability. Numbers XXIII. 19: *GOD is not a man, that he should lie, nor a Son of man, that he should be changed. Has he said, and will he not do it? Has he spoken, and will he not fulfill it?* I Samuel XV. 29: *The Triumphant One in Israel will not spare and will not be swayed by repentance: for he is not a man, that he should repent.* Malachi III. 6: *I the Lord do not change.* James I. 17: *With GOD there is no variation or shadow of turning.* And does the Nature of GOD require this? For He is most Wise and All-knowing, nor does He decree anything except from Foreknowledge, and that Wisely, whence no Change can have a place in the Decrees of GOD. The Church of Lyon gives the cause in *On the Three Epistles*, C. VI. p. 78: “Not because men cannot be changed from evil to good and from being wicked and depraved become good and upright, but because they were unwilling to be changed for the better, and willed to persevere in the worst works even to the end, nor can they in any way pertain to the lot of the Elect, who have rather chosen to remain in the evil of their iniquities and impieties. For that worst and nefarious evil, which is, being unwilling to be converted to God, nor to be changed from evil to good, but according to the hardness and impenitence of their own heart to treasure up for themselves wrath on the day of wrath and of the revelation of the just judgment, He who can in no way be deceived most truly foresaw in His eternal Foreknowledge that this would be in them. And because He most truly foresaw this, He most justly predestined such ones to eternal perdition.” Ibid. pag. 79: “That the reprobate cannot in any way be saved, not on account of the Foreknowledge and Predestination of GOD who foreknows truthfully and damns justly, but on account of their own obstinate and indomitable malice, the same Lord shows when speaking to such ones and saying, John X. 26; John VIII. 47; Ezekiel XIII. 9.” Ibid: “That therefore they cannot be saved is their own fault because they are unwilling, not any iniquity of GOD (which be far from it), who has always been both truthful toward them in His Foreknowledge and just in His judgment.”

The Attributes of the Reprobate are:

I. Plurality. Matthew VII. 13: *The gate is wide and the way is broad that leads to perdition, and there are many who enter through it.* Matthew XX. 16: *Many are called, few are Chosen.* Whence, because more are evil, more are also reprobated and damned.

II. Perseverance in unbelief and impiety.

§. XI. Therefore, since this Opinion is (1) conformed to Holy Scripture, (2) to purer Antiquity, (3) to the Confessions of the Reformed; (4) is apt both for admonishing secure men and for stimulating them to piety, as well as (5) for raising up and consoling the weak and despairing; (6) for repelling Accusations; (7) is suitable for promoting ecclesiastical Peace; (8) cuts the nerve of many Difficulties; and finally, (9) is safe, since indeed it neither attributes too much to Free will, nor too little to Divine Grace, as it ascribes Salvation entirely to Divine Grace, but Damnation and Perdition entirely to Man, and thereby counteracts Pride, Security, and Presumption on the one hand, and sloth and Despair on the other; it utterly excludes Manichaeism, Pelagianism, and Semi-Pelagianism: we rightly conclude therefrom that this opinion is to be chosen and preferred to others, always saving, however, the Authority of those who explain the ways of GOD differently.

**BARTH. HOLTZFUS, D. Theol. & Ord. Prof. in the Univ. of
Frankfurt**

**ADMONITION To the Christian and Pious Reader,
Concerning the Theological Tractate on Predestination,
Election, and Reprobation.**

Christian and Pious Reader,

A few years ago, I published a Tractate on Predestination, Election, and Reprobation, in which I asserted Universal Objective and Subjective Grace from Holy Scripture, the Fathers, and the Confessions of the Reformed Church, which was also kindly received by not a few Lutheran and Reformed Theologians. But since I have observed that certain Learned Men, hindered either by their duties or by Emotion or by Suspicion, have either not read through the whole Tractate, or have not grasped my mind in all things, and therefore in a few particulars attribute a foreign opinion to me, I thought it advisable to repeat here in the briefest Theses the opinion proposed by me, lest an occasion for erring be left to anyone.

First, therefore, I did not use the Name of Predestination precisely as a Genus of Election and Reprobation, but only adduced some reasons to excuse others, by which it could be persuaded that their opinion is not so absurd, who have employed this Name as a Genus. I said that this could indeed be granted under certain cautions, but I myself, having added a reason, judged it more advisable to

let that broader signification of Predestination go or not to press it greatly; although for the sake of better Doctrine only, and so that the Object of Election and Reprobation might be more distinctly established, I thought it best to treat first of Predestination in general, then of Election, and finally of Reprobation in particular. See Dissert. I. Chap. I. §. VII, VIII, & IX.

II. I taught that the Object of Predestination is not Man either to be Created or Created whole and liable to fall, but fallen man; and I refuted the contrary opinion with eight Arguments. Subsect. II. §. IV.

III. I indicated that the Lapse of Adam was foreseen not in a Predetermining Decree, but in the infinite light of the Divine Intellect. Subsect. III. §. VII.

IV. And although I have conceded that the Remote Object of Predestination is fallen Men, yet I established that its Proximate Object is Men redeemed and Called in the Foreknowledge of GOD. Subsect. II. §. VI, VII, and I proved that Thesis with many reasons *ibid.* §. IX.

V. Without Sophistry, both in the act, as they say, exercised and signified, I have asserted that God by His Antecedent and Ordaining Will wills all Men to be saved. §. IX. 1, 2; also Subsect. IV. §. II.

VI. I asserted that Christ died most sufficiently for the entire human Race, with a Sufficiency not Potential, but Actual, from the serious intention of God the Father and the Son, so that no defect is to be found in the sacrifice of Christ offered on the Cross. Diff. I. §. IX. n. 3; also Subsect. IV. §. I, II, & Diff. I. Chap. III. §. VIII.

VII. Lest anyone could use his ignorance or Impotence as a pretext, I asserted that God has pathetically invited and does invite every rational Creature, or all men everywhere (Mark XVI. 15; Acts XVII. 30), not hypocritically nor under an impossible condition, but seriously and sufficiently to embrace this salvation. Diff. I. Chap. I. Subsect. III. §. VII, §. IX. n. 4, n. 6; Subsect. IV. §. III, & IV; Diff. III. §. VIII. And therefore this Vocation is rightly held to be universal, although not always with respect to the outcome, yet by reason of the Divine Intention and command (Diff. I. Chap. I. Subsect. III. §. IX. n. 4), and that no one is excluded except on account of avoidable unbelief, Disobedience, and Impenitence.

VIII. Therefore, it cannot be doubted that God has ordained Means for obtaining salvation that are Sufficient and in themselves Efficacious, namely the Word and Sacraments. Diff. I. Chap. I. Subsect. III. §. IX. n. 6, 13; Subsect. IV. §. IV; Diff. I. Chap. III. §. VIII.

IX. I asserted that God is prepared to confer Faith through the Word and Sacraments to all who are Called and do not maliciously place an obstacle. Therefore, the Fault of Unbelief, stubbornness, Impenitence, and Damnation

belongs to men alone, and it is voluntary, malicious, and avoidable, and conquerable by the Sufficient Grace which they have. Diff. I. Chap. I. Subsect. III. §. IX. num. 5; Subsect. IV. §. IV, V; Diff. I. Chap. III. §. VIII.

X. Therefore, when I say that God gives to all who are Called such a measure of Grace that by its benefit they can believe and convert themselves, I have understood and do understand this in such a way that this potentiality can issue into a second act, as the Scholastics say.

XI. Nor have I ever denied that by virtue of this Common or Universal Grace some do in fact believe, are converted, and are saved; which I signified not obscurely in Dissert. I. Subsect. IV. §. III. p. 131, face 2 of the later Edition (of this Edition p. 207, etc.).

XII. The Special or Abundant Grace which I asserted, I did not consider contrary even to the Formula of Concord (by a true or false judgment).

XIII. I taught by several reasons: That we are elected in Christ and on account of Christ (Diff. I. Chap. II. §. V); that Faith enters into the Decree of Election and constitutes a part of the divine order (τάξεως); and indeed as a necessary Means or Condition for obtaining Salvation; that it is required of Us as our Duty to be performed by Us; yet that this is not from Us, but its Principle is the Grace of God.

XIV. Whence also I did not deny, but admitted, Faith foreseen from the powers of Grace. Diff. I. Chap. II. §. VII.

XV. I made the Decree of Election not absolute, but Respective and Ordained (Diff. I. Chap. II. §. VIII); on the contrary, I simply denied that the Decree of Reprobation is Absolute, and I wrote and proved with many reasons that men who are Sinners, ungrateful, unfaithful, stubborn, finally impenitent, and deserving of rejection in multiple ways by their voluntary and avoidable malice, are not only passed over but also consigned to most just punishments. Diff. I. Chap. III. §. III, VII, VIII.

XVI. I cannot be brought to believe that this Opinion concerning the Grace of God owes mockery to the Theologians of Belgium, Switzerland, and Geneva. For they are not so inhuman as to hold in mockery the opinion of many of their Predecessors, indeed of the first Reformers themselves, whose Consensus I have adduced in a long series. Nor did Johannes Clericus write this, which a certain most Celebrated Man reports that he wrote, but in the *Bibliothèque Choisie*, Tom. V, he has only this concerning the Belgians, Genevans, and Swiss: "The Author refutes the first two sentiments (of the Supralapsarians and Infralapsarians) and maintains that Universalism is the sentiment most commonly received among the Reformed and even that the Synod of Dort is not opposed to it: this is what he

will persuade neither the Reformed of the United Provinces, nor those of Geneva and Switzerland, nor the Arminians, etc.” Anyone skilled in the French language sees that no mention of mockery is made here.

But in that which Clericus says, that I wished to persuade that Universalism is commonly received among the Reformed, in that he has not grasped my mind. For by those Testimonies adduced in a long line from Reformed Authors I did not wish to persuade that Universalism is commonly received today in Belgium, Switzerland, and Geneva, but with those votes I wished to free the Universalism of the Reformed from the Suspicion of Novelty and Singularity, not paying attention to what is taught today in those places. I alleged the Consensus of the Synod of Dort on these four Heads:

1. That whoever are called are seriously called.
2. That the Death of the Son of God is abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world.
3. That because many who are called do not believe in Christ, but perish in unbelief, the fault for this is not in the sacrifice of Christ offered on the Cross, nor in the Gospel, nor in God who calls, but in the called themselves.
4. Nor did I say that the very Order of the Divine Decrees, such as is defended by the Universalists, was disapproved by the Synod, relying among other things on the Authority of Ludovicus Crocius, Paulus Steinius, and the British Theologians who attended the Synod.

That I alleged the Consensus of the Synod on these four Heads can no more be held against me as a fault than against Dr. Balthasar Mentzer, a Lutheran Theologian, whose words I produced in Diff. I. Subsect. III. §. IX. n. 14. lit. µ. p. 105, 106 of the later Edition (of this Edition p. 173).

In the remaining Questions which occur concerning the Doctrine of Predestination, whether Universalism was approved or rejected by the Synod of Dort, and in what sense, just as I did not deny it, so I did not affirm it. Certainly, the Universalists who attended the Synod did not believe that they were condemned there or that their opinion was rejected there; but this is not the place to speak of that matter.

But in that which Clericus says, that the Arminians hold our opinion in mockery, in that he is mistaken. They do not hold this opinion in mockery, but they praise

it, at least they do not hold it in the same place as Supralapsarianism and Categorical Infralapsarianism, as some call it, nor do they call it a mere Incrustation of the most rigid opinions; which is clear from the words of two Doctors among them, to be subjected here. For thus Stephanus Curcellæus writes in *Institutio Religionis Christianae*, lib. VI, c. VII, §. II, p. 372:

“But there are others who do not reluctantly confess that there are some, although in small number, who by the help of common grace believe in Jesus Christ; yet that GOD, out of His immense goodness, but a free one and owed to no one, so that so many more may be saved, has decreed to confer some greater aid on certain peculiarly beloved ones, which is not only sufficient to lead them to faith, but also infallibly produces it in them. Which is perhaps not entirely foreign to the truth, since some examples of it seem to occur in the sacred letters, as in Saul, in Cornelius the Centurion. If this is admitted in good faith, the principal difficulties which arise from the absolute decree will vanish of their own accord, and there will be no reason for Christians to contend any more among themselves about it.

For it seems to me to be sufficient if these two things are established:

- (1) That absolutely no mortal is destined for eternal damnation, except on account of his own sins which are avoidable by the grace of GOD.
- (2) That for no one is the approach to salvation open, except through the free and properly so-called obedience of faith.

I require nothing more for peace. Let them otherwise establish an aid of Grace as efficacious as they will for engendering faith in our hearts, I will not fight back, provided it appears that this aid is such that it does not subvert the nature of obedience and does not introduce fate into religion.”

The same author, *ibid.* C. XV, p. 418, Col. 2:

“Nor, as I have warned above, would I wish to odiously reciprocate the saw of contention with those who think that a particular and absolute election is given to certain ones, whom God wishes to gift with greater grace than the rest; provided they would concede that none of those to whom the Gospel is announced is destitute of that measure of grace which is necessarily required for believing and obtaining eternal salvation. For this being posited, there would be found at least some few among so many thousands of those to whose ears it daily sounds, who would believe in Jesus Christ, even if they were not gifted with the peculiar efficacious grace of the elect. Since it is not believable that all

without exception would be so wicked and incorrigible as to voluntarily, and although they could do otherwise, persevere in their Unbelief. And even if it should happen otherwise, the cause of damnation could not be attributed to anything but the sole voluntary malice and stubbornness of the sinners, who were wanting to grace, not to a defect or privation of the grace of God.”

Philippus a Limborch, *Theologia Christiana*, Lib. IV, C. X, §. VI, p. 338-339:

“Therefore others, noticing this difficulty, do not reluctantly confess that there are some, although in small number, who by the help of that common grace believe in Christ: yet that God, out of His immense goodness, but a free one and owed to no one, so that more may be saved, confers some greater aid on certain peculiarly elect ones, by which they are irresistibly converted. Johannes Overullus seems to propose that one in the *Epistolae Ecclesiasticae*, Epist. CCX, which he adds to conditional predestination. We acknowledge a diversity of degrees of divine grace: and if it is admitted that some are saved by common grace, then it must be confessed that irresistible grace is not necessarily required for conversion, but only for an easier Conversion. These things are easily tolerated:

For these two things are established:

1. That no one is damned, except for his own fault.
2. The free obedience of faith is not taken away.

Thus there is consent on the main points: the dissent which remains is of less moment than that we should wish to contend sharply with anyone on account of it.”

Those things which Curcellæus wrote in the Tractate *l'Avis d'un personnage désintéressé* (The Advice of a disinterested person), concern the opinion of the French, of Cameron, Amyraldus, etc., who are supposed to deny Sufficient Subjective Grace. But since our opinion admits Sufficient Subjective Grace and the Sufficient Vocation, and teaches in set words that those Called by the Gospel can, by the help of Sufficient Grace, believe and convert themselves, and indeed does not deny that some are in fact converted and saved by the help of that Grace, those things therefore do not touch our opinion and are opposed to us in vain.

You, Christian Reader, weigh those things which are written in my Tractate itself and are here in good faith most briefly repeated, setting aside for a time partisan zeal, in the fear of God, and recognize whether these are mockeries! Farewell!

Given at Frankfurt on the Oder, on the 24th day of September, in the Year 1709.